

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Claire Davies, David Munro, Monica Stringfellow and Ian Woodall

Officers:

Helena Plant, Amar Hussain, Steve Edden, Rosie Paget and Kyle Lander

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

47. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bill Hartnett with Councillor Monica Stringfellow in attendance as substitute

Apologies were also received from Councillors Matt Dormner and Brandon Clayton.

48. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

49. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 16th October 2025 and 13th November 2025 were presented to Members.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 16th October 2025 and 13th November 2025 were approved as a true and accurate records and were signed by the Chair.

Chair

50. UPDATE REPORTS

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

51. 25/00875/FUL - FORMER POLICE STATION, GROVE STREET, TOWN CENTRE, REDDITCH, B98 8DB

The application was reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application was for major development. Furthermore, the application was submitted on behalf of RBC. 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 35 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Former Police Station, Grove Street, Town Centre, Redditch, B98 8DB and sought the Construction of a purpose-built Innovation Centre (Class E) building with associated facilities and landscaping.

Following the Planning Application approved in Autumn 2022 and with the completion of that development, the Police Station was moved to its new site at Middle House Lane. A previous application 24/00956/FUL was submitted and then subsequently withdrawn by the applicant.

Officers drew Members attention to page 22 of the Public reports pack that detailed which Class E uses would be permitted under the application.

Vehicular access to the site would be possible off of Archer Road with the existing second entrance off Queen Street being closed. Pedestrians would be able to access the building from either Queen Street or Grove Street (Via the carpark).

Concern was raised regarding overlooking of the Magistrates Court, however, measures were proposed around tree screening which were deemed adequate. It was also taken into account the reorientation of the building which brought the building further away from the Magistrates court and therefore assisted to address privacy concerns.

Officers drew Members attention to the proposed floor plans detailed on pages 18 to 23 of the Public Reports pack and detailed that the first and second floors would be predominately Office space

with the ground floor providing a number of facilities such as a Lab, Workshops and meeting rooms.

The building was designed by intersecting two cubic masses, each of the two units would use a different brick colour to give Architectural interest to the site. the application would bring significant bio-diversity gains as the current site had almost negligible biodiversity opportunities, the application would meet the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain Condition.

At the invitation of the Chair, Rachel Egan, the applicant, addressed the committee in support of the application.

Members questioned the impact of the Loss of Car Park 3 which was detailed as a mitigating parking factor in the report. Officers clarified that due to Carpark 3 being the furthest away of the 3 named parking resources, they were satisfied that ample parking in the local area was available.

Members were generally in support of the innovation centre and on being put to a vote it was.

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations,

- a) Planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as detailed on pages 37 to 49 of the Public Reports pack. and;**
- b) Delegated powers be GRANTED to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services to determine any subsequent Non-Material Amendment (NMA) associated with the Implementation of the permission**

52. 25/01228/PIP - LAND ADJACENT, 3 POPES LANE, ASTWOOD BANK, WORCESTERSHIRE

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because 11 (or more) objections had been received. 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 37 to 48 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

Officers further drew Members attention to the update report which detailed a response from Worcester County Council, Highways (County Highways) as well as clarification regarding Policy 14, protection of incidental open space and additional

comments/objections raised.

The application was for Land Adjacent to 3 Popes Lane, Astwood Bank, Worcestershire and sought Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 6 dwellings.

Officers clarified that the application was a Planning in Principle (PIP) application. A PIP application was an application avenue for housing led developments and were in two parts. The PIP was the first part and only considered matters relating to Location, Land Use and the Amount of development, all other matters would be heard under a Technical Details application. Officers clarified that the Planning permission would only be granted when both a PIP and Technical details application were approved.

The site location was shown on page 38 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, Officers clarified that it was only the area in red which was to be considered. The blue area was owned by the application but did not form part of the application.

The site fell within the greenbelt in the Local Plan, detailed on page 39 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. However, it was Officers assessment that under Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the site fell under the definition of Grey Belt and therefore, the location was deemed acceptable.

Officers drew Members attention to the Photographs detailed on pages 44 to 48 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, clarifying that the images were taken at the site, however due to the ambient light level at the time taken they had been lighted to make it more visible.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Keith Potts, Local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

After questions from Members the following was clarified.

