

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), and Councillors Juliet Barker Smith, Brandon Clayton, Claire Davies, Matthew Dormer, David Munro, Monica Stringfellow and Ian Woodall

### Officers:

Helena Plant and Amar Hussain

### Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

### 62. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bill Hartnett and Juma Begum with Councillors Juliette Barker Smith and Monica Stringfellow in attendance as substitutes respectively.

Apologies were also received from Councillor William Boyd.

### 63. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### 64. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026 were presented to Members.

### **RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.**

### 65. UPDATE REPORTS

There were no Update Reports.

Chair

**66. 25/00162/FUL - REDDITCH CRICKET HOCKEY AND RUGBY CLUB, BROMSGROVE ROAD, BATCHLEY, B97 4SP**

This application was reported to the Planning Committee because the application site fell within the ownership of 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 5 to 21 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Redditch Cricket Hockey and Rugby Club, Bromsgrove Road, Batchley, B97 4SP and sought permission for the instillation of 3 Padel Tennis Courts with ancillary accommodation.

The location and access were identified on pages 6 to 8 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers identified the orientation and position of the courts when compared to the nearby residential properties. Three courts were proposed which were situated alongside the existing MUGA facility with the ancillary storage situated at one end of the development near the cricket batting nets.

The padel courts would be of a full standard size, surrounded by 3m clear toughened tempered glass sides with an additional mesh screen at the ends, the courts would not have a ceiling. The entrance to the courts would be along the centre line and they would be available for use from 7:00am till 10:00pm 7 days a week.

Officers detailed that the main objection to the application came from Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) who had assessed the application and determined that there would be an unacceptable impact to the nearby residential properties caused by the noise generated by the courts. Although regard had been given to all the noise which the development would generate, the main area of concern was in relation to the repeated contact of the paddle and ball during play. The distance to the effected properties was detailed as being 61m from the courts at its closest and was shown on page 17 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

A number of other concerns were noted by Officers, such as the loss of open space, drainage and light pollution, however, it was determined that they could be mitigated by suitable Conditions should Members disagree with the Officers recommendation and therefore, were not detailed under the reasons for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr David Bush, an interested party, and Mr Adam Walker, the Applicant's Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

After questions to Officers the following was clarified:

- That the application considered all the local residents including those of Pullman close, who were not all full identified in the Site Plans and Presentations pack. However, this would not affect the decision by WRS to object to the application.
- That the balls impacting on the tempered glass sides and shouting during play were considerations, however it was the repeated impact of the ball with the paddle which was considered the greater concern by WRS.
- That adjustments to the operational times were considered as mitigating factors to the objection by WRS, however, it was the conclusion of WRS that a balance could not be attained to mitigate the sound and impact to local residential amenity.

Members were in support of the sporting provision being proposed for the area; however they noted that they had to balance this against the significant loss of amenity for the local residents.

Members noted that they did not consider the light or location to be a suitable reason for refusal considering the current use of the site. Members also had regard to the noise which was generated by the current sports activity which in their opinion mitigated some of the sound expected to be generated.

With regard to the Noise, Members expressed the opinion that the measures would not be enough to mitigate the impact, they did not believe the proposed acoustic fencing to be adequate and that the lack of a roof could further lead to an amplification effect for the courts. The time of operation was also of great concern for Members who noted that the earlier and later times could potentially be very disruptive for residents. When considering these two factors together, Members felt that the impact to residential amenity would be severe and therefore, upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED that**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be REFUSED for reasons as detailed on page 20 of the Public Reports pack.**