



# Planning Committee

Thu 19 Feb  
2026  
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 17<sup>th</sup> February 2026) 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 17<sup>th</sup> February 2026**
- 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 17<sup>th</sup> February 2026**
- 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.

# Planning

Thursday, 19th February, 2026

7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community Centre

## 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 - 12)

### 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. 25/00162/FUL - Redditch Cricket Hockey and Rugby Club, Bromsgrove Road, Batchley, B97 4SP (Pages 13 - 20)

### 6. 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), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Brandon Clayton, Claire Davies, Matthew Dormer, Sharon Harvey, David Munro and Monica Stringfellow

### **Also Present:**

Councillors Gary Slim and Jane Spilsbury

### **Officers:**

Helena Plant, Amar Hussain and Sharron Williams

### **Democratic Services Officers:**

Gavin Day

### **56. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bill Hartnett and Ian Woodall with Councillors Monica Stringfellow and Sharon Harvey in attendance as substitutes respectively.

### **57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest

### **58. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2025 were presented to Members.

### **RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.**

### **59. UPDATE REPORTS**

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

Chair

## Planning Committee

Thursday, 15th January, 2026

---

**60. 25/00601/FUL - FORMER PLAY AREA, LOXLEY CLOSE, CHURCH HILL SOUTH, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE**

At the discretion of the Chair and to accommodate public speakers, the agenda was reorganised to hear Agenda item 6 before Agenda item 5 (minute No61).

The application was reported to the Planning Committee because the application required a Section 106 Agreement, in addition to the applicant being 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 15 to 24 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers further drew Members' attention to the additional Photographs of the site detailed on pages 11 to 14 of the Supplementary Agenda pack.

The application was for the former play area, Loxley Close, Church Hill South, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought development of 6 No. houses with associated parking.

Officers stated that under the current Local Plan the site was designated as a housing site for up to 10 dwellings, however, due to concerns around drainage, the application was for 6 dwellings only. Officers confirmed that the housing density would be similar to surrounding developments and therefore, was deemed acceptable.

All 6 dwellings would all be social rented units and would form part of Redditch Borough Council's housing stock.

No objections were raised by consultees which included Worcestershire County Council Highways (County Highways), North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) and environmental agencies, subject to the imposition of suitable Conditions.

Concerns with regard to Bat roosting were raised by Residents. However, following surveys undertaken, no evidence of bat roosting was found. The surveys did identify some foraging and commuting activity in the area, therefore, suitable Conditions to safeguard the bat and bird habitat were included.

At the invitation of the Chair, David Wood and Keith Linden, local residents, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Katie Hughes, the Applicant's Agent, addressed the Committee Via Microsoft Teams in support.

Following questions from Members, Officers detailed that:

## Planning Committee

Thursday, 15th January, 2026

---

- The additional vehicle parking spaces which were part of the application were over the required number of spaces for each dwelling; therefore, would be communal use for all residents.
- The houses were elevated due to the flood risks, however the gardens were not.
- Consideration had been given to large vehicular access such as refuse vehicles which would service the new development in the same manner as the surrounding dwellings.
- No evidence of bat roosting was identified. However, Conditions 15,16 and 17 would cover the mitigation measures in respect to bats and wildlife.

Officers detailed that although there was a loss of open space, due to the size of the development, there was no requirement to provide replacement areas, additionally, as there were less than 10 dwellings proposed it was not possible to secure this via the Section 106 agreement. Officers further detailed that the applicant was Redditch Borough Council. Therefore, Members had the opportunity to take up their concerns with Leisure Services to try and secure alternative provision, however, this was not a material planning consideration which formed part of the application.

The Committee then debated the application which officers recommended for approval.

Members stated that although they were reluctant to lose the open space which was actively used by residents, as the local Plan identified the area for residential development it was difficult to go against the Officers recommendation without strong material planning reasons. Although Members sympathised with residents, they had to balance the loss of amenity against the 6 dwellings, which would provide 6 families on the Council's waiting list with a home.

