



Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park Halebank Regeneration Action area

Supplementary Planning Documents
Statement of Consultation
September 2006



Halton Borough Council

Halebank Regeneration Action Area

Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park

Supplementary Planning Documents

Statement of Consultation

Environmental and Regulatory Services
Environment Directorate
Halton Borough Council
Rutland House
Halton Lea
Runcorn
WA7 2GW

Contents

1.0	Introduction
2.0	Sustainability Appraisal
3.0	Public Consultation
4.0	Methods used for Public Consultation
5.0	How the Sustainability Appraisal recommendations were taken into account
Appendix 1	Stakeholder Consultation Response
Appendix 2	Public Consultation Response
Appendix 3	Proposed Final Amendments to the SPD's
3a	Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD
3b	Halebank Regeneration Action Area SPD

I.0 Introduction

The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (17.16) state that before a Local Planning Authority adopt an SPD, they must:

- b) *prepare a statement setting out*
 - i) *the names of any persons whom the authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the UDP;*
 - ii) *how the persons were consulted;*
 - iii) *a summary of the main issues raised in these consultations; and*
 - iv) *how these have been addressed in the SPD.*

The regulations also set out minimum requirements for Supplementary Planning Document consultation. These are set out in the Government's Policy Statement 12 as follows:

The consultation arrangements will be set out in the local planning authority's Statement of Community Involvement, but as a minimum the authority should:

- make the Supplementary Planning Document available for inspection at their principal office and at other suitable places, together with any supporting documents which will help people to understand what they are being asked to comment upon;
- place the same documents on their website;
- send a copy to the Government Office if the Government Office has asked to see it;
- send a copy to any other bodies referred to in Regulation 17(4), 54; and
- advertise in a local newspaper when and where the documents can be inspected, and ensure that adequate publicity is given to the documents.

Although the Council has adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), this was prepared after the consultation on the SPD took place. However, the consultation carried out for the SPD's exceeds the minimum requirements set out above, and reflects the content of the draft SCI.

A joint Statement of Public Consultation has been prepared as a joint public consultation exercise for both the Halebank Regeneration Action Area and Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park. This is because many of the issues arising in these areas overlap.

2.0 Sustainability Appraisal

A sustainability appraisal has been carried out for both SPD's. This has been a complex process that has had to meet the requirements of a European Directive on 'Strategic Environmental Assessment' as well as Government requirements that all supplementary planning documents have to be subject to a sustainability appraisal.

This began with public consultation on a 'scoping report' which essentially set out the framework to assess how the implementation of the SPD policies might impact upon seeking to achieve sustainable development within Halton.

The sustainability appraisal has to take account of social and economic impacts as well as environmental effects, and has to measure potential impacts against a baseline of data about social, economic and environmental conditions in the area.

A final version of the sustainability appraisal has now been prepared. It was put 'on deposit' with the draft SPD's for consultation so that people could see what impacts the SPD policies are likely to have on social, economic and environmental conditions, and whether these are acceptable.

The sustainability appraisal is an on-going process that will involve monitoring the effects of policies as they are implemented in the area. This will ensure that the development at Halebank and the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park are carried out in as sustainable a manner as possible.

3.0 Public Consultation

A joint public consultation exercise for both the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD and the Halebank Action Area SPD was done because many of the issues arising from development in these areas overlap, particularly the potential conflict between residential amenity and industrial operations. That is also why a joint sustainability appraisal has been done.

It was considered essential that public consultation enabled as many as possible of those who live and work in the area had a chance to examine and understand the content of these SPD's.

However, it was made clear during consultation that the principles of development established in the UDP, such as the allocation of land at Site 253 for rail freight warehousing was not open for debate, only the principles of how it should be developed, not whether it should. A period of six weeks was set aside for representations to be made. At the end of this period, all comments and opinions were collated and analysed. Proposed amendments to the documents have been drafted and a further report has been made to the Executive Board with a recommendation that the SPD's be formally adopted.

Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD

The process of preparing a detailed plan for the development of this area began with the preparation of a Masterplan, and landscape strategy and design guide by consultants Atkins. This was finally approved by the Council in December 2004. This Masterplan needed to be converted into an SPD in accordance with the regulations of the new 2004 Planning Act if it was to be of weight in development control decisions, and to supplement the UDP as required by Policy E7, described above.

