

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Planning Application 25/00453/FUL

**Demolition of existing building and creation of 4 bungalows for supported living
(Class C2 use)**

Unit 1, Glover Street, Smallwood, Redditch, B98 7BG

Applicant: Mr Raees Syed
Ward: Central 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 for more information.

Site Description

The site comprises a detached industrial building (1298sqm GFA) to the southern side of Glover Street with a small wedge of land to the rear of the site. It has a rectangular plan and a double gabled form, orientated with the gable end to the street. The building is constructed of brick, with stone lintels and a metal seam roof with rooflights.

The site includes a separate parcel of land, a private car park to the northern side of Glover Street which is located to the immediate east of an existing playground and Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA). This area of land is owned by the Council and is leased to the applicant on a temporary basis. Your Officers understand that the temporary lease will expire on 17th September 2026 and that under the terms of the lease the car park can only be used for the parking of vehicles used in connection with the applicant's commercial business (that which is currently operating from Unit 1 Glover Street). The car park is constructed of tarmac and is not demarked. It is currently capable of accommodating 11 vehicles.

The building is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) with its primary interest being its association with wartime manufacturing in Redditch, notably the manufacture of compressors for the military in World War II. The building is recorded on the County Historic Environment Record (HER) as ref. WSM27660.

In planning terms, the building has established general industrial (B2 Class) use. The surrounding area is residential in character.

Proposal Description

The application form originally described the proposals as:

Demolition of existing building and creation of 4 bungalows for social housing

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Clarification with respect to the proposals has been sought and a revised description of:

Demolition of existing building and creation of 4 bungalows for supported living (Class C2 use)

is now agreed. For the avoidance of any doubt the proposals are not for residential dwellinghouses (Class C3), nor would they provide dwellings for social / affordable housing purposes.

The applicant states that each bungalow would provide specialised residential care for children with learning disabilities and autism. Each bungalow would accommodate a single child with two bedrooms designated for residential care staff. A fourth room is proposed as a flexible space expected to be used as a sensory room. The proposals would provide the children with 24 hour care. The bungalows would be constructed using a material palette of primarily brick and render with smaller areas of timber (walls) under a tiled roof. Pedestrian access would be via Glover Street. Parking would be on-street.

Relevant Policies:

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy 5: Effective and Efficient use of Land

Policy 19: Sustainable travel and Accessibility

Policy 20: Transport Requirements for New Development

Policy 36: Historic Environment

Policy 37: Historic Buildings and Structures

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Others

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

Relevant Planning History

24/01019/FUL	Change of use and extensions to existing industrial building to create 23 new residential units	Withdrawn by applicant	15.10.2024
--------------	---	------------------------	------------

Historic planning applications for modest extensions and alterations to the building itself have been granted between the years 1964 to 1971 but are not directly related or relevant to this application

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Consultations

Worcestershire Archaeological Service / Historic Environment Advisor

Comments summarised as follows:

Unit 1, Glover Street is a non-designated heritage asset of industrial built historic environment interest, recorded on the County Historic Environment Record (HER ref. WSM27660). The HER record notes the following;

Heywood Compressor Factory, Glover Street, Redditch.

During WWII Heywood made compressors for aircraft. They were also involved in production for tanks and marine craft. The factory moved to Burnt Oak Lane, Redditch in 1981. In 1998 the building on Glover Street was occupied by Recoil Spring Company. Dating to the early 20th century, the building is recorded on the 4th Edition Ordnance Survey map, dated 1938.

The proposed development would result in the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset of local built historic environment interest. The loss of the non-designated heritage asset would be regrettable, and Local Authorities should actively promote the conservation and enhancement of non-designated heritage assets, where sustainable. In this case, given the date and character of the building, from an archaeological perspective, I do not feel that there would be a strong case for full objection and therefore a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the conservation significance of the heritage asset (NPPF paragraph 216).

If the application were to proceed, I would recommend that a programme of archaeological works should be secured and implemented by means of a suitably worded condition attached to any grant of planning permission. This would take the form of Historic Building Recording to Level 3 standard (as defined by Historic England in Understanding Historic Buildings; a Guide to Good Recording Practice).

RBC Conservation Officer

Comments summarised as follows:

The building (to be demolished) is of some architectural merit, with features including the round gable windows, brick detailing to the eaves and verges and brick pilasters along the side elevations. Internally, it appears to be a largely open space as would be expected in an industrial building, with some small partitions creating offices and other rooms.