Members were happy with the proposed development especially the housing density, ecological considerations and the inclusion of Communal parking over what was required. Therefore, on being put to the 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:-**

- a) The satisfactory completion of a Section 106 planning obligation.**

# Planning Committee

Thursday, 15th January, 2026

---

**b) Conditions and Informatives as detailed on pages 55 to 66 of the Public Reports pack.**

The meeting stood adjourned from 19:53 hours to 19:59 hours for a comfort break.

**61. 25/00481/FUL - EASEMORE HOUSE, 103 EASEMORE ROAD, TOWN CENTRE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 8EY**

The application was reported to the Planning Committee because the application was for major development and required a Section 106 Agreement. 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 13 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers further drew Members' attention to the additional Photographs of the site detailed on pages 5 to 9 of the Supplementary Agenda pack.

The application was for Easemore House, 103 Easemore Road, Town Centre, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 8EY and sought the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a residential development of up to 13 No. new dwellings.

The Chair noted that the location was previously referred to as Community House.

Officers detailed that the site location was identified as being highly sustainable due to its proximity to the town centre and prominent bus routes. Less parking was proposed than would normally be supplied due to the sustainable location. According to the Streetscape design guidance, a 4-bedroom dwelling would normally require 3 parking spaces, however, only two spaces were proposed per plot. After reviewing the applicant's submissions, Worcestershire County Council, Highways (County Highways) deemed the parking to be acceptable due to the sustainable location.

30% affordable housing would be secured via the Section 106 planning obligation. This was identified to be plots 7,8,9 and 10 which would be under shared ownership.

There were no objections from consultees subject to appropriate Conditions.

The existing building was identified as a non-designated heritage asset; however, limited weight was afforded to the building in terms

## Planning Committee

Thursday, 15th January, 2026

---

of its impact on the streetscene which was balanced against the supply of housing.

After questions from Members, Officers clarified the following:

- it was decided to move the bus stop following discussion with County Highways after traffic safety concerns were raised.
- The built-out area at the entrance of the site would feature drop curbs to enable cyclist to go onto the curb and not have to go into the road.

Members then debated the application which Officers recommended for approval.

Members expressed some concern about the boundary screening which separated the back of the development from a major highway which could be dangerous for young children. Officers replied that the boundary treatment was covered under a Condition so they would address that issue via that condition and ensure that it provided adequate screening and safety.

Members were displeased with the movement of the bus stop to a position which was, in their opinion, a greater traffic and safety concern when compared to the current location. There was also some concern with the lack of parking provision for the residents and for any visitors to the site, noting that regardless of the sustainable location it was human nature to own a vehicle. Any vehicles above the two per household would need to be accommodated on the already packed road, further increasing congestion and obstructions. However, with no objections from County Highways on either of those issues, it would be difficult to support refusing the application on highways grounds, therefore, Members saw no reason to reject the application. Upon being put to the 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:-**

- a) The satisfactory completion of a S106 planning obligation.**
- b) The conditions and Informatives as detailed on pages 33 to 43 of the Public Reports pack.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th February 2026

---

**Planning Application 25/00162/FUL**

**Proposed padel tennis courts and ancillary accommodation**

**Redditch Cricket Hockey and Rugby Club, Bromsgrove Road, Batchley, B97 4SP**

**Applicant: A Ainge: All Things Padel Limited**  
**Ward: Batchley and Brockhill Ward**

**(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Steven Edden, Principal Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 548474 Email: [steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

### **Site Description**

The site forms part of the Redditch Cricket, Hockey and Rugby Club, Batchley. Access is via Bromsgrove Road to the south where there is a large tarmac parking area which can accommodate approximately 80 vehicles.

The site is rectangular in shape occupying an area of approximately 75m in length x 20m in width.

The proposed development would be located to the western edge of the existing Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) and to the immediate north of some existing Cricket practice nets (which would be unaffected by the development). To the south is an existing Cricket pitch beyond which is a pavilion building backing on to houses in Bromsgrove Road. The wider area is residential in nature, with Pulman Close situated to the east immediately beyond the MUGA and dwellings in Willow Way further to the west. Shops situated along Batchley Road lie to the north.

