



Planning Committee

Thu 17 Apr
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**



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)

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 Monday 14th April 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 before **12 noon on Monday 14th April 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 Monday 14th April 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
- 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, 17th April, 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 - 16)

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. 25/00103/PIP - Land Adjacent to Feckenham Gardens, Astwood Lane, Feckenham, Redditch, Worcestershire, B96 6JQ (Pages 17 - 30)

6. 25/00207/ADV - Land Adjacent, Birmingham Road, Redditch, Worcestershire. (Pages 31 - 36)

7. 25/00247/S73 - Phase 6 Development Brockhill East, Hewell Road, Redditch, Worcestershire (Pages 37 - 46)

8. Urgent Business

To consider any Urgent Reports, details of which have been notified to the Assistant Director of Legal, Democratic and Procurement Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chair, by reason of special circumstances, considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank



Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February,
2025

MINUTES

Present:

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

Also Present:

Councillors Juliet Barker Smith and Ian Woodall

Officers:

Amar Hussain, Helena Plant, Jo Chambers, Steve Edden and Chad Perkins

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

43. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Juma Begum with Councillor Paul Wren in attendance as substitute.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

During consideration of Agenda item 6 (Minute No48) Councillors Bill Hartnett and Jen Snape declared an interest in that they were Rubicon Board Members.

45. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 16th January 2025 were presented to Members.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 16th January 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

Chair

Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February, 2025

46. UPDATE REPORTS

The update report was presented to Members, The Chair permitted Members 10 minutes to familiarise themselves with the content as the report was 22 pages in length.

47. APPLICATION 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 had 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 17 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

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

The application had come before Members on 5th December 2025 and the decision at that time was for deferral, to attain additional information from Worcester County Council Highways (County Highways). The requested information had been attained and formed part of the Committee Report. However, the responses to the four questions were summarised as follows:

1. **The likelihood of a Toucan crossing being installed and when?** – there was no guarantee of a crossing being installed, this would be subject to an assessment being carried out.
2. **Were the people who undertook the Traffic Audit aware of the two schools?** – County Highways were aware of the schools.
3. **Why was the traffic survey undertaken in August and why is this acceptable given it is during school holidays?** – the survey was a traffic speed survey to ascertain stopping and viewing distance and therefore it was deemed acceptable to be undertaken at this time.
4. **Did a County Highways Officer visit the site and adjacent roads?** – an Officer from County Highways visited the site and adjacent roads.

Officers proceeded to draw Members attention to the Presentation which had not changed from the last Committee with the exception

of a single slide detailed on page 9 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. The additional slide highlighted the differences between the existing and proposed site layout.

The current site usage Class (Class E) permitted the building to be used as a convenience store. Should the application be refused, the applicant could choose to open a convenience store retaining the existing layout, without the additional landscaping, parking provision (EV, Bike and Bicycle) and could retain both entrances with no delivery time restrictions.

The Update Reports document from the Committee on 5th December 2024 was incorporated into the new Committee Report before Members. Officers guided Members through the changes to the report detailing the additions to Members.

Officers highlighted that County highways had clarified their position in that they considered the development could be safely operated with the existing or proposed configurations, therefore, they could see no reason to refuse the application on Highways grounds.

At the invitation of the Chair, local residents Emma Ravenscroft and Leslie Champion, 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:

- That illegal parking was stated as a matter for the police to enforce, however, the Chair clarified that parking enforcement was performed by a traffic warden employed by Wychavon District Council but paid for by Redditch Borough Council.
- The Legal Trigger for the £30k Section106 contribution towards a crossing would be paid prior to commencing the development.
- The “Traffic Survey” previously mention as having been undertaken in August 2023 was a “traffic speed survey”, intended to assess vehicle speeds to ascertain required visibility splays and was not to measure the volume of traffic along the road. To determine traffic speed it was deemed acceptable to have a traffic speed survey completed in a holiday period, as during this time traffic would not be impacted by severe rush hour traffic. Therefore, the average speed would be greater in the absence of a school rush hour and the visibility splays would need to be greater, benefiting road safety for the development.

Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February, 2025

- It was stated that during public speaking a consultation response recommending refusal by the Highway Authority was provided in May 2024 with an almost identical report being approved in September 2024. However, Officers clarified that there were a number of changes around key issues, following the submission of additional information. These changes led to the withdrawal of the County Highways objection.
- The addition of EV charging points was detailed under County Highways streetscape guidance. Additionally, this guidance included an allocation for staff parking on site. Therefore, the number of parking spaces proposed complied to this guidance.
- The 8:00-20:00 delivery restriction was decided on amenity (noise) grounds and County Highways did not consider that there was any highways based reason for a more onerous restriction.
- There was no guarantee of a toucan crossing being installed, this would be dependent on an assessment which needed to be carried out, the timescale for that being unknown. It was further detailed that County Highways did not see any safety grounds to expediate this, as based on their data, safe crossing could be achieved without the toucan crossing.
- Deliveries could take place during school rush hour and it was not deemed appropriate to restrict this, the Servicing Management Plan states that deliveries would be managed by a banksman who would assist with pedestrian safety.
- County Highways had visited the site and took likely vehicular parking patterns into account when assessing HGV turning data.

Officers also clarified that the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) was a nationally recognised which can be used to predict the traffic associated with new sites that match or have similar criteria. The system used a database to approximate the impact based on the size and type of proposed development, TRICS was a nationally recognised system and was the data requested to be submitted by County Highways. It was further clarified that in this instance County Highways were happy with the process and assessment and therefore, were not compelled or inclined to perform a local traffic survey for the development. A bespoke survey was not considered necessary.

Members then proceeded to debate the application

There was a short comfort break between 20:22 and 20:26 hours.

Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February, 2025

Members Stated that they had to adhere to guidance and procedures when determining an application, otherwise they would run the risk of having their decision overturned by judicial review. Members further stated that in determining an application, they must give significant weight to professional advice given by consultees and any reasons must be firmly planted in planning policy with justifiable reasons.

Members were displeased that the traffic assessment was performed in August which was not detailed as a neutral month. Officers clarified that the survey was to assess vehicle speeds only and that County Highways had found no issues with the findings.

The Chair clarified the stance of County Highways in that they were invited to attend the Committee considering questions raised by Members. However, County Highways declined to attend and stated that they would not usually attend meetings unless the developments were large in scale or in a strategic location.

Members expressed the importance of the resident's views and noted that should Members approve the application there were still several points to be finalised as the application was recommended to be Delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Cultural services. Members of the public were encouraged to raise concerns with their ward Members who were present and that they would be relayed to Officers to attempt to come to a solution which would serve the community in the best way possible.

