



Development Control Committee

**Monday, 11 September 2006 6.30 p.m.
Council Chamber, Runcorn Town Hall**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David W R', is centered on the page.

Chief Executive

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Paul Nolan (Chairman)
Councillor Dave Thompson (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Sue Blackmore
Councillor Ron Hignett
Councillor Keith Morley
Councillor Dave Leadbetter
Councillor Shaun Osborne
Councillor Rob Polhill
Councillor Colin Rowan
Councillor Tim Sly
Councillor Ian Whittaker

*Please contact Michelle Simpson on 0151 424 2061 Ext. 1126 or
michelle.simpson@halton.gov.uk for further information.
The next meeting of the Committee is on Wednesday, 11 October 2006*

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

Part I

Item No.	Page No.
1. MINUTES	1 - 12
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any personal or personal and prejudicial interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda, no later than when that item is reached, and (subject to certain exceptions in the Code of Conduct for Members) to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on the item.	
3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COMMITTEE	13 - 46
4. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS	47 - 48

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.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

At a meeting of the Development Control Committee on Monday, 14 August 2006 at Town Hall, Runcorn

Present: Councillors Nolan (Chairman), Thompson (Vice-Chairman), Blackmore, Hignett, Morley, Leadbetter, Polhill, Rowan, Sly and Whittaker

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Osborne

Absence declared on Council business: (none)

Officer present: P. Watts, J. Tully, A. Pannell, S. Baxter and G. Ferguson

**ITEM DEALT WITH
UNDER DUTIES
EXERCISABLE BY THE BOARD**

		<i>Action</i>
EXB10	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting held on 10th July 2006 having been printed and circulated, were taken and signed as a correct record.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes be noted.</p>	
EXB11	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COMMITTEE</p> <p>The Committee considered the following applications for planning permission and, in accordance with its powers and duties, made the decisions described.</p> <p>(i) Plan No. 05/00887/FUL</p> <p>Proposed single story non-food retail unit comprising 41,000 sq. ft. floorspace; (including 10,000 sq.ft. garden centre and 11,000 sq. ft. mezzanine) plus a second single storey non-food retail unit comprising 9,203 sq. ft. floorspace, access road from Daresbury Expressway and related parking/servicing areas at The Bridge Retail Park, Okell Street, Runcorn; St. Modwen Properties PLC.</p> <p>This application was originally approved by</p>	

Committee on 18th January 2006, subject to conditions. Amendments were given further consideration at the 15th March 2006 meeting and approved. Planning permission had not yet been issued and had been pending the resolution of various highway and layout issues and their impact on the Section 35 Highways Adoption Agreement and Section 106 Agreement. A draft decision notice had been prepared and reflected the resolution of the Committee at the January and March meetings.

Since the March meeting, the applicant and end user had considered the draft decision notice and the precise wording of conditions and their impact on the operational requirements of the occupier. The applicant and occupier had requested that a number of conditions are varied. One condition related to goods to be sold and the full wording of this condition was recorded in the minutes. Other conditions, though not set out in full at the January or March meetings related to the extension of various hours and amenity issues. Any variation of the goods to be sold condition required the express permission of the Committee. The other conditions and proposed variations to the draft notice prepared by officers were brought to the attention of the Committee, given the proximity of housing to the development and local sensitivities, which were reported at the previous meetings. The conditions considered were as follows:

ARTICLE I. GOODS TO BE SOLD

The applicant had requested that this condition be varied as it would not enable the end users to retail their full product range. That range included lighting and kitchenware. The applicant considered that the issue could be addressed by including the wording “and ancillary products thereto” in the condition. Officers considered that the definition was too imprecise and would be unenforceable. The words “lighting and kitchenware” could, however, be added as the sale of these additional goods was unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of nearby town centres. The condition as amended would read as follows:

The retail units hereby permitted shall be used only for the sale of building and DIY supplies, garden centre goods, furniture, carpets and floor coverings, household textiles and wall coverings, lighting, kitchenware, electrical goods, computers and ancillary personal computer accessories and software, boating and caravanning and camping equipment, bicycles, auto parts and accessories, office furniture and office equipment (excluding stationery) and for no other

purpose (including any other purpose in Class A1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2005, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Opening Hours

The specified opening hours on the application were 0900-2000. Subsequently, the applicant had requested that the hours be amended to 0800-2200 Monday to Saturday, Sunday trading hours and standard opening hours, ie. 0800 –2200, on Bank/Public Holidays.

The proposed store trading hours would remain as follows:

0800-2000 Monday - Saturday and Bank/Public Holidays and Sunday trading hours, ie any six hours between 1000-1800.

Delivery hours.

The end user had indicated that due to operational requirements, deliveries were required on Sundays and Bank/Public holidays. Deliveries also take place at either end of the day. Given that a Bank/Public holiday was a normal trading day, it would be unduly restrictive to prevent deliveries. Sunday was however the traditional day of rest and it would be unreasonable to allow deliveries, particularly as they precede, store opening hours. Proposed delivery hours were therefore as follows:

Deliveries shall be restricted to between the hours of 0730 and 2000 hours Monday to Friday and on Bank/Public Holidays and 0730- 1800 Saturday, with no deliveries permitted on Sundays.

Delivery doors.

This condition required delivery doors to be closed at certain times to minimise nuisance from noise and to safeguard residential amenity. As this condition related to noise levels, which were dealt with by separate conditions relating to the closure of all doors at certain times and to a boundary noise level condition, it results in unnecessary duplication. See 'closure of all doors' and 'maximum boundary noise levels' below

It is recommended that the delivery doors condition be deleted as the remaining conditions referred to above will provide appropriate protection and safeguards.

Running of engines by waiting vehicles.

This condition required that there shall be no waiting of delivery vehicles or running of engines in the service yards or on the service road. Members would be aware that the service road had now been deleted (amendment at the March meeting). The applicant considered that preventing vehicles waiting in the service yards was unduly restrictive, as it would result in delivery vehicles waiting elsewhere, ie. on the access road. This could be detrimental to highway safety. The applicant/end user was, however, prepared to accept no running of engines. After further consideration, officers considered that it would be appropriate to amend the condition as follows:

There shall be no running of engines by waiting vehicles in the service yards.

Closure of all doors at specified times.

Following further discussion with the applicant/end user and clarification of operational requirements, it was considered that this condition should reflect store delivery hours Monday to Saturday and Sunday trading hours. It was recommended that the condition be worded as follows:

All doors shall be kept closed except for essential access and egress outside approved delivery hours and outside Sunday trading hours.

Restriction on fork lift truck movements.

Following further discussion with the applicant/end user and clarification of operational requirements, it was considered that fork lift truck movements should be allowed outside the building within store delivery and Sunday trading hours. This would allow for the movement of goods from deliveries as well as for the general movement of goods from the service yard into the store. It was recommended that the condition be worded as follows:

Fork lift truck movements shall be restricted to inside the buildings outside approved delivery hours and outside Sunday trading hours.

Maximum boundary noise levels.

Discussions had taken place with the applicant's noise consultant to clarify and agree noise levels, their source and location and to agree a workable condition.

Rubber seals to loading bay doors

On further consideration of operational requirements, ie. end user delivery lorries are side loading, this condition is unworkable.

It is recommended that the condition requiring rubber seals to loading doors is deleted.

Outside storage.

Due to operational requirements there was a need to store products in the main service yard. Following negotiation, officers agreed that this restriction was too onerous and that storage with height limitations and a requirement to keep an undesignated area free for vehicle turning, offers a balanced solution to meeting the operational needs of the end user, overcoming highway safety concerns and safeguarding residential amenity. It was considered that restricting the height of storage in the service yard to the height of the acoustic boundary fencing would minimise any visual impact from neighbouring dwellings. The end user had reservations about the height limit as storage racking can be up to 5m high. Officers considered that residential amenity remained a key consideration and that any storage visible over the fence at ground level would be unreasonable, given the proximity of neighbouring houses. It was recommended that the condition be worded as follows:

Sufficient space shall be made available for an articulated vehicle to turn within the main service yard at all times to enable the vehicle to leave the main service yard in forward gear. There shall be no outdoor storage of equipment, goods, plant or materials in the smaller service yard, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The maximum storage height shall be limited to the approved height of the acoustic fence on the southern boundary.

Construction work audible at the site boundary.

The purpose of this condition was to restrict construction work audible at the site boundary to specified hours. The draft condition allowed such work between 0730 and 1900 hours Monday to Friday 0730 to 1300 hours

Saturdays, with no operations on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays. The applicant/end user would like a degree of flexibility to undertake internal fitting out works outside the above hours. The fitting out phase would be over a short period of time towards the end of the construction period.

Boundary treatment.

This condition included reference to the acoustic fence. In line with the acoustic consultants recommendation, the minimum height of the acoustic fence for noise mitigation purposes was 3m. The rear gardens of residential properties would be at a slightly higher level, by up to about 1.2m above service yard and fence level. The impact of the fence would therefore be mitigated and should not therefore differ substantially to existing residential boundary wall and fence heights, which were at around about 2m high. Anything over 3m would have a visible impact when viewed from residential properties. In this context, officers consider that the maximum height of the acoustic fence should be 3m.

