

MINUTES

Present:

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

Officers:

Helena Plant, Johathan Pavey-Smith, Paul Murphy, Steve Edden and Max Howarth (of Anthony Collins Solicitors)

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

34. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

36. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 14th August 2025 were presented to Members.

A typographical error was identified in that the minutes referenced “Sandycross Centre”, the correct name being “Sandycroft Centre”.

RESOLVED that

subject to the amendment detailed in the preamble above, the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 14th August 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.

Chair

37. UPDATE REPORTS

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

38. 25/00437/FUL - ACCESS AT MORTON STANLEY PARK, WINDMILL DRIVE, WEBHEATH, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was 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 15 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Morton Stanley Park, Windmill Drive, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought the Installation of a 24m by 15m multi-use games area (MUGA) with 2m high fencing.

The application was deferred by Members at the Planning Committee meeting on 11th September 2025, to assess the impact of the development on the protected Brown Hairstreak butterfly. Members also requested additional information on the Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) risk in the area.

Regarding the protected species, additional information was supplied on pages 11 and 12 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, which detailed that the Brown Hairstreak butterfly was found exclusively on Blackthorn scrub, the locations of which were detailed on page 12. Therefore, as the development was not near the Butterfly habitat it was deemed inappropriate to request a full survey to be undertaken by the applicant.

Officers detailed that although there was a concern regarding ASB linked to MUGA, installations there had been very few incidents reported to the police in the preceding years. Additionally, the seating had been removed from the MUGA, which had reduced ASB impact at other sites. Therefore, Officers did not consider the risk of ASB to be a major concern and on balance, had come to the conclusion that it did not outweigh the advantages that the application provided.

At the invitation of the Chair, a statement was read out by Officers on behalf of Ishrat Karimi Fini, Parks and Events service Manager, in support of the application.

After questions from Members the following was clarified by Officers.

- That no trees would be removed as part of the development, therefore, any actions such as imposing Conditions to manage trees on site would be unreasonable and would not meet the tests necessary.
- There was no CCTV at the site and that Officers had not considered the option due to the low risk of an ASB increase. Additionally, there was no existing infrastructure to accommodate its inclusion.
- No plan was in place to lock the MUGA overnight, which would not be possible considering the proposed open design.

Members then debated the application which Officers had recommended for approval.

Members questioned if there was adequate natural surveillance from the Café area as there were trees blocking line of sight. Another factor noted was the railing bar spacing, which Members stated appeared quite narrow which may limit natural surveillance unless looking straight at the facility.

The lack of facilities for young people was highlighted and that the park was a destination point rather than having passing or incidental visitors. Members noted several areas at the site which could be used by individuals intending to take part in illegal activities, these included the skating area and carpark. Therefore, Members noted that as there were currently few reports of ASB in the area, an increase solely due to the installation was unlikely. On the other hand, Members also expressed the opinion that MUGA facilities often led to an ASB increase, therefore, some believed that there was a high risk of an increase associated with the development.

Members expressed the opinion that the design was not in keeping with the types of facilities of the wider park in terms of design and materials and therefore, would stand out in the parkland environment.

Members debated the Officers recommendation, as detailed on page 24 of the Public Reports pack. The Officer Recommendation was proposed and seconded, however, on being put to a vote it was defeated.

Councillor Matt Dormer proposed an alternative recommendation to refuse the application due to the potential increase in ASB which was contrary to Policy 40 of the Local Plan. The Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor Claire Davies.

On being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

Having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be refused for the reasons as detailed in the preamble above.

There was then a short recess between 20:28 hours and 20:40 hours.

39. 25/00453/FUL - UNIT 1, GLOVER STREET, SMALLWOOD, REDDITCH, B98 7BG

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because part of the application site fell within the ownership of Redditch Borough Council. As such, the application fell outside of the scheme of Delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 17 to 38 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Unit 1, Glover Street, Smallwood, Redditch B98 7BG and sought the demolition of the existing building and the creation of 4 bungalows for supported living (Class C2 use)

Officers drew Members attention to the location of the application site as detailed on page 18 of the site plans and Presentations pack. Officers further highlighting that part of the application site was owned by Redditch Borough Council which was a carpark used by the site as part of the lease.

The building was a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) which was under a general industrial use (class B2), historically it was a wartime manufacturing facility producing compressors in WW2. Officers noted that NDHAs were afforded little protection and although it would be regrettable to lose the heritage asset, on balance, the principle of development was deemed acceptable.

Although the development was for four new dwellings, no off-street parking was proposed, which was deemed acceptable by Officers. The reason for this conclusion was that the current industrial facility was afforded a significant number of spaces compared to the proposed development, therefore, the application would see a reduction in the overall parking impact of the site.