The site comprises an area of Primarily Open Space as designated in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 and has previously been used for Rugby purposes.

### **Proposal Description**

Permission is sought for 3no. Padel tennis courts, acoustic fencing (2m high) together with supporting accommodation in the form of two shipping containers. Container 1 would accommodate a ladies and gents toilet, disabled toilet with separate changing facilities. Container 2 would be used as an on-site office. The containers, which would each measure 6m x 2.4m are proposed to be located to the south side of the application site.

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL****PLANNING  
COMMITTEE****19th February 2026**

---

Each Padel Court would be enclosed by 3m high rigid panel metal mesh fencing to the sides with tempered / toughened glass end walls and end returns. The glazing to the end walls and returns would be 3 metres high with an additional 1 metre high mesh panel over the 3m glazing giving a total height to the end walls of 4 metres. The courts are proposed to be uncovered and each would have a (standard) internal playing area of 20x10m with a synthetic playing surface.

Each Padel court would have a floodlight column on each of its four corners and the top of the floodlights would be 6 metres above the court surface providing an illuminance of 300 lux (E<sub>av</sub>) with 0.5 uniformity at ground level in accordance with Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) guidance.

Hours of operation are stated to be from 7.00am till 10.00pm daily.

Padel, which originated in Mexico is similar to squash but played with a solid racquet made of a composite material without strings and is played casually with regular tennis balls. The game of Padel has recently boomed in popularity and is considered to be one of the fastest-growing sports in the UK.

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

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 13: Primarily Open Space

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Policy 43: Leisure, Tourism and Abbey Stadium

**Others**

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

**Relevant Planning History**

None directly relevant to application

**Consultations****Worcestershire County Council – Highway Authority**

No objection

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th February 2026

---

### **RBC Leisure Services**

Comments summarised as follows:

The application would increase light pollution in the area as well as increased sustained noise pollution given how close the facility is to housing.

Whilst there is a need for Padel provision in the town we do not believe this site to be ideal for such a use. The town has a tennis club which seems to be a more appropriate location for the Padel proposals.

### **North Worcestershire Water Management**

No objections subject to the imposition of a surface water drainage strategy (condition) being imposed on any consent.

### **Sport England**

No objections raised. The application is considered to accord with exception 5 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and Paragraph 104 of the NPPF.

### **Worcestershire Regulatory Services: Noise**

Comments summarised as follows:

Noise from padel courts is currently a hot topic in the acoustics world in terms of how to assess the noise generated and determine the likely impact at the nearest Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSRs). Given the proximity of the proposed padel courts to the nearby residential dwellings in Willow Way, I consider that noise from ball impacts, and potentially raised voices, would have a significant adverse impact at these nearby residential dwellings. I do not consider that there is any scope for practical noise mitigation measures that would make the proposal acceptable.

The submitted noise impact assessment (Peninsular Acoustics Ref: PA1017-R01-P02 dated July 2025) concludes that *'noise impact from the proposed development may on occasion be audible at nearby residential dwellings, but will not cause an adverse impact that would result in any material change in behaviour'*.

The assessment of the potential noise impact at the nearest residential dwellings has been made by comparing the average noise levels (Leq) in the area against the maximum noise levels (Lmax) from the padel courts as an indication of audibility. This does not seem an unreasonable approach but, based on my previous experience of padel tennis noise, is likely to underestimate the perceived impact at the receptor locations. Maximum noise levels from the courts would vary depending on the proficiency of the participants and the intensity of the games. I assume that the Lmax level used in the comparison is 69dB, but the stated range of Lmax levels is 65-77dB. This indicates that just under half of the Lmax noise events would be above 69dB and, in a worst-case scenario, result in a difference of around 13dB at NSR4 first floor when compared with the stated evening Leq, which could be audible internally with a partial open window. Into the later evening period, as the average (Leq) noise level reduces, Lmax noise events are likely to become more noticeable / audible at the NSRs.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th February 2026

---

The background noise levels appear to have been monitored on the field adjacent to the rear gardens of dwellings in Willow Way and these values have been used for all NSRs.