After comments from Members, Officers clarified that there would be no grounds to support an Alternative Recommendation to amend the operational times of the HGV vehicles to outside of school hours as this was not a concern raised by the relevant consultee. Additionally, the allocation of EV charging points was covered under County Highways streetscape guidance and therefore it would not be suitable to amend that allocation.

Some Members expressed concern with the TRICS data used to determine the impact of the development, stating that in their opinion it was a desktop exercise which did not consider the specifics of the location with two schools in close proximity. Members expressed the opinion that the desktop exercise may be suitable for County Highways purposes, but they did not feel that it was enough for Elected Members representing their communities.

The specifics of the application were discussed by Members, and they were sympathetic as the development would lead to an increase of traffic, leading to road safety concerns. However, it was noted that the application was for the erection of a new building and there was no change of use required, therefore, matters relating to

Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February, 2025

traffic should not be material consideration as the applicant could open a convenience store without any amendment to the site. It was further noted that the building was the subject of the application and there was not a single objection from consultees or residents as to the suitability of the building.

Members stated that they were very sympathetic to the views of the local community, however, the law was not on their side and that restaurants, entertainment venues and Retail outlets were all covered under Class E usage. Should the Committee choose to throw out the application it would put the Council at risk and effect all the people in the Borough, furthermore, the application would likely be approved during judicial review considering the lack of consultee objection and go ahead anyway with the Council incurring costs.

The Chair noted the updated recommendation detailed on pages 14 and 15 of the Update Reports pack and 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, Leisure and Culture Services to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- 1. The satisfactory completion of a Section 106 planning obligation as detailed on page 14 of the Update Reports pack and;**
- 2. that DELEGATED POWERS be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of Conditions and Informatives as summarised on page 14 and 15 of the Update Reports pack.**

After voting for the Chair Announced a short comfort break and to permit Members of the public to leave if they wish. The Meeting stood adjourned from 21:11 hours to 21:13 hours.

48. APPLICATION 24/01242/S106A - 2 GROVE STREET, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 8DX

As noted in the Declarations of Interest under agenda item 3 (Minute No45), During consideration of this agenda item, Councillors Bill Hartnett and Jen Snape declared an interest in that they were Rubicon Board Members. Both Members left the room and took no part in the voting thereof.

Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February, 2025

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the application required the removal of a Section 106 (S106) Agreement. Therefore, 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 2 Grove Street, Redditch, B98 8DX and sought the removal of the S106 agreement attached to the planning permission 2004/066/FUL.

Officers detailed to Members the location shown in red on page 20 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, it was further clarified that before Members was not a planning application but an application to remove the Section 106 agreement from the planning permission 2004/066/FUL.

The S106 agreement covered three areas:

1. The provision of pedestrian footway / pavement improvements
2. Pedestrian linkage improvement including contributions to enhance the subway and its approaches. A figure of (£9,500) was required for these purposes.
3. The free use of the car park including the use of disabled spaces for the parking of private motor vehicles on a first come first served basis by users and staff of the Palace Theatre between the hours of 6pm and 12 midnight on every Saturday and Sunday

Numbers 1 and 2 had been completed in full and were discharged in May 2007 and therefore were not a consideration for Members. However, Number 3 was an ongoing agreement which was the subject of the application before Members.

Officers stated that the site had been up for purchase since Feb 2023 when Hughes ceased trading, and it was determined that the applicant may have more success if the carpark did not have a S106 agreement attached.

Officers were in support of the removal of the agreement as it was not reasonable to enforce one business to provide free parking to another.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Scott Bracken, the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February, 2025

After questions from Members the following was clarified by Officers:

- That there were a number of disabled parking sites in close proximity to the Palace Theatre which included two 24hour carparks.
- That it was unknown why it was deemed necessary 20 years ago to include the parking provision in the S106 agreement, however, it would not stand up to the current tests of necessity and reasonableness.

Members then debated the application

Although Members were sad to see the loss of parking provision, particularly for disabled users, they noted that removing the agreement was the right thing to do and if that permitted the site to come back under use it would be of a great benefit to the wider area.

It was further noted that the Palace Theatre was lucky to have attained the S106 agreement on the site in 2004, however, it was not suitable under regulations today.

Members also noted that the use of the carpark as a starting point for the Remembrance Day parade and asked that the site owner consider continuing to permit its use during that occasion.

On being put to the vote it was.

RESOLVED THAT

the request for the removal of the Section 106 agreement attached to 2004/066/FUL be granted.

49. APPLICATION 24/01338/FUL - LAND AT CHURCH GREEN EAST, REDDITCH

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was Redditch Borough Council. 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 25 to 30 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Land at Church Green East, Redditch and sought the erection of a CCTV Camera and steel column

Planning Committee

Thursday, 13th February, 2025

Officers detailed the location of the new CCTV Column on pages 26 and 27 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, with Pictures on Page 28 to detail the areas which it would be monitoring.

The CCTV camera was installed to close a blind spot in the current system's coverage, and oversee an alleyway between two buildings which was of some concern.

The new CCTV Pole would be slightly taller (10.6m) than existing units in the area (8m), the reason for this was due to the proximity of some trees and to permit good CCTV coverage without needing regular trimming of the trees.

Officers clarified that the Camera would cover a 360 degree range and in conjunction with the current units, enabled a consistent coverage in the town centre.

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 be granted subject to the conditions as outline on page 57 of the Public Reports pack.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 9.41 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE****17th April 2025****Planning Application 25/00103/PIP****Erection of up to 9 dwellings****Land Adjacent to Feckenham Gardens, Astwood Lane, Feckenham, Redditch,
Worcestershire, B96 6JQ****Applicant: Mr Richard Dormer
Ward: Astwood Bank and Feckenham Ward****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Emily Darby, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 881657 Email: emily.darby@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

Situated south of Astwood Lane, the application site comprises an open, grassy field beyond Feckenham Village's designated envelope and conservation area. The site's western boundary adjoins Feckenham Gardens, while its northern edge faces Winfields Outdoors and a small cluster of cottages across Astwood Lane. To the east, the site is bordered by an undeveloped plot, the Rockhill Farm buildings, and Yeates Acre. A mature hedgerow surrounds the site, and vehicular access is provided from Astwood Lane at the northeast corner.

Proposal Description

This is a Permission in Principle (PIP) application, it is an alternative route of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development, additional information is contained in the procedural section of the report. The proposed development is for up to 9 dwellings.

