



# Planning Committee

Thu 16 Jan  
2025  
7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community  
Centre, Castleditch  
Lane, B98 7YB



**If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact**

**Gavin Day  
Democratic Services Officer**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH  
Tel: (01527) 64252 (Ext. 3304)  
email: [gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)**



## ***GUIDANCE ON FACE TO FACE MEETINGS***

---

If you have any questions regarding the agenda or attached papers, please do not hesitate to contact Gavin Day ([gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk))

### **PUBLIC SPEAKING**

For this meeting the options to participate will be in person, by joining the meeting using a video link, or by submitting a statement to be read out by officers.

The process approved by the Council for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee is (subject to the discretion and control of the Chair) as summarised below:

in accordance with the running order detailed in this agenda and updated by the separate Update report:

- 1) Introduction of application by Chair
- 2) Officer presentation of the report.
- 3) Public Speaking - in the following order:-
  - a. Objectors to speak on the application;
  - b. Ward Councillors (in objection)
  - c. Supporters to speak on the application;
  - d. Ward Councillors (in support)
  - e. Applicant (or representative) to speak on the application.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Democratic Services Team (by 12 noon on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025) and invited to the table or lectern.

- 4) Members' questions to the Officers and formal debate / determination.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Democratic Services Team and invited to address the committee.

Each individual speaker will have up to a maximum of 3 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.

Each group of supporters or objectors with a common interest will have up to a maximum of 10 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.

---

Notes:

- 1) Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify Gavin Day from the Democratic Services Team on 01527 64252 (Ex 3304) or by email at [gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) before **12 noon on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025**
- 2) Advice and assistance will be provided to public speakers as to how to access the meeting and those using the video link will be provided with joining details for Microsoft Teams. Provision has been made in the amended Planning Committee procedure rules for public speakers who cannot access the meeting by Teams, and those speakers will be given the opportunity to submit their speech in writing to be read out by an officer at the meeting. Please take care when preparing written comments to ensure that the reading time will not exceed three minutes. Any speakers wishing to submit written comments must do so by **12 noon on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025**.
- 3) Reports on all applications will include a summary of the responses received from consultees and third parties, an appraisal of the main planning issues and a recommendation. All submitted plans and documentation for each application, including consultee responses and third party representations, re available to view in full via the Public Access facility on the Council's website [www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)
- 4) It should be noted that, in coming to its decision, the Committee can only take into account planning issues, namely policies contained in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 and other material considerations, which include Government Guidance and other relevant policies published since the adoption of the Development Plan and the "environmental factors" (in the broad sense) which affect the site.
- 5) Although this is a public meeting, there are circumstances when the committee might have to move into closed session to consider exempt or confidential information. For agenda items that are exempt, the public are excluded.
- 6) Late circulation of additional papers is not advised and is subject to the Chair's agreement. The submission of any significant new information might lead to a delay in reaching a decision. The deadline for papers to be received by Planning Officers is 4.00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.

Further assistance:

If you require any further assistance prior to the meeting, please contact the Democratic Services Officer (indicated on the inside front cover), Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services, or Planning Officers, at the same address.

At the meeting, these Officers will normally be seated either side of the Chair, who will be seated at the front left-hand corner of the Committee table as viewed from the Public Gallery.



# Planning

Thursday, 16th January, 2025

7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community Centre

## Agenda

### Membership:

Cllrs:	Andrew Fry (Chair)	Bill Hartnett
	William Boyd (Vice-Chair)	Sid Khan
	Juma Begum	David Munro
	Brandon Clayton	Jen Snape
	Claire Davies	

**1.** Apologies

**2.** Declarations of Interest

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and / or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.

**3.** Confirmation of Minutes (Pages 7 - 20)

**4.** Update Reports

To note Update Reports (if any) for the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting (circulated prior to the commencement of the meeting)

**5.** 24/01179/FUL - Land At 13 - 66, Winslow Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 0NQ (Pages 21 - 24)

This page is intentionally left blank



## Planning Committee

---

Thursday, 14th November,  
2024

### MINUTES

#### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Brandon Clayton, Claire Davies, Bill Hartnett, David Munro and Jen Snape

#### Officers:

Helena Plant and Amar Hussain

#### Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

#### 27. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sid Khan.

#### 28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 29. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2024 were presented to Members.

#### **RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2024 were approved as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.**

#### 30. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair Announced that there was an update report in relation to Agenda item 5 (Minute No31).

Members were given a few minutes to read the report, after which Members indicated they were happy to proceed and moved that the Update reports were noted.