Comments from Worcestershire County Council, Highways (County Highways) stated that based on the current Streetscape Design Guide the development would generate a demand for 10 spaces. Furthermore, as the current building use was for employment (B2 industrial use Class), there was a generated a parking demand of 28 spaces, 11 of which were accommodated by the car park attached to the current lease, and 17 spaces on-street. When comparing the 17 on-street parking spaces with the proposed demand of 10 cars, the development would cause a net gain of on-street parking in the area. Therefore, it was deemed acceptable by County Highways not to require the provision of off-street parking as part of the application.

The current and proposed site plans were detailed to Members. The design of the development maintained similar elevations to the existing building and sought to replicate some of the current features such as the high ridges, in an attempt to replicate the character of the original building.

However, Officers had concerns regarding the materials and construction of the proposed development, which was not in line with the surrounding dwellings, having a disproportionately high ratio of brick to render. Additionally, the proposed development had a gap between the buildings for a courtyard, this changed the Streetview and in the Officers opinion was not in preserving the character of the wider area.

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) commented that development should be sympathetic to local character and history including the surrounding built environment. Officers understood the need for the social housing provided by the development, however, on balance It was considered that the development did not sit comfortably within the site and failed to respect local character and distinctiveness. Therefore, the Officer recommendation was for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chair, a statement was read out by Officers on behalf of Gaz Hussain, a local resident, against the application. Adeel Nasir and Nasir Ahmed, local residents, and Khurram Shah, the applicant, addressed the committee in support.

The following was clarified by Officers following questions from Members.

- That the carpark, which was used by the current development, was attached as part of the lease and did not form part of the development area. Should the application be approved, this would not be usable as part of the new development.

- The provision of EV charging points was covered under building regulations, however, as there was no proposed off-street parking as part of the development, no EV charging points would be included.
- That should Members be minded to approve the application, the C2 supported living use would be Conditioned. Should the owner wish to utilise any other Class use (or subclass under the C2 use) a planning application would need to be submitted.

Members then debated the application which Officers had recommended be refused.

Members were divided with their opinion regarding the street scene impact of the application. Although some Members agreed that the use of render and the contemporary design of the development were at odds with the local area, Members also expressed the opinion that there was a mix of both new and old buildings within the vicinity so the impact would not be significant.

Members were in support of the change of use to Class C2 and that it would be used for supported residential living which was a much-needed resource within Redditch.

Serious concern was raised regarding the lack of parking provision and that any vehicles would need to be accommodated on road, when there was already a parking problem with the location. Members were also concerned about the lack of EV charging points considering it was a new development, which was at odds the climate change agenda the council had adopted. However, Members accepted that they must consider the application before them and that as County Highways deemed it acceptable for the application to not include off-street parking provision, then building regulations would not require EV charging points.

After thorough debate, Members expressed the opinion that the development was not harmful to the local area and did not outweigh the benefits of the application, in particular the supported living provision.

Therefore, Councillor Boyd Proposed an Alternative Recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Juma Begum to approve the application for the reasons as detailed in the preamble above and to delegate the decision to the Assistant Director for Planning, Regeneration and Culture Services.

Members noted a list of standard conditions for a Planning application but also included the addition of the restricted Class use, Archaeological site investigation and Contaminated Land

Condition. However, Members were content for the final number and wording of the Conditions to be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning, Regeneration and Culture Services.

On being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning, Regeneration and Culture Services to approve the application subject to Conditions as detailed in the preamble above.

A vote was then taken to continue the meeting after 22:00 hours, as was required under the Constitution. This was proposed by Councillor Andy Fry and Seconded by Councillor William Boyd, on being put to a vote it was Carried.

40. 25/00838/FUL - 5 CLENT AVENUE, HEADLESS CROSS, REDDITCH B97 5HH

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was related to an employee 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 39 to 47 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for 5 Clent Avenue, Redditch, B97 5HH and sought a Single Storey Rear Extension & Garage Conversion.

Officers drew Members attention to the existing and proposed floor plans detailed on page 42 and 43 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers highlighted that the rear extension was not visible from the street scene with the exception of a 1.3m length to the east of the property, therefore the impact was minor.

The works to the garage were covered under permitted development, however, for transparency were included as part of the application.

Officers found the proposed development acceptable in regard to the visual amenity impact and there were no objections from neighbours for the development.

Members were aware of the area and building and supported the officer's assessment that there would be no impact on the visual amenity of the area. Therefore, on being put to the vote it was

RESOVED that

having had regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions as detailed on pages 43 and 44 of the Public Reports pack.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 10.06 pm