

Public Document Pack



Development Management Committee *Supplementary Information*

**Tuesday, 2 December 2025 6.30 p.m.
Civic Suite, Town Hall, Runcorn**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Leck', is centered on the page.

Interim Chief Executive

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Rosie Leck (Chair)
Councillor Sharon Thornton (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Stan Hill
Councillor Colin Hughes
Councillor Paul Nolan
Councillor Ged Philbin
Councillor Carol Plumpton Walsh
Councillor Rob Polhill
Councillor Christopher Rowe
Councillor Dave Thompson
Councillor Bill Woolfall

***Please contact Isabelle Moorhouse on 01515113979 or
isabelle.moorhouse@halton.gov.uk for further information.
The next meeting of the Committee is on Wednesday, 14 January 2026***

**ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH
IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Part I

Item No.	Page No.
5. AB UPDATE LIST	1 - 10

In accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act the Council is required to notify those attending meetings of the fire evacuation procedures. A copy has previously been circulated to Members and instructions are located in all rooms within the Civic block.

REPORT TO: Development Management Committee

DATE: 2nd December 2025

REPORTING OFFICER: Executive Director – Environment & Regeneration

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

WARD(S): Boroughwide

PAGE NO.	LIST A*	LIST B**	Updated Information
7		25/00107/OUT	Two further objections have been received since the Agenda was published and are attached.
33		25/00262/FUL	See Attached Comments from Environmental Health. Oral update to be provided.

* 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 in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Date 20/11/25

Planning Department
Halton Council

Re: Objection to Planning Application 25/00107/OUT per your mail listed below.

Site : Hill Top Farm for 94 Dwellings.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the above planning application for the construction of 94 new houses at Hill Farm Preston on the Hill.

1. Impact on Traffic, Road Safety & Parking

The proposed development will significantly increase traffic in the area, which is already congested.

Concerns include:

- Insufficient parking provision
- Increased risk to pedestrians and children
- Narrow roads unsuitable for additional traffic
- Lack of safe access/egress for vehicle
- Knock on effect to the A56 Chester Rd which is far too congestive especially with HGV traffic.

This raises serious road safety concerns.

2. Overdevelopment of the Site

The scale and density of the proposal represent overdevelopment, which is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

The houses will:

- Appear out of scale
- Reduce open space
- Harm the semi-rural/rural/suburban character (choose one)

3. Harm to Residential Amenity

The development will negatively affect neighbouring residents through:

- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Overlooking
- Noise and disruption
- Construction impacts

This is contrary to typical Local Plan policies protecting residential amenity.

4. Environmental and Wildlife Concerns

The site may contain important wildlife, including [e.g., bats, birds, hedgehogs], and the proposed development risks habitat loss.

The application does not demonstrate adequate ecological surveys or mitigation.

5. Lack of Local Infrastructure Capacity

Local services are already under pressure. The development will increase pressure on:

- . Schools
 - GP surgeries
 - Public transport
 - Drainage and sewer systems
 - Local parks and community facilities

No adequate mitigation has been proposed.

6. Flooding and Drainage Issues

If the area is prone to flooding or surface water issues:

The development poses a risk of increased flooding due to loss of permeable ground, inadequate drainage proposals, and known existing issues in the area.

7. Inadequate Consultation / Policy Conflict

The proposal conflicts with key sections of the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, including those relating to sustainable development, character, and amenity.

Additionally, consultation with residents has to be held via the Parish Council and Preston Brook residents.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I request that planning permission be refused. The proposal would result in significant harm to the local area, residents, and environment, and fails to comply with local and national planning policies.

Yours faithfully,

Date 25 November 2025

Planning Department

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to formally object to the proposal that would allow surface water to be discharged into Kickwick brook at Preston brook CGJ2/49 and for the planning Application from HBC for the Morris Homes developments at Preston Brook

Albeit HBC have conducted a survey on the Wharf properties for drainage plus an additional topographical survey of the brook to be completed Date yet to be confirmed.

1. Environmental Impact & Water Quality Concerns

Allowing untreated or insufficiently treated surface water to enter the stream poses a significant risk of pollution. Runoff commonly contains oils, chemicals, sediments, and contaminants from roads and hard surfaces. These can harm aquatic ecosystems, reduce biodiversity, and degrade water quality for downstream users.

2. Increased Flood Risk

The stream already experiences [state current conditions, if applicable—e.g., high winter levels, recent flooding, erosion issues]. Adding new surface water volumes could increase peak flows, raise flood risk for nearby properties, and exacerbate bank erosion causing land slides. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should limit discharge to pre-development rates, not introduce new burdens on the watercourse.

