

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 Jen Snape

Officers:

Helena Plant, Paul Lester, Holly Johnston and Amar Hussain

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

50. APOLOGIES

There were no Apologies for absence, all Members were in attendance.

51. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

52. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 13th February 2025 were presented to Members.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 13th February 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

53. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair Announced that there was an update report in relation to Agenda item 5 (Minute No54). Members indicated that they were happy with the content and the Update reports were noted.

Chair

54. 25/00103/PIP - LAND ADJACENT TO FECKENHAM GARDENS, ASTWOOD LANE, FECKENHAM, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B96 6JQ

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the number of objections received exceeded the relevant threshold and therefore the proposal fell outside of 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 8 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Land Adjacent to Feckenham Gardens, Astwood Lane, Feckenham, Redditch, Worcestershire, B96 6JQ and sought the erection of up to 9 dwellings.

Officers clarified to Members that before them was a Planning in Principle (PIP) application and not a Planning application. Officers further clarified that a PIP application was a route that developers could pursue to secure housing led developments. This type of application was in two parts, the first part being the PIP and a subsequent technical details application.

The PIP was to identify if the principle of the development was acceptable and only the Location, Land use and Amount of development could be considered. All other factors would be considered at the Technical Details application.

The site covered an area of 0.9hectares and the location and proposed access were identified by Officers on pages 6 to 8 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

Officers outlined the concept of Grey Belt, introduced through the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 with the addition of Paragraph 155 and the glossary definition. Further guidance was issued in February 2025.

Although consultee responses had been gathered as part of the application Members were reminded that Drainage/Highways matters would be considered at a future Technical Details Application.

At the invitation of the Chair Mr Alan Smith, local resident, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The following was clarified following questions from Members.

- That the concept of Grey Belt was introduced in December 2024 and was a further consideration for Officers when determining an application.
- That for a PIP application, only the Location, Land use and Amount of development could be considered, all other areas would be covered under a technical details' application.
- The application site only covered the land defined by the red line shown on page 6 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.
- That the application was for 'up to' 9 dwellings, this could be less if determined when a layout was decided during the technical details' application.
- That if the number of objections received was again above relevant thresholds as to take the application outside of the scheme of delegation, then the technical details application would be required to come before Members of the Planning Committee.

Members then considered the application which officers recommended for approval.

Officers clarified for Members that as Grey Belt designations were a new concept, Officers were looking closely at cases and appeal outcomes to determine how other authorities interpreted the change to the NPPF. Officers assured Members that they were comfortable with their recommendation. Officers reminded members that if applications were refused then applicants had the right to appeal.

Members were broadly in support of the PIP application but raised a number of points including drainage, highways and Section 106 Monies. However, Members accepted that they were not considerations at this stage, and on being put to a vote it was:

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Permission in Principle was GRANTED subject to Conditions as outlined on page 29 of the Public Reports pack.

55. 25/00207/ADV - LAND ADJACENT, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE.

The application was reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application site involved Council owned land, 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 9 to 21 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Land Adjacent to Birmingham Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, and sought retrospective consent for the display of advertisements for the nearby residential development.

Officers detailed that the application covered 1 v-Board and 2 flagpole advertisements and drew Members' attention to their locations on pages 10 and 11 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The flag poles stood at 6m in height with the v-board standing at 3.66m. As the application was retrospective, Officers were able to show Members images of the advertisements, detailed on pages 16 to 19 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. It was also noted that there were no further advertisements, so no proliferation of the advertisement was identified. Overall, Officers detailed that the advertisement would not result in an adverse impact to visual amenity, nor would it result in any harm to public safety. Therefore, Officers recommended the application for approval.

It was detailed after questions from Members that the consent would be valid for 3 years from 31st January 2025, after which the advertisements would be removed, this would be secured under Condition 1 of the application.

Members were in support of the application and therefore, on being put to a vote it was:

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Advertisement consent was GRANTED subject to conditions as outlined on pages 34 and 35 of the Public Reports pack.

56. 25/00247/S73 - PHASE 6 DEVELOPMENT BROCKHILL EAST, HEWELL ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE

The application was reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application was for major development (more than 1000 sq metres of new commercial / Industrial floorspace), 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 23 to 35 of the Site

Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Phase 6 of the Development in Brockhill East, Hewell Road, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought variation of Condition 1 attached to the previously approved application 22/01535/REM.

Phase 6 of the Brockhill Development was approved in July 2023 by the Planning Committee, Taylor Wimpey have since taken over development of the site from Persimmon and sought to amend the layout and substitute housing types with their own.

Condition 1 detailed the site layout plans which would need to change if the layout and housing configuration was amended. Due to the number of proposed changes, it was not deemed suitable to approve the changes under delegated powers.

Officers clarified that there was no alteration to the types of dwellings or housing mix, which included affordable units, however there would be changes to elevations and floor layouts.

Members attention was drawn to page 28 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack which overlayed the approved and proposed site plans to highlight the extent of the changes. Officers further Highlighted the retention of the visitor parking spaces across the development.

No objections were received from Worcestershire County Council Highways (County Highways) regarding the alterations, Nore from any other relevant consultee.

At the invitation of the Chair, Michaela Corbett, the Applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The following was clarified following questions from Members.

- Condition 4 detailed on page 45 of the Public Reports pack, required the submission of plans for the pedestrian pathways to be submitted prior to approval. Additionally, the applicant would be aware of concerns raised during previous developments.
- That the application supplied a lower % of affordable housing units which was deemed acceptable as at the time more was supplied in other phases of the development as to meet affordable housing targets.

Members expressed their support for the retention of the visitors parking spaces on the development, however, concern was raised regarding the pedestrian pathways and how previous developments

had grass verges rather than hard standing which caused problems. Members asked for their concerns to be noted and that they hoped the applicant would take note also.

On being put to a vote it was:

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions as outlined on pages 44 to 46 of the Public Reports pack.

57. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to conduct, however, as a new item Officers clarified that an urgent decision would only be brought before Members under exceptional circumstances, following recommendation of the Monitoring Officer and with the agreement of the Chair. In that instance Members would be given as much notice as practicable with papers being made available to Members at the earliest opportunity.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.02 pm