

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

*At a meeting of the Development Management Committee on Monday, 7 November 2022 in the Council Chamber, Runcorn Town Hall*

Present: Councillors S. Hill (Chair), Leck (Vice-Chair), Abbott, J. Bradshaw, Carlin, A. Lowe, Polhill, Thompson and Woolfall

Apologies for Absence: Councillors Hutchinson and Philbin

Absence declared on Council business: None

Officers present: A. Jones, T. Gibbs, A. Plant, A. Evans, G. Henry, L. Wilson-Lagan, A. Blackburn and K. Brindley

Also in attendance: Six members of the public and one member of the press

### ITEMS DEALT WITH UNDER DUTIES EXERCISABLE BY THE COMMITTEE

	<i>Action</i>
DEV21 MINUTES	
<p>The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2022, having been circulated, were taken as read and signed as a correct record.</p>	
DEV22 PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COMMITTEE	
<p>The Committee considered the following applications for planning permission and, in accordance with its powers and duties, made the decisions described below.</p> <p><i>In order to avoid any allegation of bias, Councillor Thompson did not take part in the debate or vote on the following item, as he is a Member of the Town Deal Board.</i></p>	
DEV23 22/00130/FUL - THE DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING AND THE ERECTION OF UP TO 66 INDEPENDENT LIVING APARTMENTS WITH ANCILLARY SUPPORT SERVICES AND COMMUNAL FACILITIES, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AMENITY SPACES AND CAR PARKING ON LAND AT 81 HIGH STREET RUNCORN CHESHIRE	

The consultation procedure undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site.

Since the publication of the agenda and AB Update List, an additional seven neighbour representations had been received however, none of these raised any issues that had not been already addressed in the report. The Case Officer advised of two typos on pages 21 and 24 of the report; these were noted. Members were also advised of two additional conditions that were required, one restricting construction hours and one requiring that noise mitigation be implemented.

The Committee was addressed by Mrs Forward, who spoke on behalf of her husband Mr Forward, in objection to the proposal and cited the following *inter alia*:

- The proposal would mean the over development of the site, it would be better to build less development and provide more garden space;
- Not enough parking for the visitors of the residents of the properties;
- Another characterful building would be lost from the Town Centre;
- There would be a loss of street scene – a 5 storey building will be out of character with the rest of the area;
- There was a potential for rodent life to increase;
- Air pollution would increase from traffic from the 3 surrounding roads and noise pollution would increase from the noise from this traffic;
- There would be an impact on environmental health matters;
- The development was not suitable for the over 55's – there were no gardens/parks in the vicinity; there was a neighbouring nightclub open until 5am where the proposed attenuation measures were unlikely to sufficiently address the associated noise; the swimming pool had closed; and there were no museums or community centres in the area; and
- Public consultation carried out by the Applicant was questionable.

She concluded by saying that Mr Forward welcomed new developments in the Town Centre but considered this site unsuitable for a development of this nature, and suggested an alternative site on Mersey Road. She went on to list previous developments in the Town Centre, which in his opinion, were mistakes.

The Committee was then addressed by Mr Chorlton who spoke on behalf of the Applicant. He commented that, *inter alia*:

- This development would provide independent living homes for up to 100 local residents;
- It would bring into use a long standing brownfield site;
- The development would bring investment and jobs to the Town;
- The scheme was designed to facilitate independent living for its residents and would include facilities within it to encourage social interaction;
- There was a specific need for this type of housing in Halton;
- The building itself would be constructed from red brick and sand brick, so in keeping with surrounding properties; and
- The actual footprint of the scheme was smaller than a previous application that was made and approved.