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

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy 4: Housing Provision

Policy 8: Green Belt

Policy 16: Natural Environment

Policy 17: Flood Risk Management

Policy 19: Sustainable travel and Accessibility

Policy 36: Historic Environment

Policy 38: Conservation Areas

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Others

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)
Redditch High Quality Design SPD

Relevant Planning History

24/00859/CPE	Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of land in association with the land owners business, being a ground works contractor, forestry contractor, and landscape contractor. Including the use, and storage, of associate plant, machinery and materials used in this work being stored on the land	Refused	29.11.2024
--------------	---	---------	------------

Consultations**Worcestershire Archive and Archaeological Service**

The proposed development area is located within an archaeologically rich landscape, near a Scheduled Monument and Roman remains, with evidence of past brickworks and medieval agriculture. While no immediate archaeological objection exists, consultation with the district's archaeological advisor and Historic England is recommended to mitigate potential impacts on unrecorded features and the Scheduled Monument's setting.

Historic England

No comment.

Worcestershire Highways - Redditch

Worcestershire County Council has no "in principle" highway objections to the proposed development of up to 9 dwellings, contingent upon adherence to the WCC Streetscape Design Guide. The site's rural location off a high-speed road, without footpaths or lighting, necessitates careful consideration of access and potential impacts on surrounding routes. In accordance with WCC recommendations since erection of under 10 dwellings are proposed, no s106 contributions sought in this instance.

Feckenham Parish Council

Feckenham Parish Council objects to the development, citing its location within the Green Belt, contradicting the applicant's "Grey Belt" claim due to ongoing agricultural use and previous refusals. Concerns are also raised regarding increased flood risk from surface water runoff and hazardous vehicular access on a busy, speed-restricted road, with potential hedgerow removal impacting biodiversity.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

NHS/Medical Infrastructure Consultations

NHS Herefordshire and Worcestershire requests a £4,800 developer contribution to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on local primary healthcare services, calculated based on the expected increase in residents and required healthcare capacity.

Conservation Officer

Feckenham is a historically significant village with Roman origins, a well-preserved medieval street pattern, and numerous listed buildings, making its Conservation Area of considerable heritage interest. While the proposed housing development's impact is currently deemed neutral, careful consideration of scale, layout, and design is crucial to avoid detrimental effects on the Conservation Area's setting.

North Worcestershire Water Management

The proposed development site, though outside significant fluvial flood risk, faces surface water flooding concerns along Astwood Lane, requiring a comprehensive drainage strategy in future applications. Infiltration drainage is preferred but likely unsuitable due to soil conditions, necessitating alternative SuDS solutions and highlighting the lack of an "obvious solution" for surface water discharge.

WRS - Contaminated Land

Due to the site's history, a Phase I contamination study is required at the Technical Details stage to ensure suitability for development, as per the National Planning Policy Framework. This condition is necessary to address potential ground condition and pollution issues and ensure adequate site investigation by a competent person.

Open Space/Parks

The council proposes that any developer contributions be directed towards improving Feckenham recreation ground, a vital local green space located near the development site. While unable to provide a specific cost, they suggest improvements to the recreation ground's footpath, estimating costs between £30,000 and £50,000.

Public Consultation Response

56 representations have been received, 21 raising objection and 35 in support of the proposal. Members are reminded that the content of all representations can be read in full on the Council's website using the Public Access system. These comments have been summarised as follows

Objections

I. Overarching Objections (Community and Process):

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- **Dismissal of Outsider Support:** A strong and repeated rejection of supporting comments from individuals outside the Feckenham Parish, emphasizing their lack of local knowledge and vested interest.
- **Emphasis on Resident Voice:** A clear assertion that the objections represent the authentic voice of Feckenham residents who are directly impacted by the proposed development.
- **Lack of Consultation and Misrepresentation:** Concerns that resident voices are not being heard, and that information provided in the application is often misleading or inaccurate.
- **Profit-Driven Development:** A strong sentiment that the development is primarily driven by profit, disregarding the community's well-being and the environment.
- **Detrimental Impact on Rural Character:** Deep concern about the development's negative impact on Feckenham's cherished rural setting and historic character.
- **Lack of Village Infrastructure:** The village lacks the infrastructure to support more housing.

II. Green Belt/Land Use Objections:

- **Unequivocal Green Belt Status:** A firm and consistent assertion that the land is green belt and should be protected, not reclassified as "grey belt."
- **Rejection of "Grey Belt" Claim:** A detailed and evidence-based rebuttal of the applicant's "grey belt" claim, citing planning regulations and historical land use.
- **Prior Rejected Application:** Repeated reference to the applicant's previously rejected attempt to change the land's status, highlighting inconsistencies.
- **Unapproved Land Alterations:** Concerns about unapproved alterations to the land, perceived as attempts to manipulate its status.
- **Conservation Area Protection:** Emphasis on the land's location within a conservation area, where development is restricted.
- **Agricultural Covenant:** Claims that there is an agricultural covenant on the land restricting development.
- **Detrimental Impact on Countryside:** Strong objections based on the detrimental impact on the countryside and the purpose of green belt preservation.
- **Misrepresentation of Evidence:** Claims that supporting evidence is misrepresented.

III. Flood Risk Objections:

- **Severe and Increasing Flooding:** Consistent and detailed accounts of severe and worsening flooding in the area, particularly on Astwood Lane and Swansbrook Lane.
- **Impact of Recent Developments:** Specific mention of recent developments exacerbating flood risks.
- **School Closures and Disruption:** Repeated accounts of school closures and children being stranded due to flooding.
- **Runoff Concerns:** Strong concerns about increased surface water runoff from impermeable surfaces.
- **Inadequate Drainage:** Concerns about inadequate drainage infrastructure and ground conditions.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- **Impact on Properties:** Concerns about increased flood risk to existing properties, with personal accounts of flood damage.
- **Existing Mitigation Failure:** Past flood mitigation efforts are viewed as failures.

IV. Safety and Traffic Objections:

- **Dangerous Road Conditions:** Concerns about the narrow and dangerous access point on Astwood Lane, with poor visibility and pedestrian safety.
- **Increased Traffic and Congestion:** Concerns about increased traffic congestion, particularly during school hours.
- **Blind Spot and Safety Hazards:** Concerns about a blind spot at the access point, creating safety hazards.
- **Hazardous Parked Cars:** Existing issues with parked cars creating hazards and narrowing roads.
- **Speeding Traffic:** Concerns about speeding traffic on Astwood lane.
- **Traffic Pollution:** The increase of traffic will increase pollution.

V. Impact on Residents and Amenity Objections:

- **Loss of Privacy and Light:** Concerns about loss of privacy, light, and views for existing residents.
- **Noise and Commercial Vehicle Traffic:** Concerns about noise from potential commercial activity on the site.
- **Detrimental Impact on Village Character:** Concerns about the detrimental impact on the village's historic character and rural setting.
- **Loss of Views:** the building will block the stunning views of open countryside.
- **Lack of Affordable Housing:** Concerns that the development does not address the need for affordable housing for local residents.