3. Non-Compliance with Sustainable Drainage Principles

Modern planning policy emphasises onsite water attenuation, infiltration, and sustainable drainage. Direct discharge into natural watercourses should be a last resort, not a first option. The application appears to lack [state what's missing: infiltration tests, SuDS hierarchy assessment, capacity analysis, ecological survey, etc. The logical and cost reduction would be to discharge into the main sewer system, with cost down to the developer.

4. Ecological and Habitat Protection

The stream supports local wildlife, including Insects, birds rodents, fish, foxes, badgers, Increased runoff, siltation, and fluctuating water levels can destroy habitats, disrupt spawning areas, and reduce overall ecological health.

5. Alternatives Not Fully Considered

The applicant has not demonstrated that alternatives such as main sewer, soaksaways, swales, rain gardens, or controlled discharge rates have been fully explored. These methods not only reduce environmental impact but align with national and local drainage policies.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the council refuse permission for the proposed surface water discharge unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate:

- robust SuDS measures
- no increase in flood risk
- no ecological harm
- full compliance with planning policy and regulations.
- Also full assurances from HBC that they will cover the cost of any damage coursed by the following.
- Flooding to gardens and properties, subsidence into the brook from the banks into the Stream that causes any blockage to the brook.
- Three options were proposed for the Developer to review and choose an option, 1- Drain water into the canal however Peel Holdings rejected that option. 2- The Brook which is still under HBC investigation plus our objection, 3- The main sewer system for which is still the easiest option but been avoided by the developer for which no explanation as been given..
- Out of the above three options 2 and 3 are still available, with option 3 being the best option but more expensive than the other.
- Network rail and the Environment Agency have booth confirmed they have not approved for the water discharge of any surplus water into the brook.

The objection has full agreement from all the residents on the Wharf.

Thank you for considering my objection. I would appreciate confirmation that this letter/mail has been added to the planning file

Yours faithfully,



MEMORANDUM

To

Date 21/11/2025

Dept. Planning

Ref 25/00262/FUL

From Environmental Protection

Planning Consultation Response

Proposed demolition of existing workshop, lean to shed and picking line enclosure, and the erection of 2 no buildings to provide for the storage, sorting and processing of waste materials together with a new welfare block, weighbridge office and ancillary infrastructure including water tanks, weighbridges, revised vehicle parking, drainage improvements and odour control plant & equipment and stack at Widnes Skip And Reclaim Ditton Road Widnes Cheshire WA8 0PA

Comments

In order to understand WSRs current proposal and the possible implications for the borough in relation to offsite emissions, particularly in relation to odour, a site visit was undertaken on 23rd October 2025. Members of the Council's Environmental Protection and Regeneration departments met with management representatives from Beauparc who operate WSR Widnes.

Currently WSR Widnes receives residual (black bin) waste from both Halton and Warrington Councils, with refuse vehicles entering the facility directly to deposit the waste that has been collected from the kerbside that day. In addition to this the facility does receive waste from other smaller clients. The Majority of this waste is then shredded and taken by road to the Viridor Energy from Waste plant in Runcorn and other facilities as required. It was also noted that this facility also accepts some clinical waste.

WSR Widnes operates under an Environmental Permit Issued by the Environment Agency, reference SP3594CM. This permit currently allows WSR to receive and process up to 450'000 tons of waste per annum. There are no plans to increase the amount of waste the site handles as a result of the current application.

It is a key requirement of the permit that waste is not stored on site for longer than 72 hours. However, given that residual waste can be up to 14 days old when it is collected during kerbside collections, there is potential for waste to already be odorous as it is initially received on site.

MEMORANDUM

From March 2026 all Local Authorities are required to have introduced a dedicated food waste collection service for residents. This will have the effect of altering the composition of the waste received at the WSR site, as food waste is putrescible and odorous, whereas many other typical components of residual household waste are not. To what extent this change is borne out however will very much depend on the level of public participation in the food waste collection service offered by their respective councils. Given this upcoming change, WSR wish to upgrade their site and in particular their ability to process and store waste in an indoor and controlled environment.

Odour Control Abatement System

Of particular note is that the plans include the provision of an odour control abatement system, of which the core components is a 20m tall stack and filtration system, enabling the air from inside the material recovery facility to be changed in a controlled manner, so as to prevent odours being emitted from site.