It is recommended that the maximum height of the acoustic fence from ground level should be set at 3m and that this is reflected in the wording of boundary treatment condition.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the conditions be varied or deleted as outlined above; and
- 2) all other conditions referred to in the minutes of the January and March meetings still remain applicable to this application.

Operational
Director–
Environment
and
Regulatory
Services

(ii) Plan No: 06/00370/FUL

Proposed erection of a 33,556 sq m distribution warehouse development (B8) and associated office space, parking, landscaping and infrastructure; Manor Park 3-Sector D, Eastgate Way, Runcorn; Gladman Developments Ltd

The Consultation process undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site. It was noted that one representation had been received to date.

The letter of objection from the Chair of Halton Natural Environment Round Table, related to the loss of

wildlife habitat and inadequate compensatory provision, suggesting use of a green roof and other environmental measures including water recycling and sustainable urban drainage systems, potential light pollution.

RESOLVED: That the application be approve subject to 19 No. conditions relating to the following:

1. Specifying amended plans (BE1)
2. Materials condition, requiring the submission and approval of the materials to be used (BE2)
3. Submission, agreement and implementation of site and finished floor levels and requiring minimum floor levels to be set at 5.8 m AOD (PR16)
4. Submission, agreement and implementation of scheme for drainage (BE1)
5. Provision of oil interceptors to vehicle parking areas (PR5)
6. Landscaping condition, requiring the submission of both hard and soft landscaping. (BE2)
7. Submission, agreement and implementation of habitat management plan (GE19)
8. Submission, agreement and implementation of bird nesting features for swifts within the building (GE19)
9. Protection of water courses and retained habitat during construction (GE19)
10. Requiring specified bunding of any fuel/chemical storage (PR5)
11. Boundary treatments to be submitted and approved in writing. (BE2)
12. Wheel cleansing facilities to be submitted and approved in writing and used during construction. (BE1)
13. Construction and delivery hours to be adhered to throughout the course of the development. (BE1)
14. Vehicle access, parking, servicing etc to be constructed prior to occupation/ commencement of use. (BE1)
15. Agreement and implementation of cycle parking provision (TP6)
16. Requiring implementation of agreed Travel Plan (TP16)
17. Restricting external lighting (BE1)
18. Restricting external storage to that shown on plan (E5)
19. Agreement of colour coating for fuel tanks (BE1)

Operational
Director–
Environment
and
Regulatory
Services

Proposed erection of 6 no B1/B2/B8 commercial units with appropriate parking, access roads and hard & soft landscaping on site adjacent to Phase 1 Heron Business Park, Tanhouse Lane, Widnes; St Modwen Developments.

The consultation process undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site. It was noted that no representations had been received to date.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the following 13 conditions listed below: -

1. Standard condition relating to timescale and duration of the permission;
2. Specifying amended plans (BE1).
3. Ground investigation study required prior to the commencement of development (PR14).
4. Wheelwash condition required for construction phase (BE1).
5. Parking conditions (2 separate conditions) to ensure parking is provided and maintained at all times. The use of the premises shall not commence until the vehicle access and parking has been laid out (TP12 & E5).
6. Landscaping condition is required to ensure comprehensive details are provided prior to the commencement of development (BE2 & E5).
7. Replacement tree planting condition (BE2).
8. Boundary treatment condition is required to ensure details are provided prior to the commencement of development (BE2 & E5).
9. Condition to show the levels details for the proposal and how it links in with the adjoining cycleway/landscape strip (BE1).
10. Visibility splay condition for access onto Brown Street to ensure that this is maintained at all times (BE1).
11. Details of the design of the bin storage (BE2 & E5).
12. Storage condition to ensure no outside storage (E5).
13. A Travel Plan is required prior to the occupation of the units.

Operational
Director–
Environment
and
Regulatory
Services

4. MATTER RELATING ADJOINING AUTHORITY CONSULTATIONS

(i) Plan No. 06/00172/ADJWST & 06/00173/ADJELC:

Adjoining Authority Consultation by Cheshire County Council for the construction and operation of an Integrated

Waste Management Facility (IWMF) and Environmental Technologies Complex (ETC), including landscape/ecological mitigation and vehicular access from Kamira Road, water access via an upgraded berth facility on the Manchester Ship Canal and rail access via an existing rail spur and construction of a proposed Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) Plant on Land Adjacent To Manchester Ship Canal Ince Cheshire on land adjacent to the Manchester Ship Canal at Ince Marshes; Peel Environmental Ince Ltd

One resident had objected on the following grounds – local area is already overdeveloped with industry, concerned about air pollution, traffic noise, road safety and health implications.

Halton Friends of the Earth have raised objections on public health grounds, transport, and have recommended a zero waste policy.

Hale Parish Council had asked that the detrimental effect on Hale was taken into consideration.

The Committee were advised that the Environmental Statement lacked detail and there was insufficient information in the report to clarify what the impact on the Borough's roads would be and whether any additional public transport services were required, as well as a number of other site specific detailed matters. As a consequence it was considered that at this stage there was no real alternative but to deposit an objection in response to the consultation.

RESOLVED: That Cheshire County Council and the DTI, be advised that Halton objects to the proposal due to the lack of information provided within the submission.

(N.B Councillor Blackmore declared a personal interest in the above item and left the room during its consideration)

(ii) Plan No. 06/00479/ADJ:

Adjoining authority consultation by Liverpool City Council to erect multi storey car park 869 spaces over 5 levels and hotel 155 bedrooms up to 11 storeys in height with covered bridge link to terminal building and creation of additional surface car parking, reconfiguration of existing parking and access roads on land at Liverpool John Lennon Airport; Liverpool City Council Plc.

The Council actively supported the work with the airports to deliver sustainable surface access, as highlighted

in the Local Transport Plan. It had also taken an active role in the Liverpool John Lennon Airport Transport Forum alongside other representatives.

The proposal was an interim step towards the long term expansion plans and it was recommended that a letter would be sent to Liverpool City Council supporting the proposal.

RESOLVED: That Halton Borough Council have no objections to the development and supports the expansion of this regionally important facility

(N.B Cllr. Thompson is the Council's representative on the Liverpool Airport Consultation Committee. Although this does not count as a personal interest (let alone a personal and prejudicial interest) in the application to avoid any suggestion of bias Cllr. Thompson took no part in the deliberation of the application.

EXB12 MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

1) Appeals have been received following the Council's refusal of the following applications:-

05/00932/FUL Retrospective application for retention of boundary fencing (to replace damaged section) at Selwyns Travel Ltd, Cavendish Farm Road, Runcorn, Cheshire, WA7 4LU

06/00180/FUL Proposed two storey side/rear extension to form bedroom, bathroom, garage and kitchen at 18 Kingsley Road, Runcorn, Cheshire, WA7 5PL

2) An appeal was lodged following the Council's refusal of the following application:-

A decision had been received as follows :-

05/00874/OUT Proposed alterations to and conversion of Nos 179 - 181 to 4 No. apartments, with new garage block, erection of 5 No. two storey mews dwellings, new double garage to No. 177 and related access improvements (design/ external

appearance and landscaping reserved)
at 177-181 Heath Road, Runcorn,
Cheshire, WA7 4XG

This appeal was allowed

3) The following applications have been withdrawn :-

06/00260/REM	Proposal for 45 No. 2.5 storey dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping at DATS Holdings, Nicolford Hall, Norlands Lane, Widnes, Cheshire
06/00343/FUL	Proposed two storey three bedroom detached dwelling at Land Adjacent To 1 Breck Road, Widnes, Cheshire, WA8 6HH
06/00347/FUL	Proposed residential development comprising 4 No. two storey detached dwellings at Land Off Eltham Walk, Weates Close, Widnes, Cheshire
06/00362/TEL	Application for prior approval of telecommunications development comprising of a 15m high Flexicell 2 (Type E) column, 3 No. antennas, 2 No. equipment cabinets and associated development at Land Off Bennetts Lane, Widnes, Cheshire
06/00381/FUL	Proposed single storey and two storey extension to rear of 74 Dorchester Park, Runcorn, Cheshire, WA7 1QB
06/00388/FUL	Proposed extension to existing car park on to previously grassed area to front of lower wing building to provide up to 50 No. spaces at Wade Deacon High School, Birchfield Road, Widnes, Cheshire, WA8 7TD

Meeting ended at 7.00 p.m

REPORT TO: Development Control Committee

DATE: 13 September 2006

REPORTING OFFICER: Operational Director – Environmental and Regulatory Services

SUBJECT: Planning Applications to be Determined by the Committee

The following applications for planning permission are submitted to the Committee for consideration with a recommendation in each case. Those applications marked * are considered to have significant employment implications.