Support

I. Urgent Need for Housing & Village Sustainability:

- The development is deemed crucial to address the severe lack of housing, particularly for young people and local workers, preventing the village from becoming solely a retirement community.
- It's seen as vital for the village's long-term sustainability and growth, ensuring its continued vibrancy.

II. Economic Benefits & Support for Local Businesses:

- The development is expected to inject new life into the local economy, boosting revenue for pubs, shops, and other essential services.
- It's viewed as a means to safeguard the viability of these businesses and maintain community amenities.

III. Community Vitality & Demographic Balance:

- The influx of new families is seen as essential to balance the village's aging population and revitalize the community.
- The development is expected to foster a more dynamic and inclusive environment.

VI. Addressing & Dismissing Objections:

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

- Objections regarding flooding and road safety are dismissed as "misinformation" and unfounded, with assurances that these issues will be adequately addressed.
- Reliance on the approval of the Highways Authority and Environment Agency to counter resident concerns.

V. Alignment with National Housing Policy:

- The development is framed as aligning with national housing policies and the NPPF, which encourage responsible growth in rural areas.
- That the development is of a modest size and fits in with the village.

IV. Positive Development Characteristics:

- That the development is natural infill between existing built upon areas.
- That the design will be in keeping with the rural charm of the village.
- That the developer will implement appropriate drainage systems.

Procedural Matters

Permission in Principle (PIP) is an alternative route of obtaining planning permission for **housing-led development**. This process separates the issues concerning the principle of the proposed development, from the technical details of the proposal. The process has two stages - permission in principle, which establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle; and the second stage, technical details consent, where the detailed development proposals are assessed. This process was introduced in June 2018 and was intended to speed up and simplify the planning process for small housing developments.

When assessing applications for permission in principle, the scope for assessment is strictly limited to the following issues:

- o **location;**
- o **land use; and**
- o **amount of development.**

Any decision has to be made having regard to the Policies in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan Number 4 (BoRLPNo4). Matters of detail, such as how a development might look and the impact on residential amenity, will not be available and will not be a relevant consideration at this stage of the process. Following a grant of Permission in Principle, the site must receive a grant of Technical Details Consent before development can proceed. The granting of Technical Details Consent has the effect of granting planning permission for the development.

Other statutory requirements may apply at this stage such as those relating to protected species or listed buildings. Technical Details Consent can be obtained following submission of a valid application to the Borough Council. An application for Technical Details Consent must be in accordance with the Permission in Principle application. Members should also note that conditions cannot be placed on the permission at this stage.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Assessment of Proposal

Location

The application site is located within the Green Belt. Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework outlines that

"The development of homes, commercial and other development should also not be regarded as inappropriate development where;

- a. a development would utilise grey belt and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green belt across the area of the plan;*
- b. There is a demonstrable need for the type of development proposed*
- c. The development would be in a sustainable location*
- d. where applicable the proposed development meets the 'Golden Rules'" (Major developments only).*

Annex 2 (Glossary) defines grey belt as *'For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.'*

Does Green Belt land on the site strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes a), b) or d)?

To establish whether the application site can be considered 'grey belt' it must first be determined whether the site strongly contributes to Green Belt purposes a), b) or d) of the Green Belt which are set out in Paragraph 143 of the NPPF.

These are;

- a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas (LBUA); Given the sites location within the Borough (on the edge of the Feckenham) the development is not considered to amount to sprawl of a LBUA. As such, the site makes no contribution to purpose A.
- b) To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; The existing site is located at the edge of Feckenham. As such, the site makes no contribution to purpose B.
- d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; Whilst the historic core of Feckenham is recognised by the extent and quality of its Conservation Area, its Listed buildings and its Non- Designated Heritage assets, it is not considered to be a 'Historic Town' for the purpose of criteria d). As such, the site makes no contribution to purpose D.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Would the application of non-Green Belt NPPF footnote 7 policies to the scheme proposed on the Green Belt part of the site provide a strong reason for refusing development?

Footnote 7 states "*The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 194) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 75); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.*"

Although the development's potential impact on flood risk, local heritage assets (including the Conservation Area), and archaeological remains are key considerations, all consultees have indicated that subject to satisfactory design at the Technical Details stage, they do not object. Therefore, these matters, as currently assessed, do not present a strong justification for refusing planning permission.

The application site can therefore fall within the definition with grey belt and would not be inappropriate development subject to satisfying the criteria as set out in Paragraph 155 of the NPPF.

Would the proposed development on grey belt fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan?

Purposes a, b and d have already been assessed above. Regard however must be made to c and e.

- c) Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is accepted that the spatial occupation of the site would clearly encroach into the countryside as it is currently undeveloped and on the edge of a settlement. However, in relation to the wider function the Green Belt as a whole, the comparatively small nature of the site itself, within an existing run of development is such that it does not fundamentally undermine purpose c) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.
- e) Assisting in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The proposed development would not fundamentally undermine the purpose of this Green Belt criterion.

Is there a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

The NPPF at footnote 56 explains that demonstrable unmet need would apply where there is a lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply.

Would the development in the grey belt be in a sustainable location?

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

The County Council (Highways) considers the site is situated in a rural area, accessed via an improved existing vehicular access point off Astwood Lane, a classified road with a national speed limit of 60 mph. Astwood Lane lacks footpaths and street lighting, and on-street parking is unrestricted. Regional connectivity is provided by the B4090, which runs east-west, linking to Junction 5 of the M5 via the A38 and Droitwich Spa to the west. The A441, oriented north-south, connects the site to Redditch to the north and the A422 to the south.

Policy 2 of the BoRLPNo4 considers Feckenham to be a small, rural settlement offering limited local facilities. The site has access to the facilities in Feckenham and as such can be considered a sustainable location for residential development.

Does the proposal include major development involving housing?

Although the application proposes 9 dwellings which would not usually be considered a 'Major Application' under the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA), the updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) glossary defines a site over 0.5 hectares as a Major. The application site is 0.95 hectares and as such would be caught by the requirement to also satisfy the 'Golden Rules' when considering grey belt policy.

Paragraph 156 of the NPPF outlines that where major development involving housing is proposed the following contributions should be made;

- a) affordable housing
- b) necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure
- c) the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public.

The Local Planning Authority has currently identified the following infrastructure categories as requiring developer contributions: affordable housing, highway improvements, waste management facilities, leisure amenities, National Health Service provisions, educational resources, and planning compliance monitoring.

Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides specific guidance concerning affordable housing contributions, particularly in the context of development on land released from the Green Belt. In instances where local planning authorities have not yet aligned their development plan policies with paragraphs 67-68 of the NPPF, a supplementary affordable housing contribution is mandated. This contribution is to be calculated as 15% above the prevailing affordable housing requirement, subject to a maximum cap of 50%.

As the Local Planning Authority has not yet updated its existing development plan policies to reflect the latest NPPF guidance, a 45% affordable housing contribution is applicable to this development application.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

In accordance with established planning procedures, planning obligations, contingent upon adherence to statutory requirements, are to be determined and secured at the Technical Details Consent stage. Such obligations are not permissible at the Permission in Principle stage. Local Planning Authorities are empowered to provide applicants with preliminary information regarding potential planning obligations during the Permission in Principle phase.

To facilitate this process, consultations have been conducted with relevant stakeholders, resulting in some indicative figures essential for compliance with applicable policies. The applicant has been briefed on these potential obligations and has expressed agreement in principle. Therefore, given that detailed specifications are not under consideration at this stage, it is concluded that the applicant possesses the capacity to fulfil the 'Golden Rules' criteria at the Technical Details Consent stage, as mandated

In conclusion, it is considered that the site is Grey Belt and would meet the Paragraph 155 requirements and thus the proposal should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework.

Land use

The existing site is a development field with no formal land use. A recent Certificate of Lawfulness application was submitted by the applicant to demonstrate an existing use associated with their groundworks, forestry, and landscaping contracting business. This application sought to establish the lawful use of the site for the storage of associated plant, machinery, and materials. However, this application was refused due to insufficient evidence to substantiate continuous use for a period exceeding ten years. While the precise existing land use remains undetermined, the Local Planning Authority considers it likely to be agricultural. Regardless of the specific existing use, it is deemed compatible with proposed residential development and any unlawful activity onsite would be considered separately.

Amount of development

Having regards to the layout and density of the surrounding developments, in particular Feckenham Gardens and Yeates Acres it is considered that the site is of a reasonable size to facilitate 9 dwellings as proposed.

Other matters**Drainage**

There is an existing flood risk issue located at the junction of Swansbrook and Astwood Lane. This matter has been raised as part of the public consultation of this application. Although it is accepted that there is potential for the development here to negatively impact this issue, correctly designed drainage and provision of appropriate levels of

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

attenuation can mitigate this risk. Therefore, the principle of development at this site from Technical Details stage for full consideration.

Highways

The Highways Authority have considered the site and raised no objections to the proposal. The application site benefits from an existing vehicular access and is in close proximity to amenities, a bus route and bus stops. Objections have been raised from residents on Highways safety concerns and the speed of vehicles approaching the corner. Further consideration will be made at the Technical Details stage depending on the layout and access proposed.

Trees

The site is mainly a grass area which has a mature hedge around the boundary which must be protected during clearance and construction phase in accordance with BS5837:2012, using suitable protective fencing and/or ground protection as appropriate. This matter would be resolved at the Technical Details stage when layout is considered. Members should note that no ecology report has been submitted at this stage however this would be a requirement at the Technical Details stage.

Land Contamination

Due to the sites historic use as a bricks and tile works there is the possibility that the site may potentially have contamination issues. Worcestershire Regulatory Services have confirmed that the principle of developing this site would be acceptable subject to a preliminary risk assessment which could be considered under the Technical Details stage or by condition.

Conservation

Feckenham is a village of significant historical importance, evidenced by its well-preserved historic form, numerous listed buildings, and a Scheduled Monument. The proposed housing development raises concerns regarding its potential impact on the setting of the Feckenham Conservation Area. While a small, carefully designed development may be acceptable, its scale, layout, and design are crucial to protecting the area's historical character.

Archaeologically, the development site is located near known historical features, including a Scheduled Monument and Roman remains. Historical maps and LiDAR data indicate past industrial and agricultural use of the site, suggesting potential for unrecorded archaeological remains. Therefore, consultation with archaeological experts and Historic England is recommended to mitigate potential impacts and ensure the preservation of Feckenham's historical and archaeological heritage.

Public consultation

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

The objections raised by residents, particularly concerning flood risk, traffic safety, and the impact on the Green Belt, have been carefully considered. Regarding flood risk, while the existing issues at the junction of Swansbrook and Astwood Lane are acknowledged, it is important to note that the Permission in Principle (PIP) stage focuses on the principle of development, not detailed design. Technical solutions, such as appropriately designed drainage and attenuation, will be thoroughly assessed at the Technical Details Consent stage. The Highways Authority has raised no objections, and further detailed traffic impact assessments will be conducted during the Technical Details Consent phase.

Concerning the Green Belt designation, the application has been assessed against Paragraph 155 of the NPPF, specifically regarding 'grey belt' land. The report concludes that the site meets the criteria for 'grey belt' and does not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the Green Belt, as defined in Paragraph 143. The Council's current lack of a five-year housing land supply, as outlined in the NPPF, also weighs significantly in favour of granting Permission in Principle, subject to the 'Golden Rules' being addressed at the Technical Details Consent stage. Matters related to conservation, archaeology, and land contamination will also be rigorously examined during the Technical Details Consent phase, ensuring that any potential impacts are appropriately mitigated. It is crucial to remember that at this PIP stage, the assessment is limited to location, land use, and the amount of development, and that the detail of the development, including the design and impact on residential amenity, will be fully explored in the subsequent Technical Details Consent application.

Housing Supply

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply (5YHLS) and therefore regard should be had to paragraph 11(d) and footnote 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which together state that for applications providing housing, where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5YHLS, the policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out-of-date and planning permission should be granted unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

Limb i. The proposals have been found to comply with paragraph 155 of the NPPF and are not considered to comprise of inappropriate development.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Limb ii. The proposal would contribute nine dwellings to local housing land supply. The site is located within a sustainable location and is of a suitable land use and amount. Other matters can be reviewed at TDC stage. Permission in principle should therefore be granted.

RECOMMENDATION:

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Permission in principle should be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. This decision notice only relates to the grant of planning permission in principle. It does not give any approval or consent which may be needed under any legislation, enactment, byelaws, order or regulation other than the Housing and Planning Act 2016. You may need other approvals, consents or licenses for the development eg Technical Details Consent or building regulations approval.
2. Permission in Principle is not a planning permission; it is a precursor to it. A planning permission only exists when the Permission in Principle and Technical Detailed Consent have been granted.