Chair

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 14th November, 2024

---

**31. 24/00717/OUT - IPSLEY HOUSE, IPSLEY CHURCH LANE, IPSLEY, REDDITCH, B98 0AJ**

This application was reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application was for major development. Further, the application required a Section 106 Agreement. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 5 to 14 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application sought outline planning permission for the demolition of Ipsley House, Ipsley Church Lane, Ipsley, Redditch, B98 0AJ and the construction of residential dwellings.

Officers clarified for Members that it was an outline application and that they were asked to determine the principle of development and means of access to the site only. All other matters were reserved and would be considered under a later detailed application at a future Committee meeting.

The site location was detailed on pages 6 to 9 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. The locations of Ipsley Court (to the east), Shottery close (to the North) and St.Peters Church (South east) were also identified.

Although the local plan detailed on page 10 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack identified the land as primary employment space, Officers were satisfied that the site had been suitably marketed with no success. Members were informed that permission had been granted for the conversion of the building to 79 apartments under application 24/00430/CUPRIO

Officers detailed that the existing access shown on page 12 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack would need to be amended, the proposed new access was shown on pages 13 and 14. The reason for the change was to permit room for a public footpath to be included (shown in blue), however, due to nearby tree root systems it was deemed better to move the access slightly to accommodate the addition.

Officers drew Members attention to pages 5 to 7 of the Update Reports pack and highlighted the amendments to conditions 1, 5 and 6. Officers further proposed an additional Condition 13 requiring the submission of details of the mix of type and size of dwellings to be provided prior to the submission of any reserved matters application.



# Planning Committee

Thursday, 14th November, 2024

---

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Steve Williams, an interested party, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Mr David Fovargue, the applicant's agent, also addressed the Committee in support.

The following was clarified after questions from Members.

- That the application was an outline application and that the only points to be determined were the access to the site and principle of development.
- In line with current guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), there was little that could be done to enforce a passive house standard.
- A detailed planning application would need to demonstrate that dwelling to dwelling separation distances would be in accordance with the Councils Supplementary Planning Document, High Quality Design.
- The development was eligible under the vacant building credit scheme, therefore, there may be no requirement for affordable housing under the full application. However, the specific requirement would depend on the total floor space of the dwellings.
- Condition 7 covered the construction management plan which would have consideration to the operation and activities conducted at St.Peters Church.
- A 10% biodiversity net gain would be required under the full application; however, this figure would not have regard to the demolition of the existing building.

Members then debated the application.

Some Members expressed an opinion that it would have been better to utilise the existing building, however, they accepted that the Borough was also in need of 2-4 bedroom dwellings which would be provided by the development.

The highway access and impact on traffic was discussed by Members, however, Officers noted that Worcestershire County Council, Highways raised no objection to the principle of the development.

Some concern was raised regarding the proposed re- wording of Conditions 1, 5 and 6 as set out in the update report and Councillor Jen Snape proposed an Alternative Recommendation which omitted the wording "with the exception of any demolition works". However, without a seconder the amendment was not carried.

Members expressed the opinion that they could not see any material planning reasons to warrant refusal of the application since

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 14th November, 2024

---

the proposal complied with all relevant policies. Therefore, on being put to a vote it was:

**RESOLVED that**

**having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning and Leisure Services to GRANT outline planning permission subject to:-**

- a) **The satisfactory completion of a S106 planning obligation.**
- b) **Conditions 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 as detailed on pages 31 to 35 of the Public Reports pack.**
- c) **Amended Conditions 1, 5 and 6 as detailed on pages 5 to 7 of the Update Reports pack**
- d) **The additional Condition 13 as detailed in the pre-amble above.**
- e) **informatives as detailed on pages 35 to 37 of the Public Reports pack.**

**32. 24/00740/S73 - DEVELOPMENT SITE AT, WEIGHTS LANE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE**

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the application required a Section 106 Agreement. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 15 to 18 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Development Site at Weights Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought the variation of Condition 35 of the hybrid planning permission 19/00977/HYB.

Condition 35 of the hybrid planning permission 19/00977/HYB stated that no more than 128 dwellings shall be occupied until the highway improvements on Dagnel End Road were complete. The application sought to increase that number to 200.

As the hybrid application was between Bromsgrove District and Redditch Borough Councils, approval was sought and required by both. Approval was given by the Bromsgrove District Planning Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2024.