An Amendments List, containing the categorisation of planning applications, additional information and amendments to recommendations, will be circulated to Committee Members before the meeting together with plans showing the location of each application site. Those applications now before the Committee, where the planning issues are considered clear by the Chairman, will be included in List A. Unless a Member considers that additional information is required on a particular application in List A it is **RECOMMENDED** that each of the applications be determined (whether for approval or for refusal) in accordance with the conditions or the reasons printed in the Agenda and in the Amendments List previously circulated.

The remaining applications are included in List B. Together with those applications about which Members require further information, List B applications will be considered following determination of applications remaining in List A.

PLAN NUMBER: 06/00436/FUL

APPLICANT: Redwater

PROPOSAL: Proposed erection of 10 No. courtyard houses.

ADDRESS OF SITE: Dawsons Dance Centre Lunts Heath Road, Widnes

WARD: Farnworth

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions, subject to the application not being “called in” by Secretary of State.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

The proposal was advertised as a departure by way of a site notice and in the press. The neighbouring properties along Lunts Heath Road were also consulted.

In addition, the applicants have consulted local residents adjacent to the site and Ward Councillors before the application was submitted. No comments have been received following either consultation process. The Ward Councillor has written in support of the proposal and also the views of the local community.

The Environment Agency and United Utilities have been consulted. The Council's Environmental Health Officer, Trees and Woodland Officer and Highways Engineer have also been consulted.

United Utilities and the Environment Agency have no objection to the proposal. The Council's Environmental Health Officer have no objection but require a ground investigation and remediation plan and details of surface water discharge.

SITE/LOCATION:

The site is 0.6 hectares of land which is currently used as a dance hall and other social club uses. The site is located in the Green Belt on the northern outskirts of Widnes and is bounded to the south by the Church View Pub and No.s 44- 50 Lunts Heath Road.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

95/0000366/FUL Application for a proposed rear single storey extension to provide bar cellar/ store, kitchen and shower room.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

The site is allocated as Green Belt in the Halton Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the key policies, which relate to the development, are: -

BE1 General Requirements for Development, BE2 Quality of Design, S21 Green Belt, GE1 Control of Development in the Green Belt, GE28 The Mersey Forest, PR14 Contaminated Land, TP12 Car Parking, H2 Design and Density of New Residential Development, H3 Provision of Recreational Green space.

The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance for New Residential Development is also of relevance

OBSERVATIONS AND ISSUES:

The site is currently used as a dance hall and for other social club uses. The application is for the erection of 10 No. courtyard houses which will have a maximum roof height of 8.5 metres and cover 1034 square metres of the site. The dwellings will be sited on the eastern part of the site, roughly where the existing buildings (which currently total 1019 square metres) are located. They will be formed in three blocks to form the appearance of a courtyard.

Planning Policy

The main issue in relation to the proposal, is whether considerations put forward in support of the proposed dwellings are sufficient to outweigh the policy presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In essence has very special justification been demonstrated.

The very special circumstance/ justification to be weighed against the policy presumption in this case is removal of the asbestos cement club buildings. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has submitted a full report on the existing buildings. All of the buildings are constructed of asbestos cement sheeting. In addition to the asbestos cement sheeting, roofing materials and rainwater goods, higher risk asbestos insulation boards and lagging materials are present throughout the buildings. The building is likely to deteriorate with age and will require further maintenance. The owners of the property have indicated that they have limited finances and would be unable to afford significant repair work. The applicants have submitted information indicating that the special costs associated with the safe and complete removal of the current asbestos related problems on the site would be likely to cost over £350,000. This is over and above the normal site preparation works for a straightforward housing development. If the contract were carried out separately from the subsequent house construction work there would be additional costs, which would result in a likely cost close to £450,000.

The costs of remediation of the site is unlikely to be met by appropriate Green Belt uses, such as a sports club, or riding stable etc. The income or profit from such uses are unlikely to raise the finances to purchase the premises and remediate the site.

Green Belt policy does allow for the conversion of existing buildings in the Green Belt. However, due to the asbestos content the conversion of the existing building into residential use would not be possible. The conversion to other uses such as for employment use would create an issue in relation the health and safety of employees and could create a use, which would give rise to other environmental nuisance and be unacceptable on this site.

The application site is already largely developed land and in visual terms is attached to the urban area through which it gains access. The new buildings are higher than parts of the existing buildings though none are higher than the existing main dance hall. The new buildings are proposed to be constructed of materials and in a design, which reflects much better some of the nearby

established brick built barns on the northern urban edge of Widnes. This improvement to the visual quality of the site, is in itself an important material consideration.

The proposal also includes the landscaping enhancement to an existing floodlit hard standing currently used for parking. This landscaping would again lead to the enhanced appearance of the site and help to improve the openness and visual amenity of this green belt location.

Overall, the proposed dwellings have a similar footprint to the existing buildings (1019 square metre currently, 1034 square metres proposed). The dwellings are proposed in three blocks, and have been designed to form a courtyard arrangement, which is roughly set out in the same location as the existing buildings. As such, the impact on the openness of the green belt from the built form is negligible. The visual discord of by the existing buildings is reduced by their replacement with buildings of a high quality design.

Open Space

Policy H3 Provision of Recreational Green space states that sufficient recreational green space should be provided to meet the needs of local people living there. Two formal areas of open space are intended as part of the scheme, which will also provide a useful physical and visual link to the field to the north and to the open countryside.

Highway Safety

The traffic estimates of existing highway vehicle movements indicate there will be a substantial change, from a pattern of shorter, sharply peaked movements to normal small scale residential traffic movements. The overall traffic impact will therefore be reduced.

The Council's Highways Engineer although still awaiting further information on the design of a right turning lane for vehicles from Lunts Heath Road, does not object to the proposal. A safety audit is also required to demonstrate that the junction is satisfactory.

Conclusion

Whilst new housing is in principle inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore contrary to local and national policy, the benefits of removing the existing asbestos buildings, which are in a dilapidated state and which will deteriorate more with age and cause a risk to public health, are considered to outweigh policy constraints in this case. The removal of the existing hard surfaced car parking and other structures further justifies an exception to normal policy. The use proposed is likely to remediate the site to a higher standard than would be achievable through any other less valuable alternative and as such offer a more satisfactory long term solution.

Given the overriding asbestos and public health implications of not addressing the problems with the existing building stock and the clear green belt openness benefits arising from this proposal, then approval is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to the application not being called in by the Secretary of State following its referral under green belt direction and to the following conditions:

1. Standard condition relating to timescale and duration of the permission;
2. Wheel wash condition required for construction phase (BE1).
3. Parking conditions (2 separate conditions) to ensure access and parking is provided and maintained at all times. The use of the premises shall not commence until the vehicle access and parking has been laid out (TP12).
4. Landscaping condition is required to ensure comprehensive details are provided prior to the commencement of development (BE2).
5. Boundary treatment condition is required to ensure details are provided prior to the commencement of development (BE2).
6. Drainage condition, requiring the submission and approval of drainage details (BE1)
7. Construction hours to be adhered to throughout the course of the development. (BE1)
8. Delivery hours to be adhered to throughout the course of the development. (BE1)
9. Materials condition, requiring the submission and approval of the materials to be used. (BE2)
10. Site investigation, including mitigation to be submitted and approved in writing. (PR14)
11. A condition and removing permitted developments from the property including extension, porches and roof alterations. (BE1)
12. An agreed schedule for the removal of the existing buildings act contaminated materials.

PLAN NUMBER:	06/00461/FUL
APPLICANT:	Elite Homes
PROPOSAL:	Full application for erection of 101 No. 2 ½, 3 and 3 ½ storey residential dwellings
ADDRESS OF SITE:	Cameron Industrial Services LTD, Cameron House, Hale Road, Halebank, Widnes
WARD:	Ditton

**SUMMARY
RECOMMENDATION:**

Refuse

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

The application was advertised in the local press and by a site notice displayed near to the site. The nearest affected occupiers of the adjacent and nearby residential properties and commercial land were notified by letter. United Utilities, Environment Agency, English Nature, the Health & Safety Executive, the Council's Highway Engineers and Environmental Health Officer have all been consulted.

The Health & Safety Executive and United Utilities have raised no objection to the proposal. The Environment Agency have raised no objection but have recommended conditions relating to measures to be taken to prevent pollution of the water environment.

No comments have been received from local residents at the time of the writing of this report. Any comments received will be reported orally.

SITE/LOCATION:

The site is located within the existing commercial area of Halebank, the site is currently in use by Cameron Industrial Services, with access gained from Hale Road. The site includes an area to the rear of the existing car sales site.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

The current site has a planning history relating to the existing commercial use and is not of particular relevance to this current residential application.

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND
SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:**

The Council's Draft Supplementary Planning Document for Halebank Regeneration Action Area is relevant to this application and the Supplementary Planning Guidance for New Residential Development, as are the following key policies within the adopted Unitary Development Plan; S1 Regeneration; S25 Planning Obligations; RG5 Action Area 5 Halebank; BE1 General Requirements for Development; BE2 Quality of Design; BE3 Environmental Priority Areas; PR12 Development on Lane Surrounding COMAH Sites; PR14 Contaminated Lane; PR16 Development and Flood Risk; TP16 Safe Travel for All; H3 Provision of Recreational Greenspace; H4 Design and Density of New Residential Development

OBSERVATIONS AND ISSUES:

The main issues and material planning considerations arising as a result of the proposal are: - the relationship with the Halebank Regeneration Action Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD); Highway Safety; Interface with Surrounding Commercial Areas; Design Quality; Residential Amenity; Flood Risk.

