

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Brandon Clayton, Claire Davies, Matthew Dormer, Bill Hartnett and Ian Woodall

Officers:

Helena Plant, Sharron Williams, Claire Gilbert and Amar Hussain

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

13. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Munro.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

15. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 19th June 2025 were presented to Members.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 19th June 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

16. UPDATE REPORTS

There were no update reports.

Chair

**17. 25/00442/PIP - LAND SOUTH OF CRUMPFIELDS LANE,
WEBHEATH, REDDITCH, WORCS. B97 5PW**

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee because five (or more) objections had been received and therefore, the proposal fell outside of the scheme of Delegation.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 5 to 9 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Land South of Crumpfields Lane, Webheath, Redditch, Worcs. B97 5PW and sought Permission In Principle for the erection of up to 9 dwellings.

Officers clarified to Members that before them was a Permission in Principle (PIP) application and not a Planning application. Officers further clarified that a PIP application was a route that developers could pursue to secure predominately housing led developments. This type of application was completed in two parts, the first part being the PIP and a subsequent Technical Details application and that development was not permitted until both parts were granted.

The PIP was to identify if the principle of the development was acceptable and that only the Location, Land use and Amount of development could be considered. All other factors would be considered during the Technical Details application.

The location of the development was detailed on page 5 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. The development site was situated within the green belt as defined on the Local Plan proposals map and Officers stated that the development did not fall within one of the exceptions outlined under Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in determining if development in the greenbelt was acceptable. However, for the reasons set out on pages 14 to 16 of the Public reports pack, Paragraph 155 of the NPPF (Grey Belt), was considered to apply, the development was therefore not inappropriate in the green belt, and the location of the development was deemed appropriate.

In addressing the other two areas which a PIP can consider, Officers detailed that the site location was close to transport links so would be considered a sustainable development and the proposed use and amount was keeping in line with the local area.

Officers commented that some concerns were raised regarding protected trees, drainage, cultural and conservation matters by consultees, however, those would be addressed during the

technical details assessment if the PIP was approved by Members, and were not matters to be considered during the PIP application.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Alan Smith, the applicant, addressed the committee in support of the application.

After questions from Members the following was clarified by officers

- That the number of proposed dwellings was not the triggering factor for the application being outside of the “golden rules” under Paragraph 154 of the NPPF, it was the application being under 0.5 hectares.
- Officers were not aware of any historic applications on the site being sought and/or approved.
- It was the number of objections that brought the application before Members and the Technical Details assessment would not necessarily come before Members, unless there was a trigger for it to do so.

Members then considered the application.

Members did not agree with the process of the PIP applications and felt that developers were using the process as an easy way to get their applications approved. Members also noted that whilst Redditch Borough Council could not demonstrate a 5-year housing supply, developers were open to freely bring applications forward under the new Grey Belt policy in the NPPF.

Members further noted that the application had a number of issues which needed to be addressed during the Technical Details part of the application process, however, in terms of the PIP part of the application process, they could not see a reason to refuse. Therefore, 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 subject to the informative detailed on page 19 of the Public Reports pack.

18. 25/00527/PIP - ALDERS COURT, GREEN LANE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 5GY

This application was being reported to Planning Committee because a statutory Consultee (Feckenham Parish Council) had raised an objection to the proposal. 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 11 to 14 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Alders Court, Green Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 5GY and sought Planning in Principle for the conversion of an existing building to up to two residential dwellings.

Officers clarified to Members that before them was a Permission in Principle (PIP) application and not a Planning application. A PIP application was a route that developers could pursue to secure predominately housing led developments. This type of application was completed in two parts, the first part being the PIP and a subsequent Technical Details application and that development was not permitted until both parts were approved.

The PIP was to identify if the principle of the development was acceptable and only the Location, Land use and Amount of development could be considered. All other factors would be considered at the Technical Details application.

Officers detailed the location of the development detailed on page 12 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. The development site was situated within the green belt, however, under paragraph 154 of the NPPF the conversion of existing dwellings was not seen as inappropriate development within the greenbelt. Therefore, in terms of location, the application was deemed appropriate development in the green belt.

Officers further detailed that the site location was close to transport links and thus was also considered sustainable development.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Dan Hemming, the applicant, addressed the committee in support of the application.

After questions from Members the following was clarified by officers

- That the application was not assessed under its adherence with the grey belt policy as it was considered appropriate development under paragraph 154 of the NPPF and

therefore the test of if paragraph 155 applied did not need to be considered.

- That there was no set distance within which a development should or should not be situated to be classified as automatically “affecting” the setting of a listed building, each application must be considered on its own merits.
- The land no longer held an agricultural use; therefore, the site owner would not be able to apply for the erection of another barn under the basis of an “agricultural need”.
- No public footpaths dissected the site which would be impacted by the development

Members then considered the application.

Members expressed the opinion that it was a good use for the building and that they could see no reason to object to the application and therefore, 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 subject to the informative detailed on page 28 of the Public Reports pack.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 7.42 pm

This page is intentionally left blank