In order to ensure consistency with the Masterplan, consultants Atkins were commissioned to prepare the draft SPD.

A 'stakeholder' consultation version of the draft SPD was prepared in July 2005 for a short period of consultation with a small number of 'stakeholders' whose views were necessary to be considered before the formal public consultation stage now being recommended.

A summary of the consultation replies and the response in the revised SPD is given in the Appendix I. These did not result in any fundamental changes to the document.

Halebank SPD

The draft Halebank SPD was first published for 'partnership' or 'stakeholder' consultation in March 2005 to enable a limited number of people and organisations to comment as part of the new system of 'front loading' public consultation on planning documents under the new system introduced by the 2004 Planning Act.

Meetings were held with businesses and residents. The main issues were those arising from the proposals to build housing on the former ASDA supermarket site and 'Golden Triangle' industrial complex, bringing housing and existing industry in closer proximity, and the proposals for a new HGV route, avoiding the existing residential areas, shown as a diagram in the document.

In order to clarify the route for HGV's, minimise blighting effects on existing property and design suitable traffic management measures to complement the route, consultants Atkins were commissioned to carry out the necessary traffic survey, analysis and design work.

This work was completed and a report prepared that identified the maximum land take for the proposed road links that should be reserved and remain undeveloped. These road links will enable a new connection between Merseyview Road and Pickerings Road through existing industrial premises and a new road link between the end of Foundry Lane and Hale Road to the north of the existing 'Golden Triangle' industrial complex. This corridor will also have to be wide enough to accommodate an east-west freight vehicle link to serve the greenfield and brownfield elements of the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park. This allows the extent of land available to be shown for redevelopment for housing and expansion or other works to existing industrial premises. The Atkins report also analyses the impact of the proposed route on the movement of HGV's on existing roads and the extent of the improvement works necessary.

Meanwhile, planning permission has been granted for housing development on the former ASDA site, that allows access for additional housing on adjoining sites, as proposed by the draft SPD.

Changes have been made to the 'stakeholder' draft version of the Halebank SPD to do the following:

- a plan showing land to be safeguarded for future road connections is included;
- a section entitled 'overall strategy' for the Regeneration Action Area so that the aims of the SPD are clear is added; and
- a section listing the issues that the SPD will address is added.

4.0 Methods used for Public Consultation

A six week public consultation period was held between 3rd November and 15th December 2005. A leaflet was printed that summarised the contents of the SPD's and was circulated to all households and businesses in the area. This asked for comments to be sent to the Council. A series of public exhibitions, manned by Council Officers were also held on 10th, 17th and 24th November at Halebank Community Centre. Copies of the draft SPD's the sustainability appraisal, the Atkins Transport Study and the Masterplan for Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park were made available on the Council's website and put 'on deposit' in Council offices, libraries and information centres.

5.0 How the Sustainability Appraisal recommendations were taken into account

Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD Sustainability Appraisal Report

This sustainability report makes recommendations for improvements to the draft SPD.

Paragraph 9.2.1 states that the SPD represents an opportunity to promote and encourage better waste management.

Response

Add a section to Chapter 7 Design Guide General Principles as follows:

Waste Management

All development proposals will be expected to address the requirements for the re-use or exchange of waste materials between complementary businesses and provision for on-site recycling, bio-digestion or composting facilities. This will have to be in accordance with the Waste Development Plan Document and Waste Strategy.

Paragraph 9.22 states that incorporating low energy design requirements within both residential and employment development is increasingly recognised as an important means of proactively contributing to national sustainability aims focused on ameliorating future climate change. The sustainability appraisal states there is scope for incorporating these requirements in the SPD.

Response

Add a section to Chapter 7 Design Guide as follows:

Low Energy

All development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how they have actively considered the scope for sourcing a percentage of new energy requirements from renewable sources, or on-site provision of micro-renewables. Proposals which include provision for district-wide energy schemes such as CHP or larger renewables plant, should also be considered.

Halebank Regeneration Action Area SPD

The sustainability appraisal report makes recommendations for improvements to the draft SPD that also concern waste management and low energy generation.

Response

Add a section to Chapter 7 Development Form and Structure as follows:

Waste Management

All development proposals will be expected to address the requirements for the re-use or exchange of waste materials between complementary businesses and provision for on-site recycling, bio-digestion or composting facilities. This will have to be in accordance with the Waste Development Plan Document and Waste Strategy.