Relationship with Halebank Regeneration Action Area SPD

The overarching policy for the application site and wider Halebank area is the Halebank Regeneration Action Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This document is at an advanced stage in the adoption process and is due to be presented to Executive Board on 21st September 2006. The significance of the SPD in relation to the application site is that the site is within an area identified for new residential development. Planning permission has already been granted for part of this new residential area on the former Asda supermarket site to the south of this site.

The aim of the SPD is to achieve environmental improvements to the wider area of Halebank. One of the mechanisms to achieve this, is the aspiration to construct a HGV Relief Road, which would provide a route for commercial heavy goods vehicles away from Hale Road, which runs through the Halebank residential area. The proposed HGV Relief Road scheme is proposed to link back into the highway network near to the railway bridge. Both the road and the linkage into the highway network will involve considerable engineering works and land take along the area to the north of the application site and in the area of Harrison Street.

It is considered that the proposed access into the application site and part of the residential proposal will compromise the future aspirations of the Council to meet the objectives of the SPD in the provision of the HGV Relief Road and the comprehensive development of the designated residential area. As a result the current proposal is unacceptable.

In addition the separate access for this site will result in the division of the proposed residential area. It is an objective of the SPD to achieve comprehensive and co-ordinated regeneration of the residential area, which this current application will undermine. It is considered that this scheme's failure to provide connection to the remainder of the proposed residential designation, will result in piecemeal development of the area.

This is contrary to paragraphs 7.5.2 and 8.5 of the draft Halebank SPD. This states that proposals for housing development will be focused on the former Asda site first before other sites are brought forward for residential development to ensure the regeneration process is encouraged. Any further housing development should be appropriately placed to ensure that a consolidated and comprehensive residential area is created.

This requires that where possible access to this application site should be part of the road network of the former Asda site in order for the new residential area as proposed by the SPD is a properly integrated and comprehensive development.

Highway Safety

The Council's Highway Engineer has raised an objection in principal to the proposal in view of the requirements of the Draft Halebank Regeneration Area SPD and the HGV Relief Road as proposed within the document as the application will prejudice the achievement of the likely alignment of and junction for this road as outlined in the previous section of this report.

Further comment has been made with regard to the detail of the scheme and its linkage into the existing highway network. Several points have been made and the applicant has been requested to amend the plans to accommodate technical requirements in order to achieve the appropriate level of highway safety and policy standards of the Council. These include: - an increase in the proposed car parking for the apartments; clarification of those areas to be part of a separate Management Company; provision of appropriate visibility splays; and adequate radii. Details of amended plans will be given orally to Members.

There is also a requirement to ensure satisfactory development of the site in terms of highway safety for; a series of road safety audits to be carried out and the recommendations carried out at the developer's expense; a 20mph zone scheme to be implemented at the developers expense as appropriate; and permitted development rights for the conversion of a garage to habitable space and erection of fences up to 1m in height adjacent to the highway.

Interface with Surrounding Commercial Areas

The applicant has submitted a Noise Impact Assessment. The Council's Environmental Health Officer will provide comments on this and suggest conditions in relation to the protection of future occupiers from potential noise disturbance. These comments will be reported orally to Members.

Design Quality

The proposed layout shows a mixture of three and four bedroom houses and one and two bedroom apartments. Although the layout is dense in character, the site achieves New Residential Guidance standards in interface distances; car parking provision; and good quality of house type and boundary treatment.

The proposed garden sizes are below standard, however the layout includes the addition of conservatories for each dwellinghouse plot, which reduces the actual garden size. On balance it is accepted that the future occupiers would make a personal choice at the point of purchase as to the level of external space they would require. The Council can therefore accept the proposed small garden areas in the wider public regeneration interests.

The quality of proposed house types and apartment buildings is overall of a good standard. However the applicant has been asked to amend the elevation treatment of the apartment building 'Falkirk' in order to soften and domesticate its visual appearance particularly on the main access road frontage. Details of amended plans will be given orally to Members.

The proposed secured bin and cycle stores are of a good quality, brick and tanalised timber boards on a ridged roof in the case of the cycle stores and timber board elevation with tanalised timber boards on a ridged roof in the case of the bin stores. However the applicant has been requested to improve these materials to incorporate a tiled roof in the case of both. Details of any amended plans submitted will be given orally to Members.

Residential Amenity

The nearest residential properties affected by the proposal are those properties to the south of the site, 353 to 363 Hale Road. The layout shows the nearest residential property as the 3.5 storey apartment block at the entrance to the site, which is 18.5m from the nearest property. As this block is to the side of this property, there will be no windows directly facing the windows of those on the rear elevation, therefore providing an acceptable privacy interface, which complies with the requirements of the New Residential Guidance. The distance will also ensure that a sufficient interface is achieved in order to reduce the visual appearance of the block.

The current elevation details show a full-length door and balcony guardrail to the 'lounge/dining' room on the rear elevation of the apartment buildings nearest to the existing terraced properties on Hale Road. The applicant has been requested to amend these details to show regular windows in order to reduce the impact on privacy of the rear gardens of these terraced properties which may result as a consequence of the current scheme.

In addition in light of the likely requirement from the Environment Agency to raise land levels to minimise potential flood risk, the applicant has been requested to amend this apartment type to remove one storey from the block to account for this and reduce any adverse impact which may have resulted on the nearest existing residential properties and general character of the area. Details of any amended plans will be given orally to members.

The main elevation of the apartment buildings within the site is shown at 16.5m from the boundary of the adjacent car sales site. The Council currently has an application (Ref: 06/00571/FUL) for residential apartments on this site, the building is shown at 12m from this boundary. Even if during the course of the determination of this adjacent application, there is a requirement for the building to be relocated nearer to the boundary, the Council requirement of 21m will be able to be achieved.

The proximity of the adjacent building on application 06/00571/Ful to the dwellings shown on the proposed layout of this scheme is 15.5m. The side elevation of the apartment building has only obscure glazed windows in this

elevation and therefore meets the interface standards of the New Residential Guidance, which is a minimum of 13m. The additional 2.5m is a reasonable increase in this to account for the three-storey height of the building.

Flood Risk

The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and have been in discussion with the Environment Agency regarding this. The Council has received an objection from the Environment Agency in relation to the risk of flooding on the land, stating the failure to comply with the sequential test as set out in PPS25 and the inadequacy of the FRA submission. The Council is unable to support the proposal until such time as the Environment Agency objection has been removed. Details of any further comments from the Environment Agency will be reported orally to Members.

The Environment Agency has indicated that the likely recommendations from the FRA will be that the finished floor level be a minimum of 8.0m above Ordnance Datum, 2m higher than the existing ground level. This means that the recommended finished floor levels will be approximately the same height as the top of the white rendering on the front of Cameron's existing office. The applicant has been requested to amend the proposed apartment type to reduce the scale to 2.5 storey rather than 3.5, at the entrance of the site in order to take account of this advice and to minimise the impact on the street scene and existing neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

It is considered that on balance the proposed residential scheme is acceptable in terms of its design and layout, but for those areas, which affect the proposed area for the HGV Relief Road. However the principle of the proposal fails the test of policy RG5 and the Draft Halebank Regeneration Area SPD as it fails to meet the tests of achieving a consolidated and comprehensive residential development and would compromise the future provision of the proposed HGV Relief Road thereby undermining the objectives of improving residential environmental quality contained within the SPD.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse: The proposal is considered to be premature and piecemeal and if approved would prejudice the wider regeneration of the area and result in the shorter term, in a poor quality residential environment.

PLAN NUMBER:	06/00502/FUL
APPLICANT:	Halton Development Partnership
PROPOSAL:	Proposed district centre, consisting of 1No. single storey convenience store, 5 No. two storey retail

units, 1No. two storey public house and 1 No. three storey apartment block (comprising 12 No. two bed and 6 No. 1 bed)

ADDRESS OF SITE: Land Opposite Motherwell Close, Lanark Gardens, Widnes

WARD: Birchfield

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with Conditions

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

The application has been advertised by means of a site and press notice and the neighbouring properties have been consulted, United Utilities, Environment Agency and the Council's Environmental Health and Highways officers have been consulted. United Utilities raise no objections subject to drainage on a separate system with foul drainage connected into the foul sewer.

Twenty-nine letters of objection have been received on the following grounds:

- Inappropriate use of Falkirk Avenue as a cut through.
- No need for facilities due to other facilities being within walking and driving distance.
- Anti-social behaviour that would be caused by proposal.
- Noise impacts that would be caused by proposed uses.
- Loss of view
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Increased traffic from proposal
- Highway safety
- Loss of amenity
- Use of residential on the site
- Impacts on property values.