Officers detailed that the Worcestershire County Council (WCC), Highways Section 278 team had assessed the works and advised

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 14th November, 2024

---

that it would not be approved until March 2025. The WCC, Highways team further detailed that the impact of increasing from 128 to 200 dwellings was assessed which was identified to be 22 trips which and was within daily fluctuations. Therefore, there was deemed to be no significant impact and no objection was raised.

Finally, Officers detailed that a section Section 73 notice was not included in the original Section 106 legal agreement, therefore, a supplementary deed would also need to be obtained.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Danis Miles, a local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application, additionally, Ms Elizabeth Wood, the applicant agent, addressed Members in support of the application.

The following was clarified following questions from Members.

- There was no consultation undertaken with local resident, however, one was not required under the application.
- That the 200 dwellings were the maximum permitted to be sold/occupied. It was not a requirement to start work and the work may be complete prior to reaching this value.
- Officers could not comment on/identify the source of the delay, only that the date was arrived at following discussions between WCC, Highways and the applicant.
- Cost incurred by raising the supplementary deed would be covered by the applicant.

During the debate of the application, Members expressed their displeasure that the works had not been completed. However, Members accepted that what was before them was an amendment to Condition 35 and that without objections from relevant consultees and given that BDC had already approved the application, there was no Material Planning reason for refusal.

On being put to a vote it was

**RESOLVED that**

**Delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning and Leisure Services to Grant the Hybrid Planning Permission to:**

- a) determine the planning application following the receipt of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism and;**
- b) updated conditions relating to 19/00977/HYB and to agree the final scope, detailed wording and numbering of conditions.**

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 14th November, 2024

---

**33. 24/00839/S73 - DEVELOPMENT SITE AT, WEIGHTS LANE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE**

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the application required a Section 106 Agreement. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 19 to 24 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Development Site at Weights Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought the variation of Condition 4 (approved plans) of the hybrid planning permission 19/00977/HYB.

Condition 4 was the approved plans for the application, however, following additional assessments on differing ground levels a number of amendments were proposed. Officers drew Members attention to pages 22 and 23 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack which detailed the changes.

A number of two-bedroom dwellings would be changes to 1 bed maisonettes and there would be an orientation change to the last plot. Officers detailed that the overall number of dwellings would not change, nor would the allocation of affordable housing provided by the development.

Officers also detailed that a section Section 73 notice was not included in the original Section 106 legal agreement, therefore, a supplementary deed would also need to be obtained.

The following was clarified following questions from Members.

- That there would be a drop in supplied bed spaces by the development, however there was still a sufficient split between 1/2/3 and 4 bed dwellings over the site.
- That due to the movement of the access of the upper maisonette being at the side of the dwelling, a revised lighting plan may be needed, this was secured under Condition 11.

On being put to a vote it was

**RESOLVED that**

**Having had regard to the development plan and to all other material planning considerations, authority be delegated to the**

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 14th November, 2024

---

**Assistant Director for Planning and Leisure Services to Grant outline planning permission subject to:**

- a) determine the planning application following the receipt of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism and ;**
- b) updated conditions relating to 19/00977/HYB and to agree the final scope, detailed wording and numbering of conditions.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.10 pm

This page is intentionally left blank



## Planning Committee

Thursday, 5th December,  
2024

### MINUTES

#### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Brandon Clayton, Claire Davies, Bill Hartnett, Sid Khan, David Munro and Rita Rogers

#### Also Present:

Councillors Joe Baker, Jane Spilsbury and Ian Woodall

#### Officers:

Helena Plant and Amar Hussain and Jo Chambers

#### Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

#### 34. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Jen Snape with Councillor Rita Rogers in attendance as substitute.

#### 35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Munro declared in that he was a Ward Member for The Headless Cross and Oakenshaw Ward, however, he had not been involved in any discussion with constituents so as not to effect his decision making.

Councillor Juma Begum declared that she lived in the vicinity of the application, however, she had not been involved in any discussion with residents and it would not affect her decision.

#### 36. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair Announced that there was an update report in relation to Agenda item 4 (Minute No37).

Members were given a few minutes to read the report, after which Members indicated they were happy to proceed and moved that the Update reports were noted.

Chair

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 5th December, 2024

---

**37. 23/01388/FUL - 131-135 BIRCHFIELD ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 4LE**

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the application required a Section 106 Agreement. Furthermore, eleven or more objections have been received and the recommendation was for approval. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 5 to 16 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for 131 - 135 Birchfield Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 4LE and sought the demolition of the existing building and construction of a new convenience store and associated parking.

Officers drew Members attention to the location of the development on page 7 of the Site plans and presentations pack, the site was identified as use Class E (Commercial, Business and Service), therefore no change of use was sought as part of the application.

