

**Redditch Borough Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
11th December 2025**

25/00875/FUL Former Police Station, Grove Street

Page 32 and 33 of the Agenda under the heading 'Appearance and sustainability of design' refers to the applicant seeking a NABERS accreditation (5 star rating). Your officers have been informed that due to budgetary constraints, NABERS accreditation is no longer being sought. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development is considered to demonstrate compliance with BORLP4 Policy 15 Climate Change.

In addition to the Photo-voltaic (PV) solar panels to the roof area, air source heat pumps are proposed as an energy efficient and sustainable method of heating the building reducing carbon footprint compared to more traditional heating methods.

25/01228/PIP Land Adjacent, 3 Popes Lane

On further consideration, Policy 14 (Protection of Incidental Open Space) is considered to apply to this application.

Policy 14 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 states that incidental open space, irrespective of land ownership or accessibility, can make an important contribution to the Green Infrastructure Network in the Borough.

Whilst the policy acknowledges that it may be necessary to develop some areas of incidental open space, it states that development should be resisted unless the following criteria are met:

- i. the need for the development is considered to outweigh the need to protect the incidental open space;
- ii. it can be demonstrated that the site does not make an important contribution to the Green Infrastructure Network and has no particular local amenity or wildlife conservation value;
- iii. the site does not have a strategic function separating clearly defined developed areas or acting as a buffer between different land uses;
- iv. it can be demonstrated that there is alternative provision of equivalent or greater community benefit provided in the area at an appropriate and accessible locality; and
- v. the incidental open space does not play an important role in the character of the area.

The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. The site is not designated as a Local Wildlife Site and at Technical Details Consent can demonstrate how a net gain in biodiversity would be achieved. The site is not considered to have a strategic function in respect of criteria iii. There is alternative incidental open space within the local area and accessible by public rights of way. The loss of 0.3ha of incidental open space on this site, is not considered to play an important role in the wider area. Overall, the proposal is considered to meet with the objectives of Policy 14.

Consultations

Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team

No mineral safeguarding objections.

Worcestershire Highways – Redditch

A request was made by the Planning Officer for County Highways to visit site, this was carried out on Thursday, 4 December 2025, 08:25am onwards.

Additional Worcestershire Highways Comments:

My observations were that during the drop off period parents were parking on the left-hand side of Popes Lane which left the footway clear for pedestrians. Popes Lane is a publicly maintainable highway which has a Public Right of Way running along it. Parents were also observed parking along Church Rd and Castle St during this drop-off time. It is agreed there was congestion along Church Rd during this period this is expected during the drop-off and pick-up periods. I also conducted a site visit during the off-peak period which confirmed no vehicles were parked on Popes Lane and there were no congestion issues in the vicinity.

Having observed the am drop-off period highways are still of the opinion this PIP application is deemed to be acceptable for the erection of up to six dwellings. It was highlighted within the highway recommendation that any approval would be subject to the submission of a Technical Details Consent (TDC), which must comply with the Streetscape Design Guide and be acceptable by the Highways Authority.

Construction-related traffic is expected to be temporary in nature, as is typical with any development. Highways would require all construction and delivery vehicles to avoid peak school / traffic am & pm peaks times. To mitigate disruption to local residents, a Construction Management Plan will be requested to ensure safe vehicular access to the proposed development which would include but not be limited to the following will be required to be complied with in full during the construction period :-

Tracking of the largest vehicle to access the site.

Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on The public highway;

Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives' facilities as required;

The hours that delivery vehicles will be permitted to arrive and depart, and arrangements or unloading and manoeuvring;

Traffic management measures (if required) for construction vehicles on Popes Lane to include temporary signage and the use of a banksman to oversee all vehicular manoeuvres, avoiding peak pedestrian times such as the beginning and end of the school day.

Measures to demonstrate that those immediately affected by the construction works will be kept informed and due consideration and courtesy will be shown to the local community.

Officer Response

Worcestershire Highways are noted, and this PIP application cannot resolve the existing congestion on Church Road during school drop off/pick up. In principle, the location of the application site remains acceptable and the effects of the development, such as traffic generation would be considered at Technical Details Consent, however, a development of up to 6 dwellings is not considered to have a residual cumulative impact on the road network, following mitigation, which would be considered severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios, as set out within paragraph 116 of the Framework.

The Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that when granting permission in principle, local

planning authorities can provide on the decision notice what they expect the detailed proposals to include at the Technical Details Consent. This information may include where further impact assessments are needed by the applicant or where a particular scheme of mitigation may be required. Applicants are encouraged to take account of this information when preparing a Technical Details Consent application.

Councillor Christopher Holz

Objection raised due to unacceptable traffic impact and the unjustified loss of designated Green Belt land:

Church Road and Astwood Lane already experience significant and sustained traffic pressures. These routes are heavily utilised and frequently become congested, creating ongoing difficulties and stress for local residents. It is evident that the introduction of additional dwellings in the vicinity regardless of their primary access being from Popes Lane will contribute further to traffic volume on an already overstretched road network. Larger vehicles in particular already face challenges navigating these roads safely, and any intensification of use is likely to exacerbate these constraints to an unacceptable level.

Furthermore, the proposed development results in the loss of Green Belt land, which is contrary to both the principles and the intent of Green Belt policy. Such land serves an essential purpose in safeguarding the countryside, preventing urban sprawl, and preserving the rural character of the area. Erosion of the Green Belt in this location would have a detrimental and lasting impact on the landscape and the community.

Officer Response

This PIP application cannot resolve the existing congestion on Church Road during school drop off/pick up. In principle, the location of the application site is acceptable and the effects of the development, such as traffic generation would be considered at Technical Details Consent, however, a development of up to 6 dwellings is not considered to have a residual cumulative impact on the road network, following mitigation, which would be considered severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios, as set out within paragraph 116 of the Framework.

The Officer report sets out that the land is considered grey belt and meets with the policy tests of paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In terms of landscaping, in principle the landscape character area is a settled landscape, i.e. containing human habitation and in principle residential development could be acceptable, subject to further details submitted at Technical Details Consent, as set out within the Officer report.

Three additional objections have been received from existing objectors raising the following material planning considerations:

- The green belt boundary is being changed
- This is the incorrect process for a grey belt/application
- Compliance with 'Golden Rules'
- Confirmation that the blue line does not form part of the application
- Concerns that the photographs in the report pack are not giving a true representation of the boundary to properties on Church Road.
- Damage and maintenance concerns for Popes Lane.

Officer Response

The Green Belt boundary will not be changed by the granting of Permission in Principle. The boundaries of the Green Belt can only be changed through the Local Plan. The Council has to

process and determine planning applications as submitted. The proposal is not 'major' development and therefore does not need to comply with the 'Golden Rules' within paragraph 156 of the NPPF. The blue line does not form part of the Permission in Principle, but is other land owned by the Applicant. The photographs in the report pack are taken by the Planning Officer and are considered an accurate representation of the site and its environment, the photographs have been lightened as taken on a dull November day, to enable Members to clearly see the site. All public comments, and any documents submitted to accompany comments, are available online for Members to view, at Public Access [Simple Search](#) (Ref: 25/01228/PIP). The County Council is responsible for maintaining public rights of way to a standard suitable for public use.

Members may also have received additional representations by Mr Keith Potts, although the Planning Officer was not copied in directly to the email but had sight of a draft copy, and can confirm that the matters raised are not material or relevant to this determination of this Permission in Principle application.

To summarise, the above update does not alter the Officer's recommendations, set out within page 62 of the main report.

25/01248/FUL Windmill Community Centre , Ryegrass Lane
No Updates

25/01249/FUL Winyates Green Community Centre , 6 Furze Lane
No Updates

25/01250/FUL Batchley Community Centre, Cherry Tree Walk
No Updates