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because five (or more) objections have been received and therefore the proposal falls outside of the scheme of Delegation.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE****17th April 2025****Planning Application 25/00207/ADV****Retrospective application for consent to display 1x V-Board and 2x flagpole and flags to advertise residential development approved under 19/00977/HYB****Land Adjacent, Birmingham Road, Redditch, Worcestershire.****Applicant: Persimmon Homes South Midlands Ltd
Ward: Greenlands And Lakeside****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Holly Johnston, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 881258 Email: holly.johnston@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

The site is situated to the east of the roundabout connecting the A441 with Weights Lane and Odell Street to the north of Redditch Town Centre. The site comprises a grass-covered mound, with a footpath and shrubbery between the site and the A441.

The site is designated as Land Safeguarded for Leisure for which Policy 43 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (BoRLP No 4) applies, and is situated within the curtilage of Abbey Stadium and south of the River Arrow, an area designated as a Special Wildlife Site under Policy 16.

Proposal Description

The application retrospectively seeks advertisement consent for a 3.66 metre tall and 2-metre-wide V-Board sign advertising a new housing development called 'The View' in association with application 19/00977/HYB, which details directions to the development. The signage is positioned at the base of the mound closest to the A441.

The application also retrospectively seeks advertisement consent for two flagpoles either side of the V-Board measuring approximately 6 metres tall, with one detailing 'Persimmon' with the Persimmon logo and the other detailing "Together we make your home". Both flagpoles have a green background with white writing.

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

Policy 16: Natural Environment

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Policy 39: Built Environment
 Policy: 42 Advertisements
 Policy 43: Leisure, Tourism and Abbey Stadium

Others

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)
 National Planning Practice Guidance
 Redditch High Quality Design SPD

Relevant Planning History

The following history relates to the development of which the signage relates. There is no relevant planning history on the application site.

19/00977/HYB	Hybrid planning application for up to 960 dwellings consisting of a full application for 128 dwellings accessed off Weights Lane, new public open space, drainage system, engineering operations and associated works and an outline application for the construction of the remaining dwellings with access points off Cookridge Close, Hawling Street and Weights Lane and including a new District Centre, new play facilities, new highway network, public open space, new drainage system and surface water attenuation, engineering operations and all associated works including landscaping.	GRANTED Subject to S106 Agreement.	18.01.2021
--------------	--	---	------------

Consultations**Worcestershire Highways – Redditch 24.03.25**

No objection.

Cadent Gas Ltd 11.03.25

Cadent Gas have no objection to this proposal from a planning perspective; however, to prevent damage to their assets, request that an Informative Note is added to the Decision Notice.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Public Consultation Response

A site notice was erected on the 11/03/2025 and expired on the 04/04/2025. No responses were received.

Assessment of Proposal

The assessment of advertisement consent applications is limited to the impact on amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts in accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024). The signage has been considered in the context of the provisions of Paragraph 141 of the NPPF, Policy 39 and Policy 42 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 and the Redditch High Quality Design SPD.

Many flags are contained in Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) and can therefore be flown without the need for express consent. Other flags have deemed consent under Schedule 3, Class 7 of the Regulations, including flagpoles on land which have planning permission granted for residential development. However, as the application site is not situated where the residential development is taking place, this proposal cannot comply with the necessary deemed consent conditions and therefore express consent is required.

Following a site visit to the application site, it was clear that the details of the signage submitted with the application did not accurately reflect the signage displayed on site. Amended plans have since been received which reflect the signage that is on site.

Impact on Amenity:

Considering that the signage is located at the base of the mound nearest to the A441 which provides some screening and separation from the Abbey Stadium, and the signage is partially screened by existing shrubbery in the context of the A441, the signage is not considered to be prominent in positioning.

The advertisement is not overly large and there is no additional nearby advertisement in the context of the street scene to cause a proliferation of advertisements fronting the main road.

Overall, the scale, siting, design and finish of the V-Board sign and flagpoles on site are not considered to result in an adverse impact to visual amenity. The proposals would therefore comply with the provisions of the Councils SPD and Policy 39 and Policy 42 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 and the Framework in respect of visual amenity.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Public Safety:

It is not considered that the proposed adverts would result in any harm being caused to public safety. The Highways Officer has raised no objections to the proposal from a highway safety perspective and has said that as the proposal is located within the applicants site boundary, there are no highway implications.

In conclusion, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with respect to its impact upon visual amenity and highway safety and is therefore policy compliant. All advertisements, whether they require express consent or not, are subject to standard conditions and these are detailed below (conditions 3 – 7).

RECOMMENDATION:

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Advertisement Consent be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. This consent shall remain valid for a period of three years from the 31/01/2025.

Reason: In accordance with Regulation 14(7) of the Town and Country Planning (Control Of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

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

Location Plan – Drawing Number SS/ARW/001 Rev. A
Specification Version 10 – Received 03/04/2025
Flag Pole Plan - Received 20/02/2025

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

3. No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

4. No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to;

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- (a) endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);
- (b) obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air; or
- (c) hinder the operation of any device used for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

5. Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

6. Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

7. Where an advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

Procedural matters

This application is reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application site involves Council owned land and as such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**17th April 2025

Planning Application 25/00247/S73

Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) to substitute approved plans and removal of condition 4 (detailed landscaping plans) of application 22/01553/REM (Application for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the construction of 109 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure, pursuant to the outline planning permissions 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB (Cross boundary application with Bromsgrove DC 22/01608/REM))

Phase 6 Development Brockhill East, Hewell Road, Redditch, Worcestershire

Applicant: Michaela Corbett (Taylor Wimpey)
Ward: Batchley And Brockhill Ward

(see additional papers for site plan)

The case officer of this application is Mr Paul Lester, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 881323 Email: paul.lester@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

The application site forms part of the Brockhill allocation, which is a greenfield site extending to circa 56 hectares and is irregular in shape, comprising heavily grazed improved grassland and large arable field parcels typically subdivided by fencing. The allocation site's boundaries extend adjacent to Brockhill Lane to the west, Weights Lane to the north, the Redditch/Birmingham railway line to the east, Phase I (Pointer's Way) and Phase II (Meadow View) to its south, and Phase 3 and Phase 4 which are a continuation of Phase 2. These phases have been or are being built by Persimmon.

This phase covers 15.5ha, with a total developable area of 3.4 ha, and will be sited within the context of the above. Within Phase 6, the site is covered by arable land / improved grassland, with trees present along the existing field boundaries. A TPO tree is situated at the centre. A gas main line crosses the site, requiring a 28m easement. The main will divide Phases 5 and 6, with each scheme being set back the required distance to ensure safe onsite operations.

Proposal Description

Phase 6 reserved matters application was previously considered at the July 2023 Redditch Planning Committee Reserved Matters was granted 2nd August 2023.