However within both the planning statement and the Odour Project Technical note supplied in support of the application, it is stated that this aspect of the development would only be implemented if it were deemed necessary, though it is not detailed how the decision to implement this system would be made, or who would be involved in these decisions. It is important to highlight that as this site is regulated by the Environment Agency and not Halton Borough Council it would be unlikely that the council would be involved in this decision.

In order to understand how significant an issue odour from WSR presents to the borough, a Freedom of Information request was made to the Environment Agency for numbers of complaints received from 2015 to date. In total 216 complaints were received, which are broken down as follows.

Year	Odour Complaints	Other Complaints
2015	4	2
2016	2	0
2017	6	1
2018	8	3
2019	64	2
2020	30	0
2021	39	0
2022	36	0
2023	3	1
2024	13	1
2025	0	1

MEMORANDUM

It can be seen that complaints about odours were by far the most commonly reported issue to The Environment Agency. Complaints about other matters were issues such as litter noted offsite.

Whilst no complaints have been made to the Environment Agency so far this year in relation to odours, the council is aware of comments & discussions on social media by residents in relation to this issue.

Given the high levels of complaints in relation to odour, it is well justified to request that the odour control abatement system be constructed and be fully implemented prior to commencement of the operation of any of the newly proposed facilities.

Offsite emissions management

Currently the main method of controlling emissions from the WSR site, which is principally odours, is by means of a demisting system. This is a two-stage system. Inside the existing main waste reception building, there is an odour neutralising system which acts to contain odours within the building itself, whereas externally an odouriser system acts to mask any odours which are notable outside of the building.

The Emissions Management Plan submitted in support of the application, reference 243287, dated April 2025 & produced by AA Environmental Limited discusses general on-site arrangements for the control of odours and other potential emissions such as dust. Section 6.2 of this document details the actions to be taken in the event of off-site emissions being noted and section 6.3 discusses how 'These systems will be implemented in agreement with the Local Authority and the Environment Agency'. Contact has been made with Beauparc to clarify if these actions will be implemented on request of the Council, rather than just the Environment Agency.

However, the proposed Odour Control Abatement System is not mentioned within the Emissions Management Plan. As discussed, as there is a need for this system to be implemented on site, this plan will need to be amended to include the use of this system.

The Emissions Management Plan is further supplemented by an Odour Project Technical Note. This document explains that the proposed new waste transfer building 'MRF 2' will be built with the following features in order to control the release of odours;

- An airtight building able to be operated under negative pressure;
- rapid opening and shutting doors;
- use of odour neutralisers over doors; and

- no accesses on the downwind eastern façade preventing escape of fugitive odours

Once this proposed building is complete, residual waste operations will transfer to this new building to allow the current building 'MRF1' to be upgraded to include the enhanced odour control features as discussed above.

These features will need to be fully implemented on site.

The applicant has not submitted a construction phase dust management plan with their application, and so one will be required.

Noise

It is typical that any planning application which proposes new plant or equipment would include a BS4142 noise impacts assessment that assesses the likely impact of this new plant on any nearby noise sensitive areas. No such assessment has been submitted in support of this application however. Whilst it is appreciated that existing or similar machinery will be in use in the new buildings than there is in the current, we cannot simply assume that this will be the case. Therefore prior to the commencement of the operational phase, a noise impacts assessment will be required.

It would also be necessary to appropriately control the hours of construction during the redevelopment of the site.

Conclusion

Environmental Health has no objection to the application, subject to the following conditions being applied, in accordance with Policy HE7 of the Halton Delivery and Allocations Plan, paragraph 187e of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and in the interests of residential amenity;

- Prior to first use, the proposed Odour Control Abatement System as described in section 1.1.7 of the Planning Statement shall be fully installed and implemented on site.
- Prior to first use, a revised Emissions Management plan, incorporating the use of the Odour Control Abatement System shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
- The odour mitigation features of MRF1 and MRF2 as described in section 1.7 of Odour Project Technical Note reference 243287, dated April 2025 & produced by AA Environmental Limited shall be implemented in full.

- All construction activity should be restricted to the following hours;

Monday – Friday	07:30 to 19:00 hrs
Saturday	07:30 to 13:00 hrs
Sundays and Public Holidays	Nil
- Prior to the commencement of the construction and demolition phase, the applicant shall produce a Dust Management Plan, adhering to the principles set out in 'Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction' published by the Institute of Air Quality Management.
- Prior to first use, a satisfactory BS4142 noise impacts assessment shall be submitted to the local planning authority.

Phillip Wilson
Environmental Health Officer