- The Road was an unadopted highway not maintainable at public expense, however, it was also a public right of way, therefore, County Highways were required to maintain it as a footpath.
- That although Members raised concerns of potential flooding due to the topography of the site, North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) did not raise any concerns, however, a full assessment and drainage strategy would be submitted as part of the technical details stage.

Officers addressed the 5 points detailed on page 5 of the Update report pack, in relation to policy 14 of the Local Plan no4.

- I. The council could not demonstrate a 5 year housing supply.

- II. The site only impacted the local area and the technical details would look at the impact to the green infrastructure network.
- III. The site did not have a strategic function
- IV. There was alternative local space within the area and the site did not play an important role due to its size.
- V. The incidental open space did not play an important role in the character of the area.

Therefore, Officers were satisfied that at this stage Policy 14 did apply to the site.

Members then debated the application.

Members expressed a desire for the technical details application to come back before Members as they had some concerns with certain aspects that may come up. However, Officers clarified the scheme of delegation to Officers and detailed that the application before them was only there because of the number of objections that had been received, any subsequent application would also be subject to the relevant scheme of delegation.

Although Members had unresolved questions around several points, they accepted that those would be investigated properly during the technical details application. Furthermore, Members commented that at this stage there was no material planning reason to reject the PIP which only considered the location, land use and number of houses proposed. On being put to a vote it was:

RESOLVED that

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

53. 25/01248/FUL - WINDMILL COMMUNITY CENTRE, RYEGRASS LANE, WALKWOOD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 5YE

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was Rubicon and Redditch Borough Council had an interest in the land as freeholder. 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 49 to 53 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Windmill Community Centre, Ryegrass Lane, Walkwood, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 5YE and sought the Addition of an InPost Parcel Locker.

Officers detailed that InPost parcel lockers were a self-service parcel drop off and collection point which members of the public could use. The lockers would be accessible 24 hours a day and considering the nature of the site being a Community Centre, it was deemed the location and use were acceptable.

The locker would be visible from the public highway and the unit would have some self-lighting and a hi definition CCTV camera for security purposes. No objections were received from County Highways nor any other consultee.

Members drew Officers attention to the security Barrier detailed on page 53 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack and asked if it would impact access to the site if it was locked at night. Officers replied that it was an operational issue for the running of the community centre, but that Members of the public would still be able to access the InPost locker on foot.

Members saw no issue with the land use or position and on being put it 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 detailed on page 65 of the Public Reports pack.

54. 25/01249/FUL - WINYATES GREEN COMMUNITY CENTRE, 6 FURZE LANE, WINYATES GREEN, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 0SE

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was Rubicon and Redditch Borough Council had an interest in the land as freeholder. 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 55 to 58 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Winyates Green Community Centre, 6 Furze Lane, Winyates Green, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 0SE and sought the Addition of an InPost Parcel Locker.

Officers detailed that InPost parcel lockers were a self-service parcel drop off and collection point which Members of the public could use. The lockers would be accessible 24 hours a day and

considering the nature of the site being a Community Centre, it was deemed the location and use were acceptable.

The locker would be visible from the public highway, and the unit would have some self-lighting and a hi definition CCTV camera for security purposes. No objections were received from County Highways nor any other consultee.

Members drew Officers attention to page 56 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack and enquired about the window which was being obscured. Officers replied that it was a toilet window and did not have any significant impact on ventilation nor lighting.

Members saw no issue with the land use or position and on being put it 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 detailed on page 69 of the Public Reports pack.

55. 25/01250/FUL - BATCHLEY COMMUNITY CENTRE, CHERRY TREE WALK, BATCHLEY, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 6PB

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was Rubicon and Redditch Borough Council had an interest in the land as freeholder. 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 55 to 58 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Batchley Community Centre, Cherry Tree Walk, Batchley, Redditch, Worcestershire B97 6PB and sought the addition of an InPost Parcel Locker.

Officers detailed that InPost parcel lockers were a self-service parcel drop off and collection point which Members of the public could use. The lockers would be accessible 24 hours a day and considering the nature of the site being a Community Centre, it was deemed the location and use were acceptable.

The unit would not be visible from the main highway and although this meant that there would be less natural surveillance, it did have some self-lighting and a hi definition CCTV camera for security

purposes. No objections were received from County Highways nor any other consultee.

Members saw no issue with the land use or position and on being put it 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 detailed on page 73 of the Public Reports pack.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.21 pm