SITE/LOCATION:

Vacant land with Lanark Gardens to the north, vacant land to the east, local park to the south.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

An outline application (ref:04/01078/OUT) for 15 no. residential units was withdrawn. An application (ref:04/01085/FUL) for a district centre development, including a public house, nursery, two retail units and 2 no. class A3 hot food units was approved in March 2005. This permission

superseded application 04/00002/FUL which was for a district centre proposal 4 no. retail units, nursery, public house and a health centre. A further application (05/00473/FUL) was received for a proposed health centre (ground floor) with residential accommodation above (comprising 12 No. units in two bedroom apartments on the first and second floors) but was subsequently withdrawn. A current application (06/00540/OUT) has been submitted relating to outline permission for a proposed health centre.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

The site is allocated as a Proposed Local Centre where policy TC1 Retail and Leisure Allocations in the Halton Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is of relevance.

The other key policies of relevance are BE1 General Requirements for Development, BE2 Quality of Design, H2 Design and Density of New Residential Development, H3 Provision of Recreational Green space.

The Upton Rocks Local Centre Planning Brief and the Council's New Residential Guidance Note is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS AND ISSUES:

The proposal is for 5 No. retail units (including A5 and A1 uses) 1No. convenience store, a public house and a three-storey apartment block containing 18 No. apartments.

Policy

The various uses expected to be found in the proposed district centre are set out in Policy TC1 Retail and Leisure Allocations and in the Local Centre Planning Brief. TC1 allocates the site for local shops and community facilities. The Local Centre Planning Brief identifies the site for a convenience store, retail, pub/ restaurant and a health centre (See application 06/00540/OUT). Although the residential use is not explicitly identified, it is nevertheless compatible with surrounding uses and does not conflict with the requirements for the local centre. The proposed uses are, therefore, acceptable in principle.

Design and Character of the Area

The proposal includes a convenience store, which is an essential part of the local centre, providing a sustainable community use. This would reduce the need for car use in the local area. The proposed public house would ensure that the local centre maintains some vitality in the evenings.

The design of the proposed buildings is similar and complements those in the surrounding area. The external materials would be sympathetic with the adjoining residential development. Conditions would also be added to ensure

no external extraction flues and no external shutters are added. This is to ensure a good design and maintain the appearance.

The orientation of the residential block precludes any direct overlooking of existing residential properties. The properties on Falkirk Avenue are approximately 110m away and the properties on Lanark Garden, to the side of the residential block, are 23m away, which is over the Council's standards for privacy distances.

Highway Safety

The Council's Highway Engineer has assessed the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment and has noted that it states there will be an increase in traffic over that highlighted in previous permissions (of approximately 20 movements at peak times). However, the comparison shows an increase in retail floor space of 230m², 18 apartments and a substantially smaller health centre/nursery than previously shown. This gives a net decrease of 39 movements in the peak. This is compared to the worst case under the currently approved scheme.

The Council's Highway Engineer has requested conditions relating to parking and cycling areas to be laid out in accordance with the approved plans and that construction traffic shall use Queensbury Way.

Financial Contribution

The Highways Engineer has advised that a contribution towards off-site traffic management and calming measures in the surrounding areas is needed. This matter can be dealt with by way of legal or other appropriate agreement.

Summary and Conclusions

Although as can be seen from the above history and policy sections of this report, that the local centre is allocated in the adopted Halton Unitary Development Plan and indeed the Council as landowner have been marketing the site for many years, there is an element of local opposition. This opposition considers that the facility is neither needed nor in the correct location and the problems, which they believe will follow, should the centre be constructed.

The site has been carefully selected because of its position on the Queensbury Way distributor road, there are good accessibility and transport links. It is central to the 'Upton Rocks' development area and is considered as an essential component to the sustainable development of this large housing area.

The design and detail of the scheme is of a high standard and will result in not only a development which will visually add to the quality of area, but also provide for a number of essential amenities for a sustainable community.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to the following conditions listed below: -

1. Standard condition relating to timescale and duration of the permission;
2. Specifying amended plans (BE1).
3. Wheelwash condition required for construction phase (BE1).
4. Parking conditions (2 separate conditions) to ensure parking and servicing areas is provided and maintained at all times. The use of the premises shall not commence until the vehicle access and parking has been laid out (TP12 & E5).
5. Landscaping condition is required to ensure comprehensive details are provided prior to the commencement of development (BE2).
6. Boundary treatment condition is required to ensure details are provided prior to the commencement of development (BE2).
7. Details of the design of the bin storage (BE2).
8. Drainage condition, requiring the submission and approval of drainage details (BE1)
9. Construction hours to be adhered to throughout the course of the development. (BE1)
10. Delivery hours to be adhered to throughout the life of the permission. (BE1)
11. Opening hours to be adhered to throughout the life of the permission. (BE1)
12. Condition stating that there shall be no external flues on any units. (BE2)
13. Condition stating that there shall be no external shutters on any units (BE2)
14. Materials condition, requiring the submission and approval of the materials to be used. (BE2)
15. Condition requiring the entering into a legal agreement or other appropriate agreement prior to the commencement of development. (BE1)
16. Details of equipment to control the emissions of fumes shall be submitted and agreed in writing. (BE1 & PR3)
17. Condition that construction traffic is to use Queensbury Way (BE1)
18. That the A5 use is restricted to Units 1 & 5.

PLAN NUMBER:	06/00540/OUT
APPLICANT:	Halton Development Partnership
PROPOSAL:	Outline application for a two storey health centre/ children's nursery including details of layout and means of access for approval
ADDRESS OF SITE:	Land Opposite Motherwell Close, Lanark Gardens, Widnes
WARD:	Birchfield

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with Conditions

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

The application has been advertised by means of a site and press notice and the neighbouring properties have been consulted, United Utilities, Environment Agency and the Council's Environmental Health and Highways officers have been consulted. United Utilities raise no objections subject to drainage on a separate system with foul drainage connected into the foul sewer.

Nine letters of objection have been received on the following grounds:

- Inappropriate use of Falkirk Avenue as a cut through.
- No need for facilities due to other facilities being within and driving distance.
- Anti-social behaviour that would be caused by proposal.
- Increased traffic from proposal
- Highway safety
- Impacts on property values.

SITE/LOCATION:

Vacant land with Lanark Gardens to the north, vacant land to the east, local park to the south.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

An outline application (ref:04/01078/OUT) for 15 no. residential units was withdrawn. An application (ref:04/01085/FUL) for a district centre development, including a public house, nursery, two retail units and 2 no. class A3 hot food units was approved in March 2005. This permission superseded application 04/00002/FUL which was for a district centre proposal 4 no. retail units, nursery, public house and a health centre. A further application (05/00473/FUL) was received for a proposed health centre (ground floor) with residential accommodation above (comprising 12 No. units in two bedroom apartments on the first and second floors) but was subsequently withdrawn. A current application (06/00502/FUL) has been submitted relating to the local centre including public house and convenience store.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

The site is allocated as a Proposed Local Centre where policy TC1 Retail and Leisure Allocations in the Halton Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is of relevance.

The other key policies of relevance are BE1 General Requirements for Development, BE2 Quality of Design, H2 Design and Density of New Residential Development, H3 Provision of Recreational Green space.

The Upton Rocks Local Centre Planning Brief is also relevant.

OBSERVATIONS AND ISSUES:

The application is an outline application for a two storey health centre/ children's nursery.

Policy

The various uses expected to be found in the proposed district centre are set out in Policy TC1 Retail and Leisure Allocations and in the Local Centre Planning Brief. TC1 allocates the site for local shops and community facilities. The Local Centre Planning Brief identifies the site for a convenience store, retail, pub/ restaurant (See application 06/00502/FUL) and a health centre. This application has been submitted in order to reserve the site for a health centre/ nursery.

Highway Safety

The highways issues are related to application 06/00502/FUL and as such the site has been considered as a whole. The Council's Highway Engineer has assessed the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment and has noted that it states there will be an increase in traffic over that highlighted in previous permissions (of approximately 20 movements at peak times). However, the comparison shows an increase in retail floor space of 230m², 18 apartments and a substantially smaller health centre/ nursery than previously shown. This gives a net decrease of 39 movements in the peak. This is compared to the worst case under the currently approved scheme.

The Council's Highway Engineer has requested conditions relating to parking and cycling areas to be laid out in accordance with the approved plans and that construction traffic shall use Queensbury Way.

Summary and Conclusions

Although as can be seen from the above history and policy sections of this report, that the local centre is allocated in the adopted Halton Unitary Development Plan and indeed the Council as landowner have been marketing the site for many years, there is an element of local opposition. This opposition considers that the facility is neither needed nor in the correct location and the problems, which they believe will follow, should the centre be constructed.