A section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows an application to be made for permission to develop without complying with a condition previously imposed on a planning permission. A section 73 application can either seek the removal of a previously imposed condition or it may seek to vary the wording a condition previously

PLANNING COMMITTEE

imposed. The application relates to the residential element of this phase, which is located entirely within Redditch BC boundary.

In this case, Taylor Wimpey have now taken ownership of the land approved for residential development on phase 6 from Persimmon. This application seeks to substitute the approved house types with house types within Taylor Wimpey's range, whilst maintaining the principles of the approved design and not deviating from the approved housing mix (under planning condition 1). The application also proposes to remove condition 4 a landscaping details condition approved under the reserved matter application which will be re-submitted for approval under condition 23 (soft landscaping) of the hybrid permission 19/00976/HYB, prior to commencement on this phase.

The approved scheme included a total of 87 market homes are proposed to be provided across the site to provide 19 (22%), two-bedroom dwellings: 22 (25%), 3-bedroom dwellings, 36 (41%) four bed dwellings and 10 (11%) five bed dwellings. This has not changed since the previous approved application.

The proposals include the provision of 22 affordable housing units, which equates to 20% of the total dwellings proposed. The affordable housing mix would provide 2 (9%) 1 bed units, 10 (45%) 2 bed units; 2 (9%) 3 bed units; and 2 (9%) 4 bed units. The mix is reflective of the requirements set out by the Housing Strategy Team. The affordable housing tenure is split between shared ownership (12) and affordable rent (10). These units would be provided in clusters across the whole of the site. This has not changed since the previous approved application.

For clarity, the issue of external access has already been determined and approved, so it is not included in the current application. While some proposed plans show the District Centre, this is for illustrative purposes only. It does not form part of this reserved matters application. Any proposal for a District Centre would be considered under a separate reserved matters application.

Relevant Policies :

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4

Policy 1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy 3 Development Strategy

Policy 4: Housing Provision

Policy 5: Effective and Efficient use of Land

Policy 6: Affordable Housing

Policy 13: Primarily Open Space

Policy 16: Natural Environment

Policy 17: Flood Risk Management

Policy 19: Sustainable travel and Accessibility

Policy 20: Transport Requirements for New Development

Policy 22: Road Hierarchy

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Policy 31: Regeneration for Town Centre
Policy 36: Historic Environment
Policy 37: Historic Buildings and Structures
Policy 39: Built Environment
Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities
Policy 46: Brookhill East
Appendix 1 RCBD1 Redditch Cross Boundary Development

Others

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2024)
NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance
Borough of Redditch High Quality Design SPD (June 2019)

Bromsgrove District Plan

RCBD1: Redditch Cross Boundary Development
High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (June 2019)

Relevant Planning History

The application site forms part of a larger site that was the subject of a cross boundary hybrid planning applications for the following proposal.

Hybrid applications 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB for up to 960 dwellings consisting of a full application for 128 dwellings accessed off Weights Lane, new public open space, drainage system, engineering operations associated works and an outline application (with all matters reserved with the exception of access) for the construction of the remaining dwellings with access points off Cookridge Close, Hawling Street and Weights Lane and including a new District Centre, new play facilities, new highway network, public open space, new drainage system and surface water attenuation, engineering operations and all associated works including landscaping.

This was approved at Redditch Planning Committee on 27th January 2021 subject to the signing of s106 agreement. Following the signing of the s106 agreement, the Redditch decision (19/00977/HYB) was issued on 1st November 2021.

Phase 6 (22/01553/REM) Application for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the construction of 109 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure, pursuant to the outline planning permissions 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB.0977/HYB. (Cross boundary application with Bromsgrove DC 22/01608/REM). Reserved Matters was granted 2nd August 2023.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Consultations

Worcestershire Archive And Archaeological Service

This reserved matters application is related to areas previously archaeologically investigated, with fieldwork signed off. Therefore there are no additional comments in relation to the above application.

North Worcestershire Water Management

Having reviewed the changes, I have no additional comments to make and subject to drainage strategy plan.

Conservation Officer

No objection

Housing Strategy

No objection following clarification regarding affordable housing.

Worcestershire Highways – Redditch

The Highway Authority has undertaken a robust assessment of the planning application. Based on the analysis of the information submitted, the Highway Authority concludes that there are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained. The Highway Authority therefore offers no objection to the variation of Condition 1 and removal of Condition 4.

Waste Management

No objection

Arboricultural Officer

No objection to the removal of the original landscaping condition (4). Subject to the retention of the tree protection condition.

Public Consultation Response

60 neighbour letters sent 4th March 2025

Site notice displayed 4th March 2025

Press notice published 7th March 2025

No comments have been received following the end of the consultation period.

Assessment of Proposal

Phasing

The proposal relates to the sixth of eight phases proposed to complete the Brockhill development (phases seven and eight have not been submitted). The phasing of the development is reflected in the hybrid planning permission. A phasing plan has been

PLANNING COMMITTEE

approved as part of the discharge of conditions. A copy of this plan is included in the committee presentation.

Layout and appearance

Since acquiring the site, Taylor Wimpy seeks to make changes to the appearance of the development and has submitted amended floorplans and elevations together with a site layout plan to reflect those changes.

The changes in layout are shown on the TW & Persimmon Approved Scheme Overlay 22677/PL/O01) which has been included in the committee presentation (but would not form an approved plan). These changes can be summarised as follows:

- Minor replotting and substitution of all house types
- Amending the location of house types
- Internal road layout amended to reflect the house type replotting
- Several of the proposed private shared accesses have minor alignment changes; and
- Minor changes to the parking arrangements

In design terms these alterations are considered relatively minor and the general external appearance and positioning of the dwellings within the site layout and street scene remains generally consistent with the existing permission and are considered acceptable.

The Phase 6 proposals have directly incorporated the ideas of the Framework Plan and Design and Access Statement into the layout. The proposed housing wraps around the District Centre (which does not form part of this application) and school, it is set in a generous area of open space and contains a green node/square at the centre.

The DAS stresses the importance of placemaking and responding effectively to local character. Critical to this will be the use of traditional building materials, particularly the use of colour and boundary details.

These scheme is reflective of the surrounding traditional architecture and style but have additional detailing around the windows. Most of the dwellings face onto the street, with articulation of corners achieved using distinctive materials, and additional windows in habitable rooms, which ensure that blank gables to the street are avoided. Dual aspect units have been introduced to ensure elevations make a positive contribution to the public realm and junctions.

