



# Planning Committee

Thu 17 Jul  
2025  
7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community  
Centre, Castleditch Lane,  
B98 7YB

  
**Redditch**  
Borough Council  
*Working together for our communities*

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

**Gavin Day  
Democratic Services Officer**

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

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

---

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

### **PUBLIC SPEAKING**

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

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

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

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

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Democratic Services Team (by 12 noon on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> July 2025) and invited to the table or lectern.

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

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

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

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

---

Notes:

- 1) Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify Gavin Day from the Democratic Services Team on 01527 64252 (Ex 3304) or by email at [gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) before **12 noon on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> July 2025**)
- 2) Advice and assistance will be provided to public speakers as to how to access the meeting and those using the video link will be provided with joining details for Microsoft Teams. Provision has been made in the amended Planning Committee procedure rules for public speakers who cannot access the meeting by Teams, and those speakers will be given the opportunity to submit their speech in writing to be read out by an officer at the meeting. Please take care when preparing written comments to ensure that the reading time will not exceed three minutes. Any speakers wishing to submit written comments must do so by **12 noon on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> July 2025**).
- 3) Reports on all applications will include a summary of the responses received from consultees and third parties, an appraisal of the main planning issues and a recommendation. All submitted plans and documentation for each application, including consultee responses and third party representations, re available to view in full via the Public Access facility on the Council's website [www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)
- 4) It should be noted that, in coming to its decision, the Committee can only take into account planning issues, namely policies contained in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 and other material considerations, which include Government Guidance and other relevant policies published since the adoption of the Development Plan and the "environmental factors" (in the broad sense) which affect the site.
- 5) Although this is a public meeting, there are circumstances when the committee might have to move into closed session to consider exempt or confidential information. For agenda items that are exempt, the public are excluded.
- 6) Late circulation of additional papers is not advised and is subject to the Chair's agreement. The submission of any significant new information might lead to a delay in reaching a decision. The deadline for papers to be received by Planning Officers is 4.00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.

Further assistance:

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

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

## Agenda

### Membership:

|        |                           |                |
|--------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Cllrs: | Andrew Fry (Chair)        | Matthew Dormer |
|        | William Boyd (Vice-Chair) | Bill Hartnett  |
|        | Juma Begum                | David Munro    |
|        | Brandon Clayton           | Ian Woodall    |
|        | 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 - 8)

### 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. 25/00442/PIP - Land South of Crumpfields Lane, Webheath, Redditch, Worcs. B97 5PW (Pages 9 - 20)

### 6. 25/00527/PIP - Alders Court, Green Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 5GY (Pages 21 - 28)

### 7. 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

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), and Councillors Juma Begum, Brandon Clayton, Bill Hartnett, David Munro and Ian Woodall

### Officers:

Helena Plant and Amar Hussain

### Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

#### 7. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Claire Davies and Matt Dormer.

#### 8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 9. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2025 were presented to Members.

#### **RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.**

#### 10. UPDATE REPORTS

The update reports were noted.

#### 11. **25/00387/FUL - 72 REYNARD CLOSE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 6PY**

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was an employee of Redditch Borough Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Chair

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 19th June, 2025

---

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

The application was for 72 Reynard Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 6PY and sought the retrospective approval for replacement of a conservatory for a garden room.

Officers detailed that as the application was retrospective, the proposed plans were of the current configuration at the site. Officers drew Members attention to the previous and current site plans and detailed that although the footprint was similar, there was a slight change in size from 5m x 4m x 3.2m to 5.1m x 3.9 x 3.6m.

The key issue for Members to determine was the visual amenity and impact of the development. Further to this, Officers detailed that the scale and location were similar and that it was not visible from the street scene. Additionally, the materials and design were sympathetic and complimentary to the dwelling. Therefore, the development was deemed acceptable and Officers recommended approval.

After questions from Members, Officers clarified that although the development was of a similar size, as it was not an exact like for like replacement planning permission was needed.