In terms of its history, the building dates from the early C20, first appearing on old maps between the 1903 and 1926 editions of the OS. This part of Redditch appears to have industrialised in the early decades of the twentieth century, with the construction of numerous industrial buildings to the south of Glover and Union Street, including the application site, a cycle works, brickworks and a large battery works. The application site is the only remaining industrial building in the area from this period. The heritage statement identifies the building as having historic industrial uses, with the most notable being the manufacture of compressors for the military in World War Two.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Architecturally, external alterations have eroded some of its historic character and the frontage now contributes little to the street scene. Conservation would consider the building to be a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) of relatively low significance, with its primary interest being its association with wartime manufacturing in Redditch.

The proposal would result in harm through the total loss of a NDHA. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF (2024) states that:

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The degree of harm caused should be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. We would note that no information has been provided as to why the conversion of the building was not possible, though we appreciate the constraints of the site.

Worcestershire CC Highway Authority

Comments summarised as follows:

It has been clarified that the car park edged red to the immediate east of the MUGA (to the northern side of Glover Street) is leased to the applicant to be used in connection with the applicants existing B2 use. Under the terms of the current lease, it would not be available to serve the proposed development. As such, parking to serve the proposed (C2) use would need to be on-street.

The site is located in a residential and sustainable location, off an unclassified road. Glover Street has footways and street lighting, and no parking restrictions are in force in the vicinity. The site is located within walking distance of amenities, bus route and bus stops. Redditch Railway Station and Bus Station is located approx. 1km from the site.

Based on car parking standards set out in the WCC Streetscape Design Guide, the existing B2 use would generate sufficient parking demand for 28 car parking spaces. Under the terms of the current lease it would be possible to park 11 cars within the adjacent car park to the north of Glover Street. The proposed development (C2 use) identifies a requirement for 10 car parking spaces.

The on-street car parking demand by way of comparison would be 17 (for the existing use) compared to 10 for the proposed use. There would therefore be a reduced demand for car parking when comparing the existing use with that of the proposed use.

No objections are raised with respect to the proposals impacts upon the highway network.

In the case of planning permission being granted, conditions are recommended to cover:

*Re-instatement of existing dropped kerb

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

*Submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (to include demolition of existing building)

*Cycle parking provision (4 spaces to be provided)

North Worcestershire Water Management

Comments summarised as follows:

Whilst in principle I have no issues with the proposed development from a flood risk perspective, minimal drainage details have been provided with this application. These details can however be provided via a condition. No objections are raised subject to the imposition of a suitably worded drainage condition.

Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) – Contaminated land

No objection subject to land remediation (full tiered investigation) conditions

Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) - Air Quality

WRS Technical Services (Pollution Team) has reviewed available records and documents and have no adverse comments to make

Public Consultation Response

The application has been publicised by writing to adjacent occupiers, and by site notice.

Nine representations supporting the application have been received. Comments are summarised as follows:

- The proposals would enhance the street
- The existing factory use is not suited to a residential area
- Parking issues which arise here are due mainly to the nearby takeaway and from delivery drivers
- The use would rejuvenate the area without appearing overpowering
- The proposal represents a responsible and positive use of the land
- The long-term benefits associated with the proposed use would outweigh the disruption caused by the demolition of the existing building
- The demolition of an old deteriorating building with bungalows would uplift the aesthetics of the area

Four representations have been received in objection. Comments are summarised as follows:

- On-street parking is currently extremely limited, particularly during evenings, weekends, and holiday periods. The introduction of the bungalows without adequate off-street parking provision will place further strain on the limited space available and severely affect the quality of life for existing residents
- Increased congestion poses a serious risk to pedestrian safety especially for children and families who regularly use the children's play area located opposite

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

- Construction traffic during the development phase would contribute to congestion and raise safety risks for pedestrians and residents alike
- Some existing properties share a boundary with the application site. Damage to existing property boundaries is likely without appropriate retaining walls to support the land from subsidence
- The size of the development should be reduced to allow for on-site parking
- The existing premises have been used for many decades as a commercial property serving the area and its people with employment. The architecture and character of the building was designed to resemble that of the residential properties in the vicinity which date back to 1903. Allowing the demolition of this building would be a great loss
- The bungalows would alter the appearance, character and architectural style of this area. Smallwood as a whole, but Glover Street particularly dates back to 1903, and is surrounded by a lot of history and architecture from the Victorian era. Changing the style of the area would be detrimental to its character, appearance, identity and community pride. Allowing this development would detract from the area's identity
- Noise and pollution levels would rise considerably during the demolition and construction period to the detriment of existing residents health and well-being
- Overlooking from the bungalows into gardens and houses of existing residents is likely to result

One representation has been received neither supporting nor objecting to the application. Comments are summarised as follows:

- Concerns raised regarding access for plant / delivery vehicles and disruption for residents during the construction and demolition period

Other matters which are not material planning considerations have been raised but are not reported here as they cannot be considered in the determination of this application

Assessment of Proposal

Principle of development

As set out above, Unit 1, Glover Street is a non-designated heritage asset of industrial built historic environment interest, recorded on the County Historic Environment Record (HER). The building bares resemblance to many residential dwellings dating from the very early 20th century with its primary interest being its association with wartime manufacturing in Redditch. Whilst the building retains many original attractive architectural features, external alterations have over time eroded some of its historic character, such that the primary elevation most visible from the public realm (that facing Glover Street) now contributes little to the street scene.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Your officers agree with both the Councils Conservation Officer and the WCC Historic Environment Officer who comment that overall, as a NDHA the buildings significance is relatively low.

Clearly the proposed development would result in the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset of local built historic environment interest. Not only is this regrettable, from a planning policy perspective, Local Authorities should actively promote the conservation and enhancement of non-designated heritage assets, where sustainable to do so.

Members will note application 24/01019/FUL set out within the planning history section where your officers were asked to consider an application for the conversion and extension of the existing building for 23 new apartments. In principle, such applications (conversions) will be favoured by the planning department since they have several key advantages over demolition and re-build schemes.

These merits include but may not be limited to:

- Retention of a NDHA
- A more sustainable form of development having regard to carbon footprint calculations
- Fewer potential impacts upon neighbouring amenity having regard to both the demolition and construction period
- In this case an addition of 23 new dwellings (C3 use) to the Councils Housing Land Supply where the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS)

From a developers perspective however, any scheme must be viable in principle having regard to the feasibility of converting the building in question and the necessity for the developer to enter into a S106 agreement to agree Heads of Terms which would include likely financial contributions payable to RBC, WCC and the NHS including the provision of 30% of the units as affordable dwellings. Members will note that application 24/01019/FUL was withdrawn by the applicant in October 2024.

As stated by the Councils Conservation Officer, where NDHA are directly affected by an application, NPPF paragraph 216 comments that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the conservation significance of the heritage asset.

The degree of harm caused should be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. C2 (supported living) uses are welcomed within the Borough and can be acceptable uses within residential (Class C3) areas and therefore some public benefits would arise. The site is not 'designated' employment land where (Policy 24) would seek to resist the change of use from employment use to alternative uses.

Ultimately NDHA's are not afforded statutory protection in the same way as listed buildings are. Part 11, Class B of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

(England) Order 2015, allows buildings to be demolished under prior approval subject to compliance with parts a) to e) of the legislation. It is your officers view that none of these parts would be applicable in this particular case and therefore only the method of demolition could be controlled.

If the Council wanted to prevent 'permitted development rights' which would otherwise enable the building to be demolished, an Article 4 direction would need to be (speedily) served. The Conservation Officer has not expressed any particular desire for serving an Article 4 direction in the event of a Part 11, Class B Prior Approval application being lodged with the Council.

Returning to Paragraph 216 of the NPPF and the balanced judgement which is required having regard to the scale of any harm of loss weighed against the public benefits of the scheme, your officers have concluded that (on balance), the principle of the development is acceptable.

Highway safety and parking considerations

Based on the WCC Streetscape Design Guide, for a C2 use such as this, WCC Highways believe that the use would generate a demand for 10 car parking spaces based on the scale of the development proposed. They have considered the applicants statement that two full-time members of staff would be employed as carers for each child residing in each bungalow. This would give a car parking demand of 8 spaces (2 staff x 4 bungalows). It is also reasonable to expect that friends / family of the occupants would visit and also that health care professionals / GP's and CAMHS (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services) for example may visit the site from time to time.

Your Officers have spoken to RBC Property Services regarding the car park which falls within the application site who have re-iterated that the agreed terms of the lease allows only the parking of the Unit 1 Glover Streets' commercial vehicles and that the sum payable to the Council each year is reflective of the present commercial use of the site. They have indicated that it might be possible for any current or future owner of the Unit 1 Glover Street site to use the current car park for parking in connection with the proposed C2 use but that any such owner would need to enter into a new lease where the sum to be paid under the terms of the lease would need to reflect the land value as a C2 supporting living use. Since there can be no guarantee that any agreement could be reached on this matter it is necessary to assess whether the on-street parking demand which the proposed use would likely generate would be materially greater than that which could occur at present.

Based on car parking standards set out in the WCC Streetscape Design Guide, the existing use generates a parking demand for 28 car parking spaces. The current car park which is available to use under the current lease can accommodate 11 cars within it, meaning that 17 would need to be accommodated on-street. Comparing this to the 10 needed for the proposed use, there would therefore be a reduced demand for car parking when comparing the existing use with that of the proposed use.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Accommodating adequate space within the site for construction workers vehicles during the build phase would inevitably be challenging and likely to result in a temporary but potentially significant increase in the numbers of vehicles parked on-street. WCC Highways have not however made specific reference to this within their comments but have recommended a planning condition requiring the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan in the case of planning permission being granted.

Your officers are minded of the fact that although noise disturbance and general inconvenience to existing residents during the construction period is an inevitable consequence of granting permission for new development, such disruptions are temporary and are rarely justifiable reasons to refuse permission.

Members should note that Paragraph 116 of the NPPF comments that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

On balance, your officers have concluded that a refusal of planning permission on highway safety grounds alone would not be warranted based on the severity of impact.

Design and character considerations

Whilst disagreeing with one of the assertions raised within the representations received with respect to potential overlooking / privacy concerns arising from the use / occupation of the development, your officers do share many of the other concerns raised, particularly with reference to the design of the development.

As set out earlier in this report, your officers have, very much on balance arrived at the conclusion that the principle of demolishing the existing building would be acceptable in this instance albeit it would represent a regrettable loss.

Your officers believe that the design, appearance and layout of the bungalows is attempting to retain the 'memory' of the former building but in a very contemporary way which is not necessarily considered to be the correct approach when accepting the demolition of the existing building.

The significance of the existing building derives from its previous historic uses, its connections with WWII engineering components, the external industrial style pulley systems and the brick architectural detailing all of which would be lost once the building is demolished.

The area of Smallwood, particularly around Glover Street has a distinct identity. Houses date from the late Victorian / early Edwardian period at around the year 1900.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Dwellings are typically constructed in brick with accommodation over three storeys fronting directly onto the residential streets of Marsden Road and Glover Street.

Relative to the somewhat modest footprints of dwellings within Glover St / Marsden Road, many rear gardens are by proportion relatively long and are also narrow, typical of the general street pattern of dwellings from this period within the Smallwood area. Dwellings are generally terraced, relatively tall in height, with modest gaps if any between plots.

Your officers have communicated design and layout concerns to the applicants agent during the applications consideration suggesting that any development proposal, ideally C3 residential use should follow this consistent and established approach, that is, taller, terraced dwellings facing onto Glover Street with gardens to the rear, as per, (for example) numbers 21 and 23 Glover Street immediately to the west, amongst other dwellings in the vicinity.

This approach is considered to be consistent with one of the public representations received, which comments that the bungalows would alter the appearance, character and architectural style of this area. The objection goes on to state that changing the style of the area would be detrimental to its character, appearance, detracting from the area's identity. Your officers agree with these assertions.

Aside from the choice of single storey bungalows of modern design with what is considered to be a disproportionate use of render rather than brickwork, a large gap would be visible between the bungalows at the Glover Street elevation leading to a internal courtyard / amenity area. Such gaps are not commonplace in this area and cumulatively the design of the proposed development is considered to detract from the established historic character of this area. In arriving at this conclusion, your officers are minded of the fact that Policy 39 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan states that:

39.2 All development in the Borough should contribute positively to the local character of the area, responding to and integrating with the distinctive features of the surrounding environment, particularly if located within a historic setting.

Whilst not being a Conservation Area, the Smallwood area nevertheless has a distinctive established historic setting which new development proposals should integrate with. Policy 40 at 40.2 comments that schemes will be expected to reflect or complement their local surrounding and materials.

The NPPF at paragraph 135 comments that development should be sympathetic to local character and history including the surrounding built environment. It is considered that the development proposed does not sit comfortably within the site and fails to respect local character and distinctiveness.

Your officers do not dispute the need for supported living (C2) uses within the Borough, the important roles these play and have no doubt that the bungalows would provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th October 2025

Such a scheme could no doubt be accommodated on a similarly sized (rectangular) plot elsewhere within the Borough and your officers are aware of other relatively recently constructed supporting living developments located in mixed commercial and residential areas. Considering this application on its merits however, having regard to location, scale, appearance and layout, the proposals are not considered to be acceptable.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy 36 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan (adopted January 2017) at 36.2 refers to the conservation and enhancement of Non-Designated Heritage Assets in a manner appropriate to their significance and contribution to the historic environment. Paragraph 216 of the (more recent) NPPF, December 2024 requires a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Having carried out the appropriate balancing exercise, your officers have concluded that on two of the main issues (Principle and highway safety), also taking into consideration impact upon residential amenity, the application as submitted is acceptable. Despite your officers findings in these respects, the scheme would fail to integrate successfully with its surroundings and thus your officers are unable to support the application.

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) The proposed development by reason of scale, layout and appearance would be harmful to the special architectural and historic character of the area which is characterised by high density predominantly terraced early 20th Century residential development. The development would be at odds with its surroundings and would not reflect local distinctiveness. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (January 2017) and the provisions of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Procedural matters

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