The house types have been designed with a palette of materials to complement the existing housing on the previous phases. Whilst the palette of materials is minimal, it is considered that this will ensure high quality design through the choice of high quality materials. The house types are predominately 2 storey, with some 2.5 storey as well as bungalows.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

To ensure the development is fully legible, boundary treatments will define public and private spaces. Where a boundary is facing a public space (i.e., road or open space), the treatment will generally consist of 1.8m high screen brick walls (to match individual plots), and 0.45m Timber Knee rail fencing. The boundary treatments for private spaces (i.e., gardens) will be 1.8m timber close board fences. The use of these various treatments makes ownership clear and helps to prevent crime. This range of treatments is suggested in the DAS and will help to avoid the dominance of brick walls.

In design terms these alterations are considered relatively minor and the general external appearance and positioning of the dwellings within the site layout and street scene remains generally consistent with the existing permission and are considered acceptable. The material information provided to date is satisfactory. Overall, the layout, size, appearance and the architectural detailing of the dwellings is considered acceptable and to be in accordance with Borough Local Plan Policies 46, RCBD1 and 39 and 40, Redditch High Quality Design SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

WCC as the Highway Authority, has advised that the proposed changes to the internal site layout are considered minor and consistent with the WCC Streetscape Design Guide. Any points of detail can be addressed by the separate S38 Agreement if the Applicant is minded to subsequently put the internal roads forward for adoption. On that basis they have no objection to the proposed amendments.

As per the provisions of the Streetscape Design Guide, the applicant would provide 1 car parking space for a 1-bedroom unit, 2 car parking spaces for a 2 -3-bedroom unit, and 3 car parking spaces for a 4+ bedroom unit. The applicant also intends to provide 20 visitor parking spaces.

Overall, it is considered that the revised layout and parking is satisfactory in relation to highway matters.

Impact on Residential Amenity

It is considered that the revised layout, given the degree of separation, position, and orientation between the proposed dwellings and neighbouring buildings, the proposal would not result in harm to the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or future occupants of the proposed dwellings, in accordance with relevant policies.

In relation to the construction phase of this phase of development, under condition 39 of the hybrid permission, a Construction Environment Management would be required prior to the commencement of the 6th phase.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ecology

Section 15 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. As well as promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species.

In line with Policy 16 Natural Environment appropriate mitigation measures must be implemented to ensure protection of the natural environment, with benefits from development to biodiversity captured.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has become mandatory for major applications submitted as of 12th February 2024. However, reserved matters applications are exempt if the outline application was submitted prior to the February 2024 commencement date.

The outline application (the hybrid scheme) was submitted prior to this date and is therefore not subject to mandatory BNG, which would require a minimum 10% biodiversity gain.

Conditions 19 Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP), Condition 20 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEcMP) and Condition 21 Lighting of the hybrid permission ensures that appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure protection of the natural environment.

Other Matters

Technical matters regarding the number of affordable housing, air quality, noise, and contaminated land were assessed in detail on the previous applications and were considered acceptable (subject to relevant conditions). Officers consider the changes to the plans under this application do not result in any material change to these matters, subject to relevant conditions being imposed.

Conclusion

This is an allocated development site that already has reserved matters permission for its development. The proposed changes are considered to comply with Redditch Borough Plan policies, the Redditch High Quality Design SPD and the provisions of the NPPF. Therefore, in conclusion, the application to vary the approved plans (condition 1) and remove condition 4 is recommended for approval, subject to conditions. Under section 73 applications, conditions attached to the original consent (22/01553/REM) are carried across to the new section 73 permission where those conditions continue to have effect. The recommendation below together with conditions, where they are required to be amended, reflects this.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

RECOMMENDATION:

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

- 1) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

Location Plan (PL001E)

P25-0086_DE_002_B_03 Site Layout

P25-0086_DE_002_B_04 Materials Plan

P25-0086_DE_002_B_11 Affordable Mix and Tenure

P25-0086_DE_002_B_12 Refuse Strategy

P25-0086_DE_002_B_08 Building Heights

P25-0086-DE-003_01_EMA22 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_02_EMA31 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_03_EMA34 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_04_EMT31 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_05_EMT32 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_06_EMT41 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_07_EMT42 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_08_EMA43 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_09_EMA44 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_10_EMA46 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_11_EMT45 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_12_EMA48 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_13_EMG44 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_14_EMA49 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_15_EMA51 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_16_EMB52 Floor Plans

P25-0086-DE-003_17_EMB52 Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_18_EMAP11_EMAP12 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_19_BU2 Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_20_EMAP22 Floor Plans Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_21_EMAP32 Floor Plans Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_22_EMAP41 Floor Plans Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_23_Single Garage Floor Plans and Elevations

P25-0086-DE-003_24_Double Garage Floor Plans and Elevations

1A Refuse Tracking Layout

2A Fire Tracking Layout

3A MPV Tracking Layout

100A General Arrangement Layout

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

- 2) Full details of any soil or soil forming materials brought on to the site for use in garden areas, soft landscaping, filling and level raising must be provided. Where the donor site is unknown or is brownfield, the material must be tested for contamination and suitability for use on site. Full donor site details, proposals for contamination testing including testing schedules, sampling frequencies and allowable contaminant concentrations (as determined by appropriate risk assessment) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to import on to the site.

The approved testing must then be carried out and validatory evidence (such as laboratory certificates) submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any soil or soil forming materials being brought on to site.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

- 3) The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation/protection identified in the 8506 Arboricultural Method Statement – Phase 6, Brockhill East (October 2022) and 8506-TPP-02 Rev A Tree Protection Plan.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory protection of the existing trees and hedges.

- 4) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a scheme of works for a shared use pedestrian/ cycle path, between Phase 6 and any plot within the future Phase 5, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved scheme has been completed and is open to cyclists and pedestrians.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development and promoting active travel.

- 5) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the garages and parking spaces allocated to that property have been provided, as shown on the approved plans. Such garages and parking spaces shall be kept clear of obstruction and retained only for the parking of vehicles in connection with the use of each property as a dwellinghouse.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory provision is always made for the parking of vehicles off the highway.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- 6) No works or development above foundation level for Phase 6 shall take place until a finalised scheme for surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall specifically include:
- Detailed drainage design, showing all private foul and surface water connections.
 - A simple index assessment considering the water quality of surface water runoff.
 - Consideration of what SuDS features can be incorporated into the site drainage to provide an appropriate level of runoff treatment.
 - Full details of the proposed balancing area. Included information on any proposed permanent water level, which would improve its value.

This scheme should be indicated on a drainage plan and the approved scheme shall be completed prior to the first use of the full application hereby approved.

Reason: To prevent the risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality.

Procedural matters

This application is reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application is for major development (more than 1000 sq metres of new commercial / Industrial floorspace), and as such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.