Response

Add a section to Chapter 7 Development Form and Structure as follows:

Low Energy

All development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how they have actively considered the scope for sourcing a percentage of new energy requirements from renewable sources, or on-site provision of micro-renewables. Proposals which include provision for district-wide energy schemes, such as CHP or larger renewables plant, should also be considered.

Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD Stakeholder Consultation Response

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the stakeholder consultation draft

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
Halton Friends of the Earth		Change of wording from 'expected' to 'required' section 4.0 (Planning Policy Context)	Text within PR14 (section 4.0) was changed from 'expected' to 'required'.
		Section 6.0 (Development Constraints) suggested inclusion of light and noise pollution as a major constraint to development.	Light and noise pollution not considered a constraint as such.
		Paragraph 6.6 (Flood Risk) to be linked to paragraph 6.2.	
		Section 6.0 to include the need for a full Health Impact Assessment.	
		Section 7.0 (Design Guide – General Principles) – paragraph 7.5 established hedgerow protection to be addressed in a different section/policy/document.	
		Landscape Strategy and Design Guide – Changes to text.	Landscape Strategy & Design Guide not part of SPD.
Environment Agency		EA have suggested that site investigations be carried out before an application is determined in paragraph 6.2	Site investigation has been included within paragraph 6.2.
		An additional landfill site has been identified within 250 metres of the rail freight park	Additional landfill site noted.
		Paragraph 6.6 the site is at risk from flooding, as such a flood risk assessment will be required for all developments shown within the flood plain	Flood risk assessment noted and added in paragraph 6.6.
		Written consent of the Agency is required for any proposed works or structure in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of a main river.	Paragraph 6.12 'written consent of the Agency is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the main river'.
		Chapter 7 the inclusion of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).	Chapter 7 footnote regarding further information on SUDS included
English Heritage		With regards to identified nationally important Schedule Monuments, check there are no other undesignated areas of archaeology within the area.	
		Contact English Heritage with regard to landscaping works and creation of access to the site.	English Heritage will be contacted regarding landscaping works and the creation of access to the site.
		Long term management of scheduled site and surrounding area needs to be properly addressed to ensure sustainability.	
		Treatment of Lovell's Hall and its boundaries, as well as wider sitting, needs to be carefully considered.	
M Wright		No suggested changes	No changes.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
North West Development Agency		Amend paragraph 3.1	Paragraph 3.1 amended.
		Changes to text in policies GE5, PR14, GE18, S13 (Section 4).	Text changed to noted policies in section 4.
		Section 6 – Notation in Figure 5 changed from ‘English Nature Site’ to ‘English Nature Consultation Zone’.	Figure 5 (Section 6) notation changed.
		Paragraph 7.6 sites added and deleted from list.	Paragraph 7.6 sites added and deleted from list.
		Section 8 – General comments on sites B, O, P, Q, R, S & T.	Section 8 – Comments noted and changed regarding sites B, O, P, Q, R, S & T.
United Utilities		Section 4 – Within policy PR14 the development of Brownfield sites requires careful attention to existing. Drainage works can mobilise groundwater movement.	
		BE1 – bullet points supported.	
		Section 6 – paragraph 6.8 – recommended that developers give early consideration in project design as it is better value than traditional methods of data gathering.	Section 6 – paragraph 6.8 – recommended that developers give early consideration in project design as it is better value than traditional methods of data gathering. Telephone number is given in paragraph 6.11.
		Section 7 – bullet points supported.	
Halton Borough Council - Highways		Some highway pavement may not be acceptable for adoption.	Access roads unlikely to be adopted
Tessengerlo Group		Safety for the workforce, the local community and for people passing through and using the area.	Paragraph added to Development Opportunities affecting existing industrial operators to the effect that the principles only be applied if site becomes available for redevelopment.
		Concern over the sale of Tessenderlo UK Ltd land and the potential impacts on our operations.	
		Concern regarding the presentation of this plan under public consultation.	
Highways Agency		Pleased with the reference to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans under policy E7 and the principles of development for RG5 (RG6) Action Area 1 Halebank encourage alternative forms of transport to the car.	No changes

Halebank Regeneration Action Area SPD Stakeholder Consultation Response

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the stakeholder consultation draft