Offices clarified that as the application was retrospective there were not a list of Conditions for Members to approve apart from formalising the submitted development plans. Members saw no planning reason to object to the development and 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 detailed on page 13 of the Public Documents pack.**

**12. 25/00162/FUL - REDDITCH CRICKET HOCKEY AND RUGBY CLUB, BROMSGROVE ROAD, BATCHLEY, B97 4SP**

The Chair announced that the application 25/00162/FUL – had been withdrawn from the meeting.

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

17th July 2025

**Planning Application 25/00442/PIP****Erection of up nine dwellings****Land South of Crumpfields Lane, Webheath, Redditch, Worcs. B97 5PW****Applicant: C/O Agent**  
**Ward: Webheath And Callow Hill****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Sharron Williams, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 534061 Ext 3372 Email: sharron.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

**Site Description**

The site is a linear area of land that historically would have been agricultural land but has been used as a paddock for equine use/grazing in recent years. The site comprises of tree/hedge planting fronting the road. Several trees are growing within the paddock as well outside the application boundary line. Some of these trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The site is designated as Green Belt in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4.

**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. Details submitted only show a red line around the site boundary, no indicative layout has been provided at this stage.

**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 19: Sustainable travel and Accessibility

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Policy 48: Webheath Strategic Site

**Others**

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

### Relevant Planning History

No planning history.

### Consultations

#### **Worcestershire Highways - Redditch**

No highway objections “in principle” to the proposed Permission in Principle for the erection of up nine dwellings – subject to details provided within the Technical Details stage be in accordance with WCC Streetscape Design Guide to cover the following:-

- Parking to be provided in accordance with Streetscape Design Guide.
- Sheltered and secure cycle parking to comply with the Council’s parking standards.
- Appropriate vehicular and pedestrian visibility splays in accordance with WCC standards to be provided.
- The vehicular access/s for the first 5 metres of the access into the development, measured from the edge of the carriageway to be surfaced in a bound material.
- A Road Safety Audit 1 and 2 is required for the proposed development.
- Applicant to provide a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
- Bin storage details/ collection point details to be provided.

#### **North Worcestershire Water Management**

The proposed development site is situated in the catchment of Alders Brook. The site falls within flood zone 1 and it is not considered that there is any significant fluvial flood risk to the site. The EA's flood mapping also indicates that there is no surface water flood risk to the site.

As there are no details provided in relation to any proposed drainage arrangements, the following is primarily a statement of our requirements at Technical Details stage. A drainage strategy will be required to avoid the need for conditions and include a drainage plan identifying where surface water will be discharged to. It should also detail the extent of any new buildings and any new hard standing and finish materials for these areas. Where possible driveway and parking bays should comprise of a porous material to limit the amount of hardstanding on site.

Based on Severn Trent Water records there is a foul sewer that runs across the site. However, there are no nearby surface water sewers to connect to. No surface water may be disposed into the foul sewer and no water may enter the highway drainage system. Infiltration drainage should be prioritised.

#### **Severn Trent Water Ltd**

Comments awaited.

#### **WRS - Contaminated Land**

Due to the historic agricultural nature of the site, and the proximity to a historic landfill site, WRS recommend that should any permission be granted to the development, that potential contaminated land issues on site are appropriately addressed at the Technical Details stage.

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**17th July 2025

---

**Worcestershire Archive and Archaeological Service**

No objection to the proposal. However, Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Planning Advisory Service should be consulted at the Technical Details stage, as there may be a case for conditions to offset potential harm.

**Tree Officer**

The site outline might impact on 3 protected ash trees and possibly an additional tree and a group of trees covered under Tree Preservation Order No. 74 (1992) if services need to be added. An existing hedgerow adjacent to Crumpfields Lane is also likely to be affected.

Any application for the site should include a full Tree Survey and a comprehensive Arboricultural Impact and Method statement (in line with BS5837- 2012) to be approved by the LPA before any work commences.

If it can be demonstrated that the development would not cause harm to the trees during the construction phase and there would not be future pressures for pruning or removal after development, I would support the application.

**Public Consultation Response**

27 letters of objection following public consultation which included 42 letters sent out and a site notice erected. Comments are summarised as follows:-

**Highway matters**

Road infrastructure in the area is inadequate, narrow lanes with inadequate footpaths. Traffic passing up and down the lane already excessive and beyond speed limits. Lane used as a short cut route. Road goes into a single track lane close to where the site is located. Speed and use by HGVs already an issue with difficulty turning/reversing, so not appropriate to add additional housing/traffic off this lane. Nearest bus stop is 15 mins walk away. Road used for cyclists, walkers and horseriders – need to protect their safety. The area is already burdened by the construction of hundreds of new dwellings, which is having an impact on traffic and safety on these country lanes. Potential parking issues. Traffic congestion.

Concern regarding general safety. Street lighting is located on the opposite side of the road to the site, to cross this busy lane could be dangerous.

**Drainage matters**

Concern regarding drainage and flooding issues close to the site. Field beyond the application site has long periods of standing water on it. Heavy rain runs down Crumpfields Lane. Pumping station issues located down a track between No.s 80A and 82 Crumpfields Lane. Main sewer runs under the site.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

Environmental matters

Loss of green space. Impact on the environment. Additional noise and air pollution. Loss of trees.

Loss of wildlife. Potential badger set, great crested newts on the land along with deer, bats, hedgehogs, and owls. Wild orchids exist on the site. The grassy area provides benefits to butterflies/insects.

Character of the lane is individual style houses within large plots, scheme could be out of character with the area. Do not agree that the land is considered to be grey belt. Webheath area already been overly developed. Lack of local services such as doctors/dentists etc.

### 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:**

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

Any decision has to be made having regard to the Policies in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 (Local Plan). 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.

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

17th July 2025

### Assessment of Proposal

#### **Location**

The application site is located within Green Belt; therefore, Policy 8 of Local Plan No. 4 would apply. The site also abuts strategic housing site No. 213 on its northeastern and northwestern boundaries. Policy 4 and 48 of Local Plan No. 4 would apply in respect to allocating approximately 600 dwellings for this strategic and sustainable site.

Given the Green Belt designation of the application site Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Framework (NPPF) states that '*development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:-*

- a) *buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) *the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) *the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) *the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) *limited infilling in villages;*
- f) *limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- g) *limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.*
- h) *Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:*
  - i. *mineral extraction;*
  - ii. *engineering operations;*
  - iii. *local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;*
  - iv. *the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;*
  - v. *material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and*
  - vi. *development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.'*

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

17th July 2025

The application does not fall within the above exceptions. However, Paragraph 155 of the NPPF would apply and outlines that:-

The development of homes, commercial and other development should also not be regarded as inappropriate development where all of the following apply;

- 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 unmet 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 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 location of the site within the Borough, adjacent to established ribbon housing development and abutting a strategic housing site. 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 Webheath. As such, the site makes no contribution to purpose b).

d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;

Webheath is not considered to be a 'Historic Town' for the purpose of criteria d). As such, the site makes no contribution to purpose d).

To summarise the site does not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes a), b) or d).

Would the application of non-Green Belt NPPF footnote 7 policies to the scheme proposed on 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*

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

*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 drainage, trees, potential contamination, and archaeological remains are key considerations, all consultees have indicated that subject to satisfactory design at the Technical Details stage, there would be no objection. 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 of 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 of the Green Belt as a whole, the comparatively small nature of the site itself, within an existing run of ribbon 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. At present, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply.

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

County Highways considers the site is situated in a semi-rural residential location, off an 30 mph unclassified road that does not benefit from an existing vehicular access. Crumpfields Lane benefits from footpaths and street lighting and no parking restrictions are in force in the vicinity. It is also noted that this site is not located within walking distance of amenities / facilities, in addition, whilst there is a bus service S85 located at Hill Top, this is a school bus and not a regular bus service. Whilst it is County Highways view that the site is not a sustainable location potentially resulting in future occupants heavily reliant on the use of the private car to access amenities and services; highway

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

17th July 2025

safety & pedestrian safety is not being compromised by this proposed development since a footway and street lighting is located along Crumpfields Lane.

County Highways also refer to a recent appeal decision for a site at 38 Crumpfields Lane. The scheme (Ref: 22/00520/FUL) was a full application for the development of 6 dwellings. County Highways considered the site to be unsustainable. The applicant appealed to the Planning Inspectorate for non-determination reasons. The Inspector in their appeal decision dated 18<sup>th</sup> April 2024, stated that the LPA's main issues related to:-

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- Whether the proposal would make suitable provision for pedestrian and cycle links.

The Inspector noted the pavement which would provide a pedestrian route for future occupiers to the facilities and services of Webheath. The Inspector stated in the appeal decision that *'It was noted that whilst there is no dedicated cycle path in the vicinity of the site, Crumpfields Lane is lit by streetlamps and vehicle speeds are not excessive. Therefore, cycling into Webheath and connecting to existing routes leading towards Redditch Town Centre would be a realistic prospect for future occupiers.....The proposal would be a discreet and relatively modest development. As such, ...would provide adequate connections to existing pedestrian and cycle links which would provide future occupiers with a choice of modes of transport.'*

The above appeal was dismissed for other reasons; however, whilst the two schemes are not like for like; they both would have access off Crumpfields Lane. Therefore, the view the Planning Inspector had in respect to the sustainable location of the appeal site (38 Crumpfields Lane) is a material consideration for this application. The Inspector considered that there would have been a choice of modes of transport for the scheme concerned.

For the above reasons it is considered that the site is a sustainable location for residential development.

Does the proposal include major development involving housing?

The application proposes 9 dwellings which would not usually be considered a 'Major Application' under the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA). However, the updated NPPF glossary defines a site over 0.5 hectares as a Major. To clarify the application site for this PIP application is 0.48 hectares and as such would not be caught by the requirement to also satisfy the 'Golden Rules' when considering grey belt policy.

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 NPPF.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

### **Land use**

The site has been used in recent years as an equine paddock. Given its location in respect to the existing ribbon development it is considered that the proposal for 9 dwellings would be compatible with existing residential development.

### **Amount of development**

Having regards to the layout and density of the nearby established ribbon development, it is considered that the site is of a reasonable size to facilitate 9 dwellings as proposed. Given the linear nature of the site, it assumed that the 9 dwellings would directly front Crumpfields Lane. However, the design and layout is not for consideration at this stage but would be considered at the Technical Stage.

### **Other matters**

#### Drainage

The site is not considered to be at risk to flooding, however, a public sewer runs across the site (parallel with the Crumpfields Lane). Comments are awaited from Severn Trent regarding this matter. Comments have been expressed by residents regarding drainage and flooding issues close to the site. North Worcestershire Water Management raise no objection to the application; however, they have expressed that a drainage strategy will need to be submitted at the Technical Stage.

#### Highways

County Highways have no objection "in principle" to the proposed erection of up to nine dwellings – subject to the details provided at Technical Details stage are in accordance with WCC Streetscape Design Guide. Objections have been raised from residents on Highways safety concerns and the speed of vehicles. Further consideration will be made at the Technical Details stage depending on the layout and access proposed.

#### Land Contamination

Due to the historic agricultural nature of the site, and the proximity to a historic landfill site, 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.

#### Archaeology

In respect to Archaeology, there would be no objection to the proposal. However, Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service should be consulted on Technical Details, as there may be a case for conditions to offset any potential harm.

#### Trees

Tree Preservation Order No. 74 exists on the site. The Tree Officer has stated that it is likely that the development might impact on 3 protected ash trees; and also to a lesser extent, another ash tree and group of trees if services need to be added. The existing hedgerow adjacent to Crumpfields Lane is also likely to be affected.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

Therefore, a full Tree Survey and a comprehensive Arboricultural Impact and Method statement (in line with BS5837- 2012) will be required at the Technical Details stage. So long as it can be demonstrated that the development would not cause harm to the trees, during construction and after development has taken place in terms of future pressures for pruning or removal; the Tree Officer does not object to the application.

### Public consultation

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 there are existing concerns in respect to flooding and a nearby pumping station, it is important to note that the Permission in Principle (PIP) stage focuses on the principle of development, and not detailed design. Technical solutions, such as appropriately designed drainage and attenuation, will be thoroughly assessed at the Technical Details Consent stage.

County Highways has no objections in principle, and further detailed traffic impact assessments will need to be conducted as part of 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.

Matters related to biodiversity, archaeology, trees, 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 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,

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

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.

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 the Technical Design Consent 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 be GRANTED.**

### **Informative**

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 e.g. Technical Details Consent or building regulations approval.

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 July 2025

---

**Planning Application 25/00527/PIP****Permission in Principle for the conversion of the existing building for to up to two Residential Dwellings (C3)****Alders Court, Green Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 5GY,****Applicant: Mrs R Portman  
Ward: Astwood Bank And Feckenham Ward****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Claire Gilbert, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 881655 Email: [claire.gilbert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:claire.gilbert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

**Site Description**

The existing building that the application relates to forms part of a farmstead which is located to the Southwest of Redditch in an area designated as Green Belt. The building is a linear barn structure which is agricultural in nature. The other barns that form the farmstead have already been converted into dwellinghouses.

Due to its age the building is not considered to be of historic interest, however it does fall within the setting of a historic and largely intact farmstead, which is of historic interest and also forms part of the curtilage of the grade II listed farmhouse known as Wellbrook House.

The building is currently used for a mixture of uses including as an ancillary building for the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling houses and as a stable for the keeping of horses. The land that surrounds it and makes up the remaining site area, appears to be land which is maintained by the existing residential dwellings at Alders Court and mainly comprises areas of grass and shrubs along the existing access drive that serves some of the existing dwellings within the farmstead.

**Proposal Description**

This is a Permission in Principle (PIP) application, which is an alternative route of obtaining planning permission for development, additional information is contained in the assessment section of the report.

The proposed development is for the conversion of the existing building on the site for up to 2 dwellings.

**Relevant Policies****Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4****Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

17th July 2025

---

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 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

### **Others**

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

### **Relevant Planning History**

No relevant history

### **Consultations**

#### **Conservation Officer**

Comments received summarised as follows:

The application refers to a building that forms part of the farmstead historically known as Greenlane Farm located to the southwest of Redditch around Callow Hill. From map evidence, it is a linear building and was constructed sometime between 1938-71. The planning statement notes that it has a concrete portal frame, so the building is most likely a barn associated with the wider farm site. It is probably agricultural in character and therefore in keeping with the sort of building found on a farm, though its age suggests it is not of historic interest. However, it falls within the setting of a historic and largely intact farmstead, which is of historic interest and forms the curtilage of the grade II listed farmhouse, Wellbrook House. It is also sited next to a historic moat, which is of archaeological interest.

In principle, the conversion of the building to residential purposes would be acceptable to Conservation. This would be subject to the submission of further information for consideration at the technical details consent stage.

#### **Worcestershire Archive and Archaeological Service**

Comments received summarised as follows:

There is no archaeological objection to the principle of re-development of the existing building and land for up to two dwellings, however, Archaeology should be consulted on the Technical Details, as there may be a requirement for conditions to offset harm.

#### **North Worcestershire Water Management**

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

Comments received summarised as follows:

The proposed development site is situated in the catchment of Alders Brook. The site falls within flood zone 1, meaning it is not considered that there is any significant fluvial flood risk to the site. But there is a section of unmapped watercourse to the East of the development which could pose some risk. The EA's flood mapping does however indicate that there is a risk to the site and surrounding area to surface water flooding. This is mostly on the south half of the site away from the current building but does show a significant risk.

As there are no details provided in relation to any proposed drainage arrangements, NWWM have provided a statement of their requirements for the technical details.

### **Worcestershire Highways – Redditch**

Comments received summarised as follows:

No highway objections "in principle" to the proposed residential development of Permission in Principle for the conversion of the existing building for to up to two Residential Dwellings (C3) – subject to details provided within any full application are in accordance with WCC Streetscape Design Guide.

The site is located in a semi-rural and unsustainable location due to amenities and facilities not being located within acceptable walking distance, however this is accepted since pedestrian safety is not compromised. The site has an existing vehicular access and is located off a private drive which is located opposite a classified road (Green Lane). Green Lane has no footways or street lighting. No bus stops are located within acceptable walking distance.

Due to the latest December 2024 government published National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highways now look at pedestrian and highway safety, and it has been concluded sustainability of the site is no longer a highway reason for refusal. Sustainability of the site is something that is now considered by the planning department.

### **WRS - Contaminated Land**

Comments received summarised as follows:

I have looked over the information provided by the applicant; the previous commercial use of the existing building is unclear, and as its being converted to a dwelling we require further information on the land use history, I would suggest a desk study in the first instance.

### **Feckenham Parish Council**

Comments received summarised as follows:

Whilst we accept that this application site falls within the definition of "grey belt," the question of whether the application complies with paragraph 155 of the NPPF is far less clear.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**17th July 2025

---

The principle of conversion of the existing buildings may be acceptable, but the change of use to two large residential dwellings would significantly increase the use and therefore create a detrimental effect to the openness of the surrounding area.

Again, whilst in principle, the highways authority, have not objected, the site is in an unsustainable location with no adequate footpaths or street lighting.

The application therefore fails to comply with -:

Paragraph 155a, as it would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining green belt.

Paragraph 155b, whilst the Borough do not have a five-year land supply, there is no demonstrable (clearly apparent or capable of being logically proved reason), to substantiate it.

Paragraph 155c, the site is in an unsustainable location.

On the basis of the above the Parish Council object to this application

**Arboricultural Officer**

Comments received summarised as follows:

No objection to the proposal set out in this application.

**Public Consultation Response**

1st Site Notice posted 09/05/2025 expired 26/05/2025

2<sup>nd</sup> Site notice posted 16/05/2025 expired 09/06/2025

1<sup>st</sup> Neighbour letters sent 09/05/2025 expired 26/05/2025

2<sup>nd</sup> neighbour letters sent 14/05/2025 expired 31/05/2025

1<sup>st</sup> Press Notice posted 12/05/2025 expired 02/06/2025

2<sup>nd</sup> Press Notice posted 9/05/2025 expired 09/06/2025

No representations received to date.

**Assessment of Proposal**

The proposal is for permission in principle, as provided for in the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017(as amended). The Planning Practice Guidance advises that this is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle, and the second stage ('technical details consent') is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The granting of technical details consent has the effect of granting planning permission for the development.

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

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

- **Location**
- **land use; and**
- **amount of development**

All other matters are considered as part of the subsequent technical details consent application if permission in principle is granted. Consideration of this application has to be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is one such material consideration.

### Location

#### **Green Belt**

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF sets out that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 goes on to set out that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the set list of exceptions applies, one of which is:

- h) other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
- i. mineral extraction.
  - ii. engineering operations.
  - iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location.
  - iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.
  - v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
  - vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

It is considered that the conversion of the existing building into dwellings would fall within paragraph 154. h) iv. which is the re use of buildings provided that the buildings are of a permanent and substantial construction.

Whilst it appears that the building that is the subject of this application would be capable of conversion, no structural survey to confirm this has been submitted at this stage. Information about the structural integrity of the building and how the conversion would take place would be required to be submitted at the technical details consent stage.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

17th July 2025

---

Due to the sites existing use and siting, it is not considered that the proposal to convert the building to provide up to two dwellings would conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. It is also considered that due to the nature of the development that is proposed, the openness of the Green Belt would be preserved.

Overall is it considered that the proposal would be appropriate development in the Green Belt.

### **Sustainability**

The site is situated to the southwest of the identified residential area of Redditch. The access to the site is via an existing vehicular access off Green Lane which currently serves other residential properties at Alders Court. There are no pavements or street lighting along this section of Green Lane.

On the eastern side of Green Lane, there is a footpath that connects into the existing residential area of Callow Hill (Underwood Close). There are 2 access points into this footpath from Green Lane. One of which is situated approximately 20 metres to the north of the sites access and the other is situated just over 40 metres to the south of the sites access. This is a tarmacked footpath which does have some street lighting.

Given the proximity of the site to the main residential area of Redditch and that there is an existing footpath near to the site that would provide a link into this residential area of Redditch, it is not considered that the site is in a wholly unsustainable location.

### **Land Use**

The application site is near to other residential properties.

### **Historic Environment**

The Councils Conservation Officer has set out that in principle, the conversion of the building to residential purposes would be acceptable. In the event of a formal application, they have set out that further information and detail would be required and the potential impact of the proposal on the nearby heritage assets would need to be taken into consideration.

County Archaeology have set out that they have no archaeological objection to the principle of re-development of the existing building and land for up to two dwellings, however, they have set out that they should be consulted on the Technical Details as there should be conditions to offset harm.

### **Contaminated Land**

Worcestershire Regulatory Services have not raised an objection to the principle of the development but have set out that given the unknown history of the site and building, further information would be required to be provided. This would be required at the technical details stage.

### **Drainage**

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

North Worcestershire Water Management have not raised an objection to the principle of the development but have set out that there is a risk of surface water flooding on the site. Due to this they have recommended that detailed drainage information should be provided at the technical details stage.

Notwithstanding, the land use is considered appropriate at this stage.

### Amount of Development

The amount of development proposed is considered to be acceptable given the size of the building and the area of land shown within the red line on the application plan.

### Other matters

#### **Highway safety**

Worcestershire County Highways have raised no highway objections "in principle" to the proposed residential development - subject to details provided with any full application are in accordance with WCC Streetscape Design Guide.

#### **Trees**

The Councils Tree Officers have no objection to the proposal.

#### **Biodiversity and Ecology**

The grant of PIP is not within the scope of biodiversity net gain (BNG) and this is a matter that instead will need to be considered at Technical Details stage.

The site does not fall within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or a Special Wildlife Site; however, the proposal does affect an existing rural building and the site is surrounded by trees and hedgerows and open countryside. Whilst it is not a reason to refuse PIP, further information in relation to protected species will be necessary at the technical details consent stage.

#### **Planning Conditions**

The Governments Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) expressly sets out that it is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle. Conditions could only be attached at any later technical details consent stage.

### Conclusion

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

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th July 2025

---

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.

This application seeks to establish whether the principle of development is acceptable, having regard to only three matters: location, land use and amount of development.

In view of limb (i) the proposal has been found to comprise appropriate development within the Green Belt. There is therefore no strong reason for refusing the application on this basis.

In view of limb (ii), the location of the site is considered sustainable, making effective use of the land and providing up to 2 new dwellings towards housing supply.

On that basis, there are no known adverse impacts of granting permission in principle that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. It is therefore considered that this Permission in principle application should be granted.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, permission in principle be GRANTED.**

### **Informative:**

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.

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 Planning Committee because a statutory Consultee (Feckenham Parish Council) have raised objection to the proposal. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.