The site has been carefully selected because of its position on the Queensbury Way distributor road, there are good accessibility and transport links. It is central to the 'Upton Rocks' development area and is considered as

an essential component to the sustainable development of this large housing area.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to the conditions listed below:

- 1.Reserved matters condition, for the submission of and approval prior to the commencement of development.
- 2.Time limit for the submission of reserved matters.
- 3.Time limit for the commencement of development.
- 4.Reserved matters to be submitted and carried out as approved.
- 5.Materials condition, requiring the submission and approval of the materials to be used. (BE2)
- 6.Drainage condition, requiring the submission and approval of drainage details. (BE1)
- 7.Landscaping condition, requiring the submission of both hard and soft landscaping. (BE2)
- 8.Boundary treatments to be submitted and approved in writing. (BE1)
- 9.Wheel cleansing facilities to be submitted and approved in writing (BE1)
- 10.Parking conditions (2 separate conditions) to ensure parking and servicing areas is provided and maintained at all times. The use of the premises shall not commence until the vehicle access and parking has been laid out (TP12).
- 11.Details of the design of the bin storage (BE2).
- 12.Construction hours to be adhered to throughout the course of the development. (BE1)
- 13.Delivery hours to be adhered to throughout the life of the permission. (BE1)
- 14.Condition that construction traffic is to use Queensbury Way (BE1)

PLAN NUMBER:	06/00542/HBCFUL
APPLICANT:	Halton Borough Council
PROPOSAL:	Proposed erection of gates adjacent to 1 Ireland Street, Widnes
ADDRESS OF SITE:	Adj. 1 Ireland Street, Widnes
WARD:	Halton View

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

All adjoining properties have been consulted and the application advertised by means of site notice. The Council's Highways and Waste Services, the

Emergency Services and United Utilities have all been consulted.

The Council's Highways Engineer has commented that it is illegal to stop up a highway without an appropriate Stopping Up Order and that new legislation exists for use in such cases. The Highways Authority therefore objects to the granting of permission for this scheme.

Any further representations will be reported orally at Committee.

SITE/LOCATION:

Alleyway adjacent to 1 Ireland Street, Widnes.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

Approval was given for the implementation of a pilot alleygating scheme by the Executive Board on 7th December 2000. Permission was granted in February 2001 (00/00771/HBC) for a small pilot scheme, which has been implemented. A number of further permissions have since been granted across the borough.

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

All entrances/ alleyways to be gated are within a Primarily Residential Area in the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Policies BE1 General Requirements for Development, and BE22 Boundary Walls and Fences are particularly relevant. The "Design for Community Safety" SPD is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS:

Permission is sought for the erection of gates at the entrance of alleyways to the rear of terraced properties following successful completion of earlier schemes.

Justification for the Scheme

Gating of alleyways or "alleygating" has proved to be a very successfully crime prevention measure in other areas contributing to reducing burglaries, criminal damage, graffiti and vandalism. The gates can furthermore act as a deterrent to fly tippers, limit dumping and associated litter nuisance.

To be an effective crime prevention measure, gates need to be of sufficient size and structure. Planning permission is required where an enclosure in excess of one metre in height fronts onto a highway. The proposed gates are approximately 2 metres high.

The advantages offered by a Council supported scheme include:

- Preventing crime;

- Reducing litter/fly tipping;
- Improving the local environment; and
- Supporting residents through the Council continuing to maintain responsibility for the highways

Legal Issues

The alleyways under consideration are all presently maintained by the Council. Formerly if the alleyways were formally stopped up or closed the highway rights would be removed. This would mean that liability for the maintenance and upkeep of the alleyways would fall upon the individual adjoining landowner.

To avoid this outcome, it was resolved at Executive Board on 7th December 2000, that where the key criteria for an alleygating scheme are met, the Council would support the schemes by resolving not to exercise its discretion to institute proceedings in relation to the encroachment constituted by the gates.

Members will be aware that under new legislation (The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005) powers are available to close alleyways without removing highway rights. This however requires demonstration of a crime case and the Council have not progressed this to date.

Members also need to be aware that the legal position is complicated by the fact the Council has conflicting duties, on the one hand to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area and on the other hand it has duty to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up or obstruction of any highway for which it is responsible. Indeed the Councils Highways Engineers continue to object to such schemes. Whilst gating without an order is strictly unlawful, there are nevertheless strong policy grounds to justify the Council proceeding with this additional scheme.

Conclusions

Building safer communities is a priority objective for the Council. The alleygating scheme has the potential to reduce crime, improve the environment, strengthen local communities and enhance social well being. The gates are not felt to be intrusive and it is felt can be justified as a crime prevention measure. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to 1 No. condition requiring colour coating Dark Green BE22.

PLAN NUMBER: 06/00543/HBCFUL

APPLICANT: Halton Borough Council

PROPOSAL: Proposed erection of gates rear of 74 Arley Drive and 77 Arley Drive, Widnes

ADDRESS OF SITE: Rear of 74 & 77 Arley Drive, Widnes

WARD: Hough Green

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

All adjoining properties have been consulted and the application advertised by means of site notice. The Council's Highways and Waste Services, the Emergency Services and United Utilities have all been consulted.

The Council's Highways Engineer has commented that it is illegal to stop up a highway without an appropriate Stopping Up Order and that new legislation exists for use in such cases. The Highways Authority therefore objects to the granting of permission for this scheme.

Any further representations will be reported orally at Committee.

SITE/LOCATION:

Alleyway to rear of Arley Drive and 77 Arley Drive, Widnes.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

Approval was given for the implementation of a pilot alleygating scheme by the Executive Board on 7th December 2000. Permission was granted in February 2001 (00/00771/HBC) for a small pilot scheme, which has been implemented. A number of further permissions have since been granted across the borough.

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

All entrances/ alleyways to be gated are within a Primarily Residential Area in the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Policies BE1 General Requirements for Development, and BE22 Boundary Walls and Fences are particularly relevant. The "Design for Community Safety" SPD is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS:

Permission is sought for the erection of gates at the entrance of alleyways to the rear of terraced properties following successful completion of earlier schemes.

Justification for the Scheme

Gating of alleyways or "alleygating" has proved to be a very successfully crime prevention measure in other areas contributing to reducing burglaries, criminal damage, graffiti and vandalism. The gates can furthermore act as a deterrent to fly tippers, limit dumping and associated litter nuisance.

To be an effective crime prevention measure, gates need to be of sufficient size and structure. Planning permission is required where an enclosure in excess of one metre in height fronts onto a highway. The proposed gates are approximately 2 metres high.

The advantages offered by a Council supported scheme include:

- Preventing crime;
- Reducing litter/fly tipping;
- Improving the local environment; and
- Supporting residents through the Council continuing to maintain responsibility for the highways

Legal Issues

The alleyways under consideration are all presently maintained by the Council. Formerly if the alleyways were formally stopped up or closed the highway rights would be removed. This would mean that liability for the maintenance and upkeep of the alleyways would fall upon the individual adjoining landowner.

To avoid this outcome, it was resolved at Executive Board on 7th December 2000, that where the key criteria for an alleygating scheme are met, the Council would support the schemes by resolving not to exercise its discretion to institute proceedings in relation to the encroachment constituted by the gates.

Members will be aware that under new legislation (The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005) powers are available to close alleyways without removing highway rights. This however requires demonstration of a crime case and the Council have not progressed this to date.

Members also need to be aware that the legal position is complicated by the fact the Council has conflicting duties, on the one hand to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area and on the other hand it has duty to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up or obstruction

of any highway for which it is responsible. Indeed the Council's Highways Engineers continue to object to such schemes. Whilst gating without an order is strictly unlawful, there are nevertheless strong policy grounds to justify the Council proceeding with this additional scheme.

Conclusions

Building safer communities is a priority objective for the Council. The alleygating scheme has the potential to reduce crime, improve the environment, strengthen local communities and enhance social well being. The gates are not felt to be intrusive and it is felt can be justified as a crime prevention measure. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to 1 No. condition requiring colour coating Dark Green BE22.

PLAN NUMBER:	06/00544/HBCFUL
APPLICANT:	Halton Borough Council
PROPOSAL:	Proposed erection of gates adjacent to 99 and rear of 119 Cradley, Widnes
ADDRESS OF SITE:	Adj 99 and rear of 119 Cradley, Widnes
WARD:	Broadheath

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

All adjoining properties have been consulted and the application advertised by means of site notice. The Council's Highways and Waste Services, the Emergency Services and United Utilities have all been consulted.

The Council's Highways Engineer has commented that it is illegal to stop up a highway without an appropriate Stopping Up Order and that new legislation exists for use in such cases. The Highways Authority therefore objects to the granting of permission for this scheme.

Any further representations will be reported orally at Committee.

SITE/LOCATION:

Alleyway adjacent to 99 and rear of 119 Cradley, Widnes.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

Approval was given for the implementation of a pilot alleygating scheme by the Executive Board on 7th December 2000. Permission was granted in February 2001 (00/00771/HBC) for a small pilot scheme, which has been implemented. A number of further permissions have since been granted across the borough.

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

All entrances/ alleyways to be gated are within a Primarily Residential Area in the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Policies BE1 General Requirements for Development, and BE22 Boundary Walls and Fences are particularly relevant. The "Design for Community Safety" SPD is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS:

Permission is sought for the erection of gates at the entrance of alleyways to the rear of terraced properties following successful completion of earlier schemes.