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
Halebank Community Action Group	20/03/2005 Letter	Para 1.6 a) local community facilities”. I mentioned before that Mr. Edwards suggested a new community centre originally to improve the planned village when it acquires its additional population. See also para. 2.3.2	Comment noted.
H.C.A.G.		Para 1.6e) “improved open space provision”. Has this any particular meaning?	Document makes specific provision for the provision of additional greenspace within Halebank.
H.C.A.G.		Para 1.7 Has the Council an alternative plan, if no buyer/builder for the Action Area land is found? We have already suggested to you the area north of Clapgate and west of Lovell Terrace (7.24), as well as the land to the left of Garnet’s Lane as suitable alternatives.	Land north of Clapgate Crescent / west of Lovell Terrace is shown as proposed housing site. Land left of Garnett’s Lane is outside the area of this SPD and is potentially adopted Green Belt in the UDP.
H.C.A.G.		Para 2.2.3 Is there any particular plan involved in this section?	This section refers to the now recently adopted Halton Unitary Development Plan.
H.C.A.G.		Para 2.3.4c Can this be explained.	This issue will be covered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.
H.C.A.G.		Para 2.3.6 what “existing land features must be protected” . What land features are being referred to?	This is a generic phrase referring to the elements of existing land use that the UDP and SDP are seeking to retain or reinforce.
H.C.A.G.		Para 3.1.1. A full explanation of “conservation Area status” should be given.	This document is supplementary to the Halton UDP, the Built Environment section of which contains a fuller explanation of Conservation Area status. For details of the particular merits of an individual conservation area reference should be had to the original designation report.
H.C.A.G.		Para 3.2.7 Last sentence. Attention must be paid to the section of industry which does not conflict with the residential side of Halebank. Offices might be most appropriate.	Offices are within use class B1, which is included as one of the acceptable uses within the Regeneration Area.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
H.C.A.G.		<p>Para 4.4 Attention has been called to the problem of obtaining insurance in areas which have been subject to flooding in the past. This includes the Clapgate area, Lovel Fields, marked as floodplain on the Ordnance Survey Maps, the Golden Triangle and Hale Road, by the Lovel Terrace houses. The added danger of flooding in these areas requires particular attention now that climate change is regarded as a reality. New techniques of building in these circumstances are being examined.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
H.C.A.G.		<p>Para 6.3.6 “contribution”. We have 3 definitions of this word for this sentence. Which one is correct?</p>	<p>“Contribution” appears twice in this paragraph. Its use is appropriate as a developments “contribution” to highways / transport improvements may be either in the form of direct improvements implemented by the developer or a financial payment to the Council to allow the Council to commission the relevant improvements.</p>
H.C.A.G.		<p>Para 7.2.2 I gather that this is not planned in detail yet. Most local people need reasonably priced Housing Association dwellings as no houses are for sale are within their pocket.</p>	<p>The SPD does not preclude a Housing Association from providing additional housing in the area. The UDP however does not contain an Affordable Housing policy whereby the Council can negotiate for affordable units as part of development as the evidence at the time did not support this. A revised Housing Needs Study is now being undertaken and the matter will kept under review.</p>
H.C.A.G.		<p>Para 7.2.4. This land may need careful examination before any decision over new building is made. The maisonettes and flats that were removed suffered from subsidence. Was there any mining in that area or land disturbance caused by a geological fault?</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
H.C.A.G.		<p>Para 7.2.5 Univar’s provisions should be re-negotiated over the danger of unsuitable chemicals being stored near to housing and the permission that seems to have been granted to them about a year ago to allow them to have fierce lighting directed straight at the houses opposite, all night.</p>	<p>There are no established procedures whereby the Council can force re-negotiation over the consented chemical holdings. The Council is however commissioning work to assess COMAH issues across the borough and will seek to do so with the full co-operation of all the companies involved. This may result in certain consents being amended to more accurately reflect the current operational needs / practices.</p>