As one would expect gardens to be enclosed by boundary fencing, noise levels within these spaces should be lower than in the field and therefore the difference between the Leq in gardens and Lmax from the courts would be greater than the presented level differences in Table 4-2 and more noticeable / audible.

The proposed noise barrier, at 2m high, does not screen NSRs to the west from the semi-open sides of the courts. Although the assessment states that the barrier would have some effect in reducing noise levels to the west this has not been quantified and appears to be minimal based on the Sound Level Contour Maps in Appendix C. A 4m high fence would completely screen dwellings to the west and would likely reduce noise levels further but possibly only marginally.

It is accepted that there are other sports undertaken at the club and nearby residents may have become accustomed to the noise that they generate. However, noise from padel tennis is much more impulsive in nature and while activity on a few courts by inexperienced players may not be noticeable at all by local residents, twelve experienced players occupying all three courts, especially in the evening period, would likely result in very frequent impact noise events that would be audible at the NSRs, especially to the east and west of the courts.

Therefore, I do not consider that the applicant has demonstrated that noise from the proposed courts would not, at times, adversely impact the nearest sensitive receptors and for that reason I do not support this application.

### **Worcestershire Regulatory Services: Light Pollution**

Comments summarised as follows:

Whilst the proposed lighting columns would be 6m tall, it is considered that levels of illumination together with means of any cowling / light shields could be agreed via condition between the Council and WRS to ensure that nearby residential amenities are not adversely affected. The presence of existing floodlighting around the MUGA (immediately to the east) has been taken into consideration in concluding that no objections are raised in principle to the means of illuminating the Padel Tennis courts.

### **Public Consultation Response**

Two representations received objecting to the application for the following summarised reasons:

- Light pollution from the floodlighting would lead to sleep deprivation for people who have to leave early in the morning to go to work
- Noise from the facility would be unacceptable. Residents are already inconvenienced by noise arising from existing sports uses at the site
- Alternative locations should be considered

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th February 2026

---

### Background

The application site and the wider sports facilities provided within this area of open space is owned by Redditch Borough Council. The land is currently operated by Redditch Cricket Hockey and Rugby Club who benefit from a long-term lease to operate given by Redditch Borough Council. In applying for planning permission, the applicant, 'All Things Padel Limited' have served notice on the owner of the site (the Council), as confirmed to your officers by the RBC Property Services team.

Discussions between RBC Property Services and your officers have confirmed that no 'pre-application discussions' have taken place between the applicant and the Council prior to the submission of the application. Notwithstanding this, and reservations received via the Council's Leisure Services Team (summarised earlier in this report), Members are tasked with determining the acceptability or not of this application in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise as set out under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

As an application submitted on land within the ownership of the Council, such applications are required to be determined by the Planning Committee and fall outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

### Assessment of Proposal

#### Principle of development

The site is designated as Primarily Open Space in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4. As such, Policy 13 would apply.

Policy 13 comments that: *"Open space will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced to improve quality, value, multifunctionality and accessibility. In order to maintain the levels of open space provision in the Borough, proposals which would result in the total or partial loss of Primarily Open Space will not normally be granted planning permission unless it can be demonstrated that the need for development outweighs the value of the land as an open area."*

In this case, the proposal retains the existing Class F2(c) (Local Community: Place for outdoor sport or recreation) use on the site through providing further facilities for outdoor sport and recreation. As such, your officers have not identified any conflicts with Policy 13. It should be noted that Sport England have been consulted and raise no objections to the application.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th February 2026

---

Policy 43 (A): Leisure, tourism and culture, comments under 43.2 that Leisure, tourism and culture proposals, including new build, extensions or additions to existing facilities will be promoted and supported where:

- i. the proposal is located in places that are sustainable and accessible by a choice of transport modes, principally Redditch Town Centre and/or where additional visitor numbers can be accommodated without detriment to the local economy and environment; and*
- ii. they support sustainable tourism or leisure developments and benefit the economy of the Borough and enhance community facilities.*

Worcestershire County Highways have raised no objection to the application and your officers consider that the application would generally accord with Policy 43 of the Local Plan.

### Impact upon residential amenity

Paragraph 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) states that:

*Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:*

- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life;*
- b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and*
- c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation*

Paragraph 6.3.14 of the Council High Quality Design SPD reflects the above, commenting that the effects of noise and lighting on nearby dwellings should be taken into account in detailed site and design planning.

### **Noise**

Paragraph 4.2.53 of the SPD states that ‘*disturbance caused by noise may potentially be an issue where neighbouring uses and associated patterns of activity are dissimilar*’.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th February 2026

---

WRS have carefully assessed the proposals with respect to potential noise disturbance to the nearest sensitive receptors (those residential occupiers in closest proximity to the site). Given the proximity of the proposed three padel courts to nearby residential dwellings, WRS consider that noise from ball impacts, and potentially raised voices, would have a significant adverse impact upon occupiers of the nearest dwellings, particularly those in Willow Way. WRS have examined the noise report submitted by Peninsular Acoustics on behalf of the applicant. Notwithstanding its findings, Regulatory Services experience of dealing with similar proposals elsewhere within Worcestershire have led them to consider that there is no scope for practical noise mitigation measures in this case that would make the proposal acceptable. As such, WRS do not support the application in terms of noise impacts.

Whilst it is appreciated that some noise disturbance arises from the use of the clubs car parking area immediately to the south, and in particular from the Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) which was in operation at the time of your officers visit to the site, the relative tranquillity of the site's surroundings could at the same time be appreciated.

The sounds attributed to the games being played within the MUGA in relation to the ambient noise of the area were noted.

It is not in question that the Club is a well-established, local asset, with a presumption of some level of noise emanating. It is also however generally understood that the game of padel on purpose-built courts can create significantly more noise than tennis and potentially other sports played at the Club.

Discussions with WRS suggest that the ball bouncing off the (padel) bat has a very specific, acute sound which is clearly audible over other background noise and clearly WRS do not support the application in terms of noise impacts.

Your Officers have concluded that noise impacts arising from such a use in this location would be unacceptable in terms of their impact on existing residential amenities.

### **Lighting**

It is also important to ensure that impacts arising from light pollution do not materially harm the residential amenities currently enjoyed by occupiers of nearby dwellings.

The Borough Councils adopted High Quality Design SPD under 4.2.55 states that:

*'the type of lighting selected should be relevant to the local context, character and use of the area and minimise the impact of light pollution as well as being as energy efficient as possible'*

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL****PLANNING  
COMMITTEE****19th February 2026**

---

Whilst the proposed lighting columns would be 6m tall, levels of illumination together with means of any cowling / light shields could be agreed via condition between the Council and WRS to ensure that nearby residential amenities are not adversely affected. No objections are raised in principle to the means of illuminating the Padel Tennis courts.

**Other matters**

No highway safety implications or specific drainage concerns have been identified which could not be overcome via conditions to be attached to any consent.

No objections are raised to the proposed containers, your officers appreciating the need for an on-site office, nearby changing facilities and toilets where none exist in close proximity to the proposed padel facility.

**Conclusion**

Notwithstanding your officers findings with respect to the principle of the development, highway safety, drainage matters and lighting; considering your officers observations during site visits and based on the application submission, it has not been satisfactorily shown that the proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with regard to disturbance from noise. The application cannot therefore be supported.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:**

**Reason for Refusal**

- 1) Noise impacts arising from the proposed operation of the development, having regard to its closeness to existing residential uses are likely to cause disturbance and detriment to the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residents. The proposals would be contrary to the advice contained within Paragraph 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024, Policy 1 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (January 2017) and the provisions of the Councils High Quality Design SPD, adopted June 2019

**Procedural matters**

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the application site falls within the ownership of Redditch Borough Council. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.