Justification for the Scheme

Gating of alleyways or "alleygating" has proved to be a very successfully crime prevention measure in other areas contributing to reducing burglaries, criminal damage, graffiti and vandalism. The gates can furthermore act as a deterrent to fly tippers, limit dumping and associated litter nuisance.

To be an effective crime prevention measure, gates need to be of sufficient size and structure. Planning permission is required where an enclosure in excess of one metre in height fronts onto a highway. The proposed gates are approximately 2 metres high.

The advantages offered by a Council supported scheme include:

- Preventing crime;
- Reducing litter/fly tipping;
- Improving the local environment; and
- Supporting residents through the Council continuing to maintain responsibility for the highways

Legal Issues

The alleyways under consideration are all presently maintained by the Council. Formerly if the alleyways were formally stopped up or closed the

highway rights would be removed. This would mean that liability for the maintenance and upkeep of the alleyways would fall upon the individual adjoining landowner.

To avoid this outcome, it was resolved at Executive Board on 7th December 2000, that where the key criteria for an alleygating scheme are met, the Council would support the schemes by resolving not to exercise its discretion to institute proceedings in relation to the encroachment constituted by the gates.

Members will be aware that under new legislation (The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005) powers are available to close alleyways without removing highway rights. This however requires demonstration of a crime case and the Council have not progressed this to date.

Members also need to be aware that the legal position is complicated by the fact the Council has conflicting duties, on the one hand to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area and on the other hand it has duty to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up or obstruction of any highway for which it is responsible. Indeed the Councils Highways Engineers continue to object to such schemes. Whilst gating without an order is strictly unlawful, there are nevertheless strong policy grounds to justify the Council proceeding with this additional scheme.

Conclusions

Building safer communities is a priority objective for the Council. The alleygating scheme has the potential to reduce crime, improve the environment, strengthen local communities and enhance social well being. The gates are not felt to be intrusive and it is felt can be justified as a crime prevention measure. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to 1 No. condition requiring colour coating Dark Green BE22.

PLAN NUMBER:	06/00545/HBCFUL
APPLICANT:	Halton Borough Council
PROPOSAL:	Proposed erection of gates adjacent to 21 Andrew Close, Widnes
ADDRESS OF SITE:	Adj. 21 Andrew Close, Widnes

WARD: Ditton

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

All adjoining properties have been consulted and the application advertised by means of site notice. The Council's Highways and Waste Services, the Emergency Services and United Utilities have all been consulted.

The Council's Highways Engineer has commented that it is illegal to stop up a highway without an appropriate Stopping Up Order and that new legislation exists for use in such cases. The Highways Authority therefore objects to the granting of permission for this scheme.

Any further representations will be reported orally at Committee.

SITE/LOCATION:

Alleyway adjacent to 21 Andrew Close, Widnes.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

Approval was given for the implementation of a pilot alleygating scheme by the Executive Board on 7th December 2000. Permission was granted in February 2001 (00/00771/HBC) for a small pilot scheme, which has been implemented. A number of further permissions have since been granted across the borough.

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

All entrances/ alleyways to be gated are within a Primarily Residential Area in the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Policies BE1 General Requirements for Development, and BE22 Boundary Walls and Fences are particularly relevant. The "Design for Community Safety" SPD is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS:

Permission is sought for the erection of gates at the entrance of alleyways to the rear of terraced properties following successful completion of earlier schemes.

Justification for the Scheme

Gating of alleyways or "alleygating" has proved to be a very successfully crime prevention measure in other areas contributing to reducing burglaries,

criminal damage, graffiti and vandalism. The gates can furthermore act as a deterrent to fly tippers, limit dumping and associated litter nuisance.

To be an effective crime prevention measure, gates need to be of sufficient size and structure. Planning permission is required where an enclosure in excess of one metre in height fronts onto a highway. The proposed gates are approximately 2 metres high.

The advantages offered by a Council supported scheme include:

- Preventing crime;
- Reducing litter/fly tipping;
- Improving the local environment; and
- Supporting residents through the Council continuing to maintain responsibility for the highways

Legal Issues

The alleyways under consideration are all presently maintained by the Council. Formerly if the alleyways were formally stopped up or closed the highway rights would be removed. This would mean that liability for the maintenance and upkeep of the alleyways would fall upon the individual adjoining landowner.

To avoid this outcome, it was resolved at Executive Board on 7th December 2000, that where the key criteria for an alleygating scheme are met, the Council would support the schemes by resolving not to exercise its discretion to institute proceedings in relation to the encroachment constituted by the gates.

Members will be aware that under new legislation (The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005) powers are available to close alleyways without removing highway rights. This however requires demonstration of a crime case and the Council have not progressed this to date.

Members also need to be aware that the legal position is complicated by the fact the Council has conflicting duties, on the one hand to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area and on the other hand it has duty to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up or obstruction of any highway for which it is responsible. Indeed the Councils Highways Engineers continue to object to such schemes. Whilst gating without an order is strictly unlawful, there are nevertheless strong policy grounds to justify the Council proceeding with this additional scheme.

Conclusions

Building safer communities is a priority objective for the Council. The alleygating scheme has the potential to reduce crime, improve the environment, strengthen local communities and enhance social well being.

The gates are not felt to be intrusive and it is felt can be justified as a crime prevention measure. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to 1 No. condition requiring colour coating Dark Green BE22.

PLAN NUMBER: 06/00546/HBCFUL

APPLICANT: Halton Borough Council

PROPOSAL: Proposed erection of gates adjacent to 122 & 124 Mottershead Road, Widnes

ADDRESS OF SITE: Adj. 122 & 124 Mottershead, Widnes

WARD: Kingsway

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

All adjoining properties have been consulted and the application advertised by means of site notice. The Council's Highways and Waste Services, the Emergency Services and United Utilities have all been consulted.

The Council's Highways Engineer has commented that it is illegal to stop up a highway without an appropriate Stopping Up Order and that new legislation exists for use in such cases. The Highways Authority therefore objects to the granting of permission for this scheme.

Any further representations will be reported orally at Committee.

SITE/LOCATION:

Alleyway adjacent to 122 and 124 Mottershead Road, Widnes.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

Approval was given for the implementation of a pilot alleygating scheme by the Executive Board on 7th December 2000. Permission was granted in February 2001 (00/00771/HBC) for a small pilot scheme, which has been implemented. A number of further permissions have since been granted across the borough.

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

All entrances/ alleyways to be gated are within a Primarily Residential Area in the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Policies BE1 General Requirements for Development, and BE22 Boundary Walls and Fences are particularly relevant. The "Design for Community Safety" SPD is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS:

Permission is sought for the erection of gates at the entrance of alleyways to the rear of terraced properties following successful completion of earlier schemes.

Justification for the Scheme

Gating of alleyways or "alleygating" has proved to be a very successfully crime prevention measure in other areas contributing to reducing burglaries, criminal damage, graffiti and vandalism. The gates can furthermore act as a deterrent to fly tippers, limit dumping and associated litter nuisance.

To be an effective crime prevention measure, gates need to be of sufficient size and structure. Planning permission is required where an enclosure in excess of one metre in height fronts onto a highway. The proposed gates are approximately 2 metres high.

The advantages offered by a Council supported scheme include:

- Preventing crime;
- Reducing litter/fly tipping;
- Improving the local environment; and
- Supporting residents through the Council continuing to maintain responsibility for the highways

Legal Issues

The alleyways under consideration are all presently maintained by the Council. Formerly if the alleyways were formally stopped up or closed the highway rights would be removed. This would mean that liability for the maintenance and upkeep of the alleyways would fall upon the individual adjoining landowner.

To avoid this outcome, it was resolved at Executive Board on 7th December 2000, that where the key criteria for an alleygating scheme are met, the Council would support the schemes by resolving not to exercise its discretion to institute proceedings in relation to the encroachment constituted by the gates.

Members will be aware that under new legislation (The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005) powers are available to close

alleyways without removing highway rights. This however requires demonstration of a crime case and the Council have not progressed this to date.

Members also need to be aware that the legal position is complicated by the fact the Council has conflicting duties, on the one hand to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area and on the other hand it has duty to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up or obstruction of any highway for which it is responsible. Indeed the Council's Highways Engineers continue to object to such schemes. Whilst gating without an order is strictly unlawful, there are nevertheless strong policy grounds to justify the Council proceeding with this additional scheme.

Conclusions

Building safer communities is a priority objective for the Council. The alleygating scheme has the potential to reduce crime, improve the environment, strengthen local communities and enhance social well being. The gates are not felt to be intrusive and it is felt can be justified as a crime prevention measure. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to 1 No. condition requiring colour coating Dark Green BE22.

PLAN NUMBER:	06/00565/HBCFUL
APPLICANT:	Halton Borough Council
PROPOSAL:	Proposed erection of gates adjacent to 20 Boston Avenue & rear of 97 Morval Crescent, Runcorn
ADDRESS OF SITE:	Ajd. 20 Boston Avenue & rear of 97 Morval Crescent, Runcorn
WARD:	Halton Brook

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

All adjoining properties have been consulted and the application advertised by means of site notice. The Council's Highways and Waste Services, the Emergency Services and United Utilities have all been consulted.