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
H.C.A.G.		Para 7.6.1 Unfortunately, the chemist who intended to move here was offered a space in the Co-Op at too high a price. Perhaps the Council can soon negotiate a pharmacy for the many elderly and sick, and other inhabitants of the village.	Comment noted.
H.C.A.G.		Map 5 seems rather unclear. We recommend the closing of Pickerings Road and the linking of it with the new road completed as soon as possible. We hope that most traffic will stay within this HGV industrial road. Cars and 7½ tonne lorries should be allowed to take any road. Those over this weight should return along the same road, leaving the village via Ditton Station bridge. Only United Utilities heavy vehicles should use Halegate Road and no major vehicles that are not seeking access in Hale Road and Halebank Road should use these minor roads. All these improvements should be achieved as soon as possible to alleviate the pressure on local residents suffered for many years.	This issue will be covered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.
H.C.A.G.		Finally, negotiations with Network Rail should begin immediately to improve or replace Ditton Station bridge so that a strong road will be available for all the improvements planned for the village.	This issue will be covered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.
Summary of points raised by local businesses (circa April'05)		The need to ensure that HGV access to and from existing businesses is protected and improved and not restricted by the DPD proposals.	This issue will be considered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
Summary of points raised by local businesses (circa April'05)		Concern over the impact of new housing on the operational requirements of businesses.	<p>The SPD for Halebank is being prepared in parallel with an SPD for the proposed Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park. This will address issues of protecting residential amenity, providing a new road access from the freight park to the strategic road network, including solving the problem of the sub standard Ditton Road railway bridge.</p> <p>Work is also continuing on a “sustainability appraisal” of both the Halebank and Ditton SPD’s. This will look at the social, economic and environmental impact of the proposals. Concerns expressed by residents and businesses in the area about these impacts will form part of this appraisal.</p>
Summary of points raised by local businesses (circa April'05)		Concern over the basis for requiring and calculating contributions from businesses to an improved highway network.	<p>There is a recognition in the draft SPD that new development, whether of new housing or industry or expansion of existing industry can increase the amount of traffic generated. Where the existing highway infrastructure is inadequate and there is a plan to improve it, new development should contribute to the cost of improving it. This is in line with Government Planning Policy on “Planning Obligations” (see Circular 1/93) and the use of “Section 106 Agreements” under the Planning Act. It is also in line with the policy on planning obligations in the Halton Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>It is recognised however that contributions to improvements to the existing transport infrastructure in Halebank will need to be based on a formula based on the transportation impact of a particular new development. It is planned to carry out further technical feasibility on this with a view to including it within a future draft of the SPD.</p>
Summary of points raised by local businesses (circa April'05)		The route of the proposed new link road from Foundry Lane to Hale Road, particularly the “Golden Triangle” complex.	This issue will be considered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.
Summary of points raised by local businesses (circa April'05)		Concern over the location and design of a new road connection between Pickerings Road and Mersey View Road.	This issue will be considered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
Summary of points raised by local businesses (circa April'05)		The possible use of compulsory purchase powers by the Council.	The Planning Act 1990 gives powers for the Council to use compulsory purchase powers to purchase any land in their area in order to secure the carrying out of development, redevelopment or improvement to achieve the proper planning of the area in which the land is situated. Normally the Council will endeavour to purchase land by negotiation and use CPO powers if this is not successful. There are no plans to use CPO powers within the Halebank Regeneration Action Area at present, although the existence of a final approved SPD will provide the Council with the ultimate power to consider use of CPO powers.
Halebank Residents Meeting. Halebank Methodist Church. (25 attendees)	01/05/05 Public Meeting	: People were told by Lancashire County Council that Pickerings Road industrial estate would be light industry, not heavy industry.	Widnes Town Map did not zone site as light industry.
Residents Meeting.		Will Mersey Coatings still have access on Hale Road for abnormally long loads? Cause long delays.	Only if it is the only safe route on advice of the police. New road should accommodate extra long loads.
Residents Meeting.		Problems of noise and light from existing industry.	Need to comply with planning conditions. SPD proposes additional controls.
Residents Meeting.		Will new Ditton Station bridge be built over the railway?	Bridge has failed its assessment and needs to be fixed, upgraded or rebuilt. Not part of this SPD.
Residents Meeting.		When will new road be built? Document mentions at least a five year wait.	
Residents Meeting.		Univar premises causing noise and light pollution at night.	
Residents Meeting.		Bernie Allen. What happened to proposed new route from Hale Road alongside Lovel Terrace? (see April 2004 version of SPD)	No road is proposed alongside Lovel Terrace but route of road will be to north, alongside rail line and will be considered as part of the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD.
Residents Meeting.		Where will HGV's go from Mersey View Road?	Univar and Roger Haydock businesses should use Pickerings Road to access their sites.
Residents Meeting.		Why can't we have a weight restriction on Halebank Road? This could be done now.	