The site plan was detailed on page 8 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, Officers drew attention to the singular vehicular entrance proposed off Feckenham Road with the current vehicular entrance from Birchfield Road being closed off with pedestrian access only being provided from this point. The proposed parking was also detailed which included 15 spaces, 2 of which were disabled spaces, 2 electric Vehicle Charging spaces and additional motor bike and cycle parking.

Worcestershire County Council Highways ("County Highways") had raised no objection to the development, subject to a contribution of £30,000 towards a Toucan crossing which would be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

Acoustic fencing of varying heights, ranging from 1.8m to 4m, was detailed as being located adjacent to Archer Terrace it was clarified that the 5m hedge along the boundary of the site would be retained to aid in screening.

Officers clarified that delegated authority was being sought to allow the completion of the Section 106 agreement, Conditions would also to be decided by delegated authority, however, Members were assured that all the usual conditions would be enforced should Members approve the application.



# Planning Committee

Thursday, 5th December, 2024

---

At the invitation of the Chair, local residents Leslie Champion, Emma Ravenscroft and Margaret Wheeler addressed the committee in opposition of the application, Councillor Ian Woodall also addressed the Committee in opposition as a Ward Member. Tony Aspbury addressed Members in support of the development.

The following was clarified following questions from Members:

- There was no separate staff parking proposed. The 15 parking spaces required under the Streetscape Design Guide included the provision for employee parking.
- The proposed development was single storey, the towers shown in the elevation images on pages 11 and 12 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, were cosmetic in nature and would have false windows.
- Articulated lorries would not service the site, the largest delivery vehicle would be a 10.35m long rigid delivery vehicle.
- 70% of the trips to the unit would already be on the highway network.
- The designation (Class E) of the site would allow the conversion of the current building to a convenience store without any planning approval.
- That the £30,000 contribution towards the Toucan crossing was not the full cost but a contribution based on the size and type of development. Officers had no information on the total cost or when this crossing would be installed. It was further clarified that there was no requirement from the County Highways to complete the crossing prior to opening.
- The AM delivery restriction proposed by County Highways would need to be discussed with the applicant, who have stated that it would make the development unviable. However, once a decision has been attained it would become a drafted condition that must be adhered to.
- The traffic survey took place during the summer period when schools were not in session.
- Traffic calming measures were not recommended by County Highways, therefore, it would be unreasonable to attach Conditions relating to this to the application.
- That a 147-page transport statement document was submitted by the applicant which covered pedestrian and vehicular traffic generated by the development.

Members then debated the application.

Members expressed a general displeasure that the traffic survey was undertaken during the summer holiday period and expressed the opinion that this may have tainted the results of the assessment. Members explored the possibility of asking for a new

traffic survey to be undertaken at a more appropriate time. However, after discussion with Officers it was detailed that County Highways raised no objection and did not identify the timing of the survey to be a weakness in the assessment. Therefore, it would not be reasonable to ask for a new traffic survey and there would be no obligation for either County Highways or the applicant to undertake this.

It was highlighted that the applicant had a strong fallback position in that the site was designated as Use Class E. The applicant would be able to convert the current building to a convenience store without requiring planning permission. It was further noted that in such an instance the two access points to the site would remain, County Highways would not receive a contribution towards a toucan crossing and there would be no requirement for the applicant to provide parking amendments such as EV charge points and disabled parking.

Officers clarified that for County Highways to raise an objection to a development the impact on the highway system would need to be severe. However, according to data submitted by the applicant which had been analysed by County Highways the increase trip generation would be +27 vehicles in each direction during the busiest period. This was not deemed as a severe impact and thus no objection was raised by County Highways.

Members enquired as to if County Highways was aware of the immediate location around the site, in particular if they were aware of the proximity of the two schools, and if Officers had visited the location. Officers assured Members that during their assessment they had been to the site, however, they were not able to answer the questions in regard to the County Highways team.

Some Members stated that they were not technical experts and had to listen to the analysis of the data submitted by relevant consultees, regardless of if they disagreed with the results. The importance of having evidence to support material Planning Reasons to go against the Officer's recommendation was highlighted, otherwise the applicant could appeal the decision and the Council could have costs awarded against them.

After discussion and input with various Members an alternative Recommendation was proposed by Councillor Claire Davies to defer the application. However, as there were a number of reasons suggested by various Members, the Chair permitted a short break to allow Councillor Davies an opportunity to formulate the exact wording of the Alternative Recommendation on which Members would vote.