The Council's Highways Engineer has commented that it is illegal to stop up a highway without an appropriate Stopping Up Order and that new legislation exists for use in such cases. The Highways Authority therefore objects to the granting of permission for this scheme.

Any further representations will be reported orally at Committee.

SITE/LOCATION:

Alleyway adjacent to 20 Boston Avenue and rear of 97 Morval Crescent, Runcorn.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

Approval was given for the implementation of a pilot alleygating scheme by the Executive Board on 7th December 2000. Permission was granted in February 2001 (00/00771/HBC) for a small pilot scheme, which has been implemented. A number of further permissions have since been granted across the borough.

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

All entrances/ alleyways to be gated are within a Primarily Residential Area in the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Policies BE1 General Requirements for Development, and BE22 Boundary Walls and Fences are particularly relevant. The "Design for Community Safety" SPD is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS:

Permission is sought for the erection of gates at the entrance of alleyways to the rear of terraced properties following successful completion of earlier schemes.

Justification for the Scheme

Gating of alleyways or "alleygating" has proved to be a very successfully crime prevention measure in other areas contributing to reducing burglaries, criminal damage, graffiti and vandalism. The gates can furthermore act as a deterrent to fly tippers, limit dumping and associated litter nuisance.

To be an effective crime prevention measure, gates need to be of sufficient size and structure. Planning permission is required where an enclosure in excess of one metre in height fronts onto a highway. The proposed gates are approximately 2 metres high.

The advantages offered by a Council supported scheme include:

- Preventing crime;
- Reducing litter/fly tipping;

- Improving the local environment; and
- Supporting residents through the Council continuing to maintain responsibility for the highways

Legal Issues

The alleyways under consideration are all presently maintained by the Council. Formerly if the alleyways were formally stopped up or closed the highway rights would be removed. This would mean that liability for the maintenance and upkeep of the alleyways would fall upon the individual adjoining landowner.

To avoid this outcome, it was resolved at Executive Board on 7th December 2000, that where the key criteria for an alleygating scheme are met, the Council would support the schemes by resolving not to exercise its discretion to institute proceedings in relation to the encroachment constituted by the gates.

Members will be aware that under new legislation (The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005) powers are available to close alleyways without removing highway rights. This however requires demonstration of a crime case and the Council have not progressed this to date.

Members also need to be aware that the legal position is complicated by the fact the Council has conflicting duties, on the one hand to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area and on the other hand it has duty to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up or obstruction of any highway for which it is responsible. Indeed the Councils Highways Engineers continue to object to such schemes. Whilst gating without an order is strictly unlawful, there are nevertheless strong policy grounds to justify the Council proceeding with this additional scheme.

Conclusions

Building safer communities is a priority objective for the Council. The alleygating scheme has the potential to reduce crime, improve the environment, strengthen local communities and enhance social well being. The gates are not felt to be intrusive and it is felt can be justified as a crime prevention measure. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to 1 No. condition requiring colour coating Dark Green BE22.

PLAN NUMBER: 06/00604/HBCFUL

APPLICANT: Halton Borough Council

PROPOSAL: Proposed erection of gates adjacent to 8 Vahler Terrace & rear of 16 Cartwright Street, Runcorn

ADDRESS OF SITE: Adj. 8 Vahler Terrace & rear of 16 Cartwright Street, Runcorn

WARD: Halton Brook

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:

Approve with conditions.

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION:

All adjoining properties have been consulted and the application advertised by means of site notice. The Council's Highways and Waste Services, the Emergency Services and United Utilities have all been consulted.

The Council's Highways Engineer has commented that it is illegal to stop up a highway without an appropriate Stopping Up Order and that new legislation exists for use in such cases. The Highways Authority therefore objects to the granting of permission for this scheme.

Any further representations will be reported orally at Committee.

SITE/LOCATION:

Alleyway adjacent to 8 Vahler Terrace and rear of 16 Cartwright Street, Runcorn.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

Approval was given for the implementation of a pilot alleygating scheme by the Executive Board on 7th December 2000. Permission was granted in February 2001 (00/00771/HBC) for a small pilot scheme, which has been implemented. A number of further permissions have since been granted across the borough.

UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DESIGNATION, KEY POLICIES AND SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES:

All entrances/ alleyways to be gated are within a Primarily Residential Area in the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Policies BE1 General Requirements for Development, and BE22 Boundary Walls and Fences are particularly relevant. The "Design for Community Safety" SPD is also of relevance.

OBSERVATIONS:

Permission is sought for the erection of gates at the entrance of alleyways to the rear of terraced properties following successful completion of earlier schemes.

Justification for the Scheme

Gating of alleyways or "alleygating" has proved to be a very successfully crime prevention measure in other areas contributing to reducing burglaries, criminal damage, graffiti and vandalism. The gates can furthermore act as a deterrent to fly tippers, limit dumping and associated litter nuisance.

To be an effective crime prevention measure, gates need to be of sufficient size and structure. Planning permission is required where an enclosure in excess of one metre in height fronts onto a highway. The proposed gates are approximately 2 metres high.

The advantages offered by a Council supported scheme include:

- Preventing crime;
- Reducing litter/fly tipping;
- Improving the local environment; and
- Supporting residents through the Council continuing to maintain responsibility for the highways

Legal Issues

The alleyways under consideration are all presently maintained by the Council. Formerly if the alleyways were formally stopped up or closed the highway rights would be removed. This would mean that liability for the maintenance and upkeep of the alleyways would fall upon the individual adjoining landowner.

To avoid this outcome, it was resolved at Executive Board on 7th December 2000, that where the key criteria for an alleygating scheme are met, the Council would support the schemes by resolving not to exercise its discretion to institute proceedings in relation to the encroachment constituted by the gates.

Members will be aware that under new legislation (The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005) powers are available to close alleyways without removing highway rights. This however requires demonstration of a crime case and the Council have not progressed this to date.

Members also need to be aware that the legal position is complicated by the fact the Council has conflicting duties, on the one hand to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area and on the other hand it has duty to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up or obstruction

of any highway for which it is responsible. Indeed the Councils Highways Engineers continue to object to such schemes. Whilst gating without an order is strictly unlawful, there are nevertheless strong policy grounds to justify the Council proceeding with this additional scheme.

Conclusions

Building safer communities is a priority objective for the Council. The alleygating scheme has the potential to reduce crime, improve the environment, strengthen local communities and enhance social well being. The gates are not felt to be intrusive and it is felt can be justified as a crime prevention measure. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve, subject to 1 No. condition requiring colour coating Dark Green BE22.

REPORT TO: Development Control Committee

DATE: 13th September 2006

REPORTING OFFICER: Operational Director – Environment and Regulatory Services

SUBJECT: Miscellaneous Items

WARD(S): Borough Wide

1) The following applications have been withdrawn :-

04/01099/OUT	Outline application for two storey residential development consisting of a two storey block of 6 No. flats and associated vehicle parking at Ditton Church Hall, Liverpool Road, Widnes, Cheshire
06/00460/FUL	Proposed two storey detached house with basement area and detached garage at Original Site Of Hale Village Nursery, Cocklade Lane, Hale Village, Liverpool, L24 4BB
06/00504/FUL	Proposed conversion of existing stable building and erection of 9 No. apartments to provide 11 No. accommodation units at 35 Irwell Lane, Runcorn, Cheshire, WA7 1RX
06/00511/FUL	Proposed erection of 1 No. two storey detached dwelling at Land Adjacent To 248 Moorfield Road, Widnes, Cheshire, WA8 3HG
06/00512/FUL	Proposed single storey workshop building to the rear of existing warehouse with two storey amenity block to one end at Albion Chemicals Limited, Pickerings Road, Widnes, Cheshire, WA8 8XW
06/00531/FUL	Proposed conservatory to rear of 1 Swindon Close, Runcorn, Cheshire, WA7 6NF

2) The following application has been returned :-

06/00529/FUL	Conversion of garage to study/w.c. at 6 Kildare Close, Liverpool, Hale Village, Merseyside, L24 5SA
--------------	---

3) The following petitions have been received:-

05/00957/FUL	Proposed erection of 5 no. four bedroom detached dwellings at Lawson House, Moughland Lane/Campbell Avenue
--------------	--

The petition contained 23 signatures where the objections were: 1) There has been no consultation on the outline plan for the whole of the Lawson House site, 2) The site density and type of dwellings proposed is totally out of character with existing housing in the area, 3) The partial development initially proposed effectively cuts off

any access to the remainder of the site. The access may be required at a later date if a series of planning applications are made by Morris Homes, 4) Earlier planning applications for 4 executive style houses on the south side of the site was not pursued by the previous owners due to access problems near to the bend in Moughland Lane. A tenfold increase in traffic on the site with access in the same vicinity would cause even more problems, 5) Overloading of the suspect main drainage with additional drainage from such a high density development, 6) Access problems for Emergency and Environmental vehicles.