Having considered the application, the Officer's presentation and speakers' comments, the Committee agreed that the application be approved subject to the conditions listed and the additional conditions recommended above.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – full permission;
2. Approved plans;
3. Restriction of use;
4. Implementation of external facing materials (CS(R)18 and GR1).
5. Submission of landscaping scheme and subsequent maintenance (Policy GR1);
6. Japanese Knot Weed method statement/validation;
7. Revised risk assessment and supporting remedial strategy, along with verification reporting upon completion of such remedial activities (HE8);
8. Electric vehicle charging points scheme (C2);
9. Parking and servicing provision (C1 and C2);
10. Car park management plan (C2);
11. Off site highway works (C1);
12. Implementation of cycle parking scheme (C2);
13. Residential travel plan (C1);
14. Details of the external buggy store (GR1/C1);
15. Implementation of drainage strategy (Policies CS23 and HE9);
16. Flood evacuation plan (CS23/HE9);

17. Programme of archaeological work (HE2);
18. Sustainable development and climate change scheme (CS(R) 19);
19. Submission and agreement of a site wide waste management plan (WM8);
20. Restricting gates/barriers to the car park entrance;
21. Restriction on demolition/construction hours (HE7);  
and
22. Noise mitigation implementation (HE7).

DEV24 22/00260/FUL - PROPOSED EXTENSION TO EXISTING WAREHOUSE (USE CLASS B8), GROUND WORKS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS - ONYX 35, BLACKHEATH LANE, RUNCORN, WA7 1SE

The consultation procedure undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site.

It was noted that since the publication of the Committee agenda, there was no additional information to report.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Rouse, who spoke on behalf of the Applicant. He stated that *B&M Bargains* employed 210 people in Halton. They were presently on a short-term lease but required an extension to the warehouse, as the business is growing and they needed more space. *B&M Bargains* would be committed to a new lease if planning approval was granted for this. He added that the extension would bring up to a further 15 jobs to the area. He also advised that all statutory consultees raised no objections and all applicable planning policies had been met.

One Member queried the concerns made by Moore Parish Council in relation to noise. He asked if there were any conditions that could be imposed in relation to noise. In response, it was explained that the application was for an extension to an existing building, so this would be difficult and that any condition would need to meet the tests for a valid condition. Additionally, an environmental protection noise report concluded that noise levels would have no adverse effect on the area, so therefore Environmental Health could not sustain an objection based on noise and a planning condition could not be justified according to the legal tests. It was noted that in the event of noise nuisance being reported in the future; this would be dealt with by Environmental Health.

The Committee agreed that the application be

approved.

RESOLVED: That the application be granted subject to the following planning conditions:

1. Time limit – full permission;
2. Approved plans;
3. Implementation of external facing materials (CS(R)18 and GR1);
4. Landscaping (CS(R)18 and GR1);
5. Tree felling (HE5);
6. Arboricultural works (HE5);
7. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CS(R)20 and HE1);
8. Lighting scheme (CS(R)20 and HE1);
9. Off-site ecological mitigation (CS(R)20 and HE1);
10. Surface water drainage (CS23 and HE9);
11. SuDs verification (CS23 and HE9);
12. Flood mitigation (CS23 and HE9);
13. Electric vehicle charging points scheme (C2);
14. Travel plan (CS(R)15 and C1);
15. Site Waste Management Plan (WM8);
16. Securing ecological watching brief;
17. Remediation strategy (HE8); and
18. Verification of remediation strategy (HE8).

DEV25 22/00369/FULEIA - PROPOSED INSTALLATION OF AN ADDITIONAL PRODUCTION LINE, INVOLVING AN EXTENSION TO AN EXISTING BUILDING AND THE INSTALLATION OF ASSOCIATED PLANT AND MACHINERY - UNIFRAX WIDNES, SULLIVAN ROAD, WIDNES, CHESHIRE, WA8 0US

The consultation procedure undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site.

This application was moved from List A of the published AB Update List to List B, as an update was required. The Case Officer advised that Highways impacts had been assessed by the Council's Highways Officer. It was confirmed that there was sufficient parking on site for the number of staff employed, who mostly work shift patterns. He also advised that the Applicant had agreed to an additional condition concerning a parking layout that would also include details of EV charging spaces and the installation of a covered cycle storage facility.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – full permission;
2. Approved plans (GR1);
3. Contaminated land identification, remediation strategy, verification (CS23);
4. External facing materials (GR1);
5. SUDS (HE9, CS, CS23);
6. SUDS verification and validation (HE9, CS7, CS23);
7. Construction management plan (GR2, CS23);
8. Construction waste audit (WM8); and
9. Submission and agreement of landscaping to be implemented.

*Meeting ended at 7.15 p.m.*