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 5th December, 2024

---

At the invitation of the Chair, the Committee adjourned between 21:22 hours and 21:42 hours, to allow Members time to consider the wording of the Alternative Recommendation.

Having reconvened the meeting, Councillor Claire Davies raised an Alternative Recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Brandon Clayton to defer the application to a future meeting of the Planning Committee subject to the following information being sought from County Highways.

1. The likelihood of a Toucan crossing being installed and when?
2. Were the people who undertook the Traffic Audit aware of the two schools?
3. Why was the traffic survey undertaken in August and why is this acceptable given it is during school holidays?
4. Did a County Highways Officer visit the site and adjacent roads.

On being put to a vote it was

**RESOLVED that**

**having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, the application was deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee pending submission of information from County Highways on the following matters:**

1. **The likelihood of a Toucan crossing being installed and when?**
2. **Were the people who undertook the Traffic Audit aware of the two schools?**
3. **Why was the traffic survey undertaken in August and why is this acceptable given it is during school holidays?**
4. **Did a County Highways Officer visit the site and adjacent roads.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 9.50 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE****16<sup>th</sup> January 2025****Planning Application 24/01179/FUL****Replacement windows at numbers 13 to 66 Winslow Close.****Land At 13 - 66, Winslow Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 0NQ,****Applicant: Mrs Penny Bevington  
Ward: Winyates****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Chad Perkins, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 881257 Email: chad.perkins@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

**Site Description**

The site is located in the Winyates East area of Redditch, on the eastern side of Winslow Close. A public footpath runs along the northern boundary of the site. To the east of the site, behind a row of mature trees are the playing fields of Tenacres First School. The proposal relates to a total of 54 units, located in three connected blocks of flats comprising numbers 13-66 Winslow Close.

**Proposal Description**

The proposal comprises the replacement of the existing windows within each flat across all three blocks. The windows in communal areas are not part of this proposal and would remain unchanged, The replacement windows would be similar in style, colour and the way in which they open.

Notwithstanding the above, the existing flats have a projecting or 'hanging bay' window serving their living room areas. These would be removed under this permission. These window elements are proposed to be replaced by windows which are flush with the external wall. This change is proposed to be necessary as residents find the current hanging bay windows leads to extensive condensation collecting, which the Tenants and leaseholders find hard to control. This is brought about due to the cold spot and the potential lack of insulation to the box section and wall underneath the windows. The condensation then mixes with the dust particles and allows mould growth to start.

It is proposed that the works proposed would reduce this cold spot area significantly, by replacing the windows and insulating the area at the cavity openings and at the wall hidden by the boxing. The window replacement is due to be coupled with replacement of the cavity wall insulation, loft insulation top up, improved ventilation and heating controls (where needed). This is being partly funded by the SHDF Wave 2 Grant funding with 50% co-funding by RBC.

Replacement of internal doors in communal areas is also proposed, however this would be internal works and is not considered to be a planning matter.

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL****PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

---

**Relevant Policies:****Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4:**

Policy 15: Climate Change

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

**Others**

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

**Relevant Planning History**

There are no previous relevant planning applications.

**Consultations**

None required in this circumstance

**Public Consultation Response**

A site notice was erected on site on 22.11.2024. No responses were received.

**Assessment of Proposal**

The information submitted has been assessed against the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 and the policies listed above.

With regard to design, the proposed windows are considered to be of a high quality, retaining the existing colour and design where appropriate. The proposed external alterations, consisting of the removal of all the existing hanging bay windows is considered to be of an acceptable design, having regard to the presence of existing flush windows on a number of other external elevations. The colour of all replacement windows would be unaltered.

The proposals would represent a benefit to occupiers of the flats within the blocks as they would increase energy-efficient and reduce energy costs. The flush windows would remove the elements which are currently contributing to cold spots, leading to damp and the growth of mould. Further, in accordance with Policy 15 regarding Climate Change, the proposals would increase the energy efficiency of the units through the combination of new double-glazed windows and the use of insulation.

No new openings are being proposed, therefore there are no neighbour amenity issues regarding overlooking to neighbouring properties in Winslow Close or towards Tenacres First School.

Officers are therefore of the view that the proposals are considered to be acceptable with regard to policies at both the Local and National level.

**RECOMMENDATION:****That having regard to the development plan and to all other material**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

---

considerations, planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

### **Conditions**

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

Location Plan – dated 13th of November  
Window Survey Report– dated 13th of November

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning.

### **Procedural matters**

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant is Redditch Borough Council. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank