

**REPORT TO:** Development Management Committee

**DATE:** 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023

**REPORTING OFFICER:** Executive Director – Environment & Regeneration

**SUBJECT:** Planning Applications to be Determined by the Committee – AB Update List

**WARD(S):** Boroughwide

<b>PAGE NO.</b>	<b>LIST A*</b>	<b>LIST B**</b>	<b>Updated Information</b>
<b>10</b>	21/00679/FUL		<p>The table on page 10 should read that two representations have been received.</p> <p>Natural England have confirmed a position of no objection.</p>
<b>20</b>		22/00462/FUL	<p>The report should read that seven representations have been received.</p> <p>As part of the report members will have noted that discussions with LLFA was on going. The LLFA have now confirmed that they agree with the principals of the FRA and discussed drainage strategy, however the LLFA would require modelling of the watercourse prior to commencement of development on this site to ensure FFL are set at the correct height of the proposed properties closest to the watercourse will not be at risk of flooding and an updated drainage strategy be submitted prior to commencement based on the principals discussed to ensure flood risk and drainage is managed appropriately on site. Therefore, it is recommended that the above conditions are added to the recommendation. The delegation is therefore not now required in relation to the outstanding flood risk issue only in</p>

			relation to the HSE call in procedure.
39		22/00543/OUTEIA	<p>A further letter of representation has been received querying whether access has already been agreed, to be decided later and if so, who will make that decision? These matters are addressed through the report.</p> <p>Page 87 stated that in relation to primary school places, the ES concluded that there was likely to be a minor adverse impact and that mitigation in the form of a contribution towards primary school places was suggested. The applicant has since provided the below clarification on this point:</p> <p><i>Chapter 11, Socio-Economics and Chapter 16, Residual Effects and Conclusions from the October 2022 ES have been reviewed by the Buro Happold ES coordination and socio-economics technical leads.</i></p> <p><i>An error in Table 11-24 'Summary of operational supplementary mitigation measures for Application A' has been identified: the table mistakenly lists a minor adverse effect on provision of primary school places, requiring a s106 contribution as mitigation. However, as demonstrated by the baseline discussion in Table 11-21 'Estimated School Places Yield from the proposed development', and assessment made in Table 11-28 'Summary of all effects if only Application A is approved', the significance of effect is in fact negligible, and does not require mitigation. This is on the basis that the demand for primary school places generated by Application A alone (calculated to be 34 places) can be accommodated for in the baseline surplus (79 places).</i></p> <p><i>This error was carried forward into</i></p>

			<p><i>Chapter 16, Table 16-2 'Summary of supplementary mitigation measures required to reduce operational effects' (for Application A only), which repeats the mistaken reference to a minor adverse effect upon provision of primary school places, requiring S106 contribution. In conclusion, to confirm, the applicant's assessment does not identify any adverse impacts requiring mitigation arising from the Sandymoor South Phase 2 outline application with regard to primary school places.</i></p> <p>Condition Heading 17 on page 99 - Submission and Implementation of a scheme detailing Bridleway provision to be updated to the following:</p> <p>Submission and Implementation of a scheme detailing bridleway provision, including crossing points, to connect with, and complete, existing infrastructure provision as per the Sandymoor SPD.</p>
<p><b>400</b></p>		<p>23/00128/FUL &amp; 23/00129/LBC</p>	<p><b>Additional correspondence to application 23/00128/FUL:</b></p> <p>A request to speak has been received that sets out the following points of objection;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Objection to the relocation of Palacefields Community Centre and the demolition of Bethesda Church with replacement of joint function building.</li> <li>-Reduction in space would not accommodate existing community groups.</li> <li>-People will have reservations entering a church within a mixed use building.</li> <li>-Reduction in outdoor space for the Church.</li> </ul>

-Bethesda Church will be demolished prior to the new church building being built.

**Corrections in relation to both applications**

Pages 406/407 Correction: from 'Historic England discussions ongoing' to 'Historic England no objection'.

Page 414 Correction: Report states that the proposed development will deliver 63 No. extra care units. The scheme will deliver 65 No. units comprised of 63 No. extra care apartments and 2 No. extra care bungalows. This is as stated in the description of development at page 400.

**Changes to recommendations for each application separately as follows:**

**23/00129/LBC**

Authority be delegated to the Operational Director: Policy, Planning and Transportation, in consultation with Chair or Vice Chair, to determine subject to:

-Referral to Secretary of State in relation heritage objection

-Conditions considered necessary to ensure policy compliance. Note, the list of conditions set out in the committee report are indicative of the conditions that would be added to a listed building consent should the application be approved.

**23/00128/FUL**

Authority be delegated to the Operational Director: Policy, Planning and Transportation, in consultation with Chair or Vice Chair, to determine subject to:

			<p>-Suitable mechanism to secure compliance with DALP Policy RD4.</p> <p>-Conditions considered necessary to ensure policy compliance. Note, the list of conditions set out in the committee report are indicative of the conditions that would be added to a planning permission should the application be approved.</p> <p><b>Additional conditions to 23/00128/FUL</b></p> <p>Prevention of the existing Church demolition until such time that the new Church is developed and ready for use.</p> <p>Securing the use of the replacement church for the purposes of a church, community centre and café and for no other purpose.</p>
--	--	--	---

\* **LIST A items** are those items that are not considered to raise significant issues that require further explanation. Members have a full report and these items are not anticipated to initiate further discussion. List A items are considered at the start of the meeting unless a Member specifically requests that an item be moved to List B.

\*\* **LIST B items** are those items which are considered to raise more potentially significant issues, that may warrant further update, explanation, discussion or other announcement. List B items may also have speakers registered who wish to address the committee.

**Note:- Background Papers**

With respect to all applications to be determined by the Committee, the submitted planning applications are background papers to the report. Other background papers specifically mentioned and listed within the report are open to inspection by contacting [Dev.control@halton.gov.uk](mailto:Dev.control@halton.gov.uk) in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.