

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Brandon Clayton, Claire Davies, Matthew Dormer, Bill Hartnett, David Munro, Ian Woodall and Paul Wren

Officers:

Helena Plant, Amar Hussain, Steve Edden and Emily Cox

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

19. APOLOGIES

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

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ian Woodall declared an other disclosable interest in relation to agenda item 6 (minute No24) in that he had been very vocal regarding traffic and the impact of local development in the surrounding area. Therefore, he believed that his views were too strong to guarantee impartiality when considering the application, and he would leave the room during the consideration of the item and take no part in the discussion or decision thereof.

21. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 17th July 2025 were presented to Members.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 17th July 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

22. UPDATE REPORTS

Members indicated that they had enough time to read and consider the Update reports, therefore, the update reports were noted.

Chair

23. 25/00414/REM - IPSLEY HOUSE, IPSLEY CHURCH LANE, IPSLEY, REDDITCH, B98 0AJ

The application was reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the application was for major development. 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 26 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Ipsley House, Ipsley Church Lane, Ipsley, Redditch, B98 0AJ and sought Reserved Matters approval for the erection of 62 dwellings (use class C3), open space and associated works.

Officers detailed that the Outline Planning application 24/00717/OUT went before Members and was approved in November 2024. At the time an indicative plan was shown to Members which was not intended to be an accurate representation of the final plan, however, the plan shown at the time drew an objection from a member of the public.

The location of the development and surrounding area were detailed to Members, particularly those to the north at Shottery Close and to the East at Ipsley Court. The heights of the proposed dwellings and surrounding area were shown to Members on page 13 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The dwellings were mostly 3-bedroom units in brick and tile construction matching the surrounding developments, the makeup of housing was considered to reflect the requirements of the most recent Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) which identified that there was a greater need for 3-4 bed units within the Borough. Furthermore, Officers clarified that due to vacant building credits there was no requirement for the developer to provide any affordable units as part of the development.

Officers drew Members' attention to the public right of way shown on page 16 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Links were identified which connect the new footpath on the development site with existing route just outside the site boundary to maintain a connection for public access.

Site access was initially determined during the outline application so would not usually also form part of the proceeding reserved matters application. However, due to a very minor change to the access point, Members were asked to consider the matter again. To

highlight the change Members' attention was drawn to page 25 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, which shows a straightening of the access road which had a slight curve in the outline application.

There was no objection from statutory consultees which included Worcestershire County Council, Highways (County Highways) regarding the change to access. Furthermore, there were no objections from any other statutory consultee subject to appropriate Conditions. The only objection to the application being from a resident, which was summarised in the Officers report.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Steve Williams, local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Michaela Corbett, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support.

The following was clarified by Officers following questions from Members:

- Informative 4 was a standard informative and did not reflect that the road network might have difficulties with drainage.
- There was no supplied parking for visitors as part of the application, however, all dwellings comply with the required number of parking spaces based on the size of the dwelling.
- All dwellings must comply with building regulations which mandate the inclusion of EV charging points with any new builds.

There was some confusion regarding the removal of some trees and hedgerow on the site. However, Officers confirmed that there was no intention to remove the hedgerow or trees indicated. With the possible exception of a small section of the hedgerow to accommodate the linking of the new and existing public footpath as detailed on page 25 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

Members expressed the opinion that it was a good use of a brownfield site, which was preferable to development going into greenbelt areas. On being put to the 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 and Informatives as outlined on pages 22 to 24 of the Public Reports pack.

**24. 25/00636/FUL - STONEBRIDGE NURSING HOME, 178 - 180
BIRCHFIELD ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 4NA**

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the Ward Member requested it be determined by Planning Committee as opposed to being determined under Delegated Powers.

Having declared an interest, Councillor Woodall retired from the meeting room and took no part in the debate or decision thereof.

The Chair announced that the primary objector speaking on the application, Mrs Eileen McMahon, was known to Members of the Labour party but that it would not play a part in their decision and that Members would remain impartial.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 9 to 23 of the Update Reports pack. Officers clarified that since the publication of the agenda, some more recent photographs were obtained which Officers felt necessitated an updated presentation for Members. Furthermore the amended and additional Conditions detailed on page 8 of the Update Reports pack were highlighted to Members.

The application was for Stonebridge Nursing Home, 178 – 180 Birchfield Road, Headless Cross, Redditch and sought a two-storey rear and front extension to improve facilities.

Officers drew Members attention to the site plans detailed on pages 12 and 14 of the Update Reports pack, highlighting the proposed extension locations shown on page 14. Officers also drew Members attention to 203 Birchfield Road opposite which was also owned by the nursing home, and which accommodated some employee parking.

The extensions which would be 5x7.5x2.8m and 5.75x7.85x10.5m for the front and rear extensions respectively, would create an additional 3 bedrooms within the home. The alterations to the building were shown on pages 32 and 33 of the update reports pack, labelled as rooms 1-10.

There were 9 separate objections from 5 Members of the public, which were summarised in the report. The main reason for objection was the impact on highways and parking. There were no objections from statutory consultees which included Worcester County Council, Highways (County Highways).

Officers detailed that when assessing parking spaces required for a care home, in accordance with WCC Parking standards, 1 space

was required per 4 residents. As the plan detailed 29 spaces which was an increase of 9 spaces, this was compliant with parking standards.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mrs Eileen McMahon, Local Resident and Councillor Barker Smith, Ward Member, addressed the Committee in opposition to the development. A statement was also read out by Officers on behalf of Philip Edmunds, the Applicant, in support of the application.

After questions from Members the following was clarified by Officers.

- As the road was designated as unclassified there was no requirement for the developer to submit a planning application for the parking spaces outside number 178/180.
- The size of the development has increased since the care home was established and was evidenced by the planning history. It was usual for the impact of the development to be assessed rather than just the size increase. Officers did not feel that the impact was severe.
- The location of the waste bins was not shown on the plans. However, that detail was not required for the planning application and was not a material planning consideration.
- That the disabled spaces were split between the two sites.
- The Informative requested by WRS regarding the contaminated Land 250m away was a standard Informative in place so there was a process if anything was discovered. There was no identified immediate risk to the site.
- That a construction management plan would be submitted under Condition 5 to manage the impact of the development and also to identify locations for material storage and workers quarters.

The previous dedicated hatched Ambulance space shown on page 20 of the Update Reports pack was to be repositioned between new parking spaces and Officers detailed to Members the position of this and a second ambulance point on the site near the entrance.

Officers detailed that currently the Care home had capacity for 52 residents with some of the rooms having shared facilities. The application was to give all rooms an en-suite facility with some widening of corridors. Officers further clarified that the care home licence currently permitted up to 55 residents so would not require a change. Additionally, there would be no increase in employees on site.

Members then debated the Application which officers had recommended for approval.

Members expressed the opinion that they did not consider the information presented by County Highways to be robust and that in their opinion it did not adequately stand up to scrutiny and there would be an impact on the highways network within the area, the question was how severe. Members further commented that even though it may not have been previously marked as such, it did not stop Employees using some of the “new parking” areas for parking previously. Therefore, the increase in parking by the development would be less than that claimed by the developer. Members drew Officers attention to the image on Page 23 of the Update Reports pack which appeared to show a vehicle parked in a spot not currently designated for parking. Officers detailed that they could not comment on that matter but that the new plan would be conditioned as part of the application.

After Comments from Members, Officers clarified that the storage of Medical/food waste was an operational issue for the care home and that it would not form a material planning consideration. Additionally, Officers highlighted that the care Home would be bound by their own regulations in regard to Health and Safety and Care arrangements, therefore, those matters could not be considered material planning considerations.

Members commented that the Planning Committee must consider an application on its Merits and expressed the opinion that the care home provided a much-needed benefit for the Borough and that 3 additional bedrooms would not have a significant impact the highways network. Furthermore, without an objection from relevant consultees there was not a good material Planning reason on which to refuse the application. Therefore, on being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to:

- **Conditions 1,3,4,5 and the Informative as Outlined on pages 33 to 34 of the Public Reports pack.**
- **Amended Condition 2 as Outlined on page 8 of the Update Reports pack**
- **The Additional Condition 6 as Outlined on page 8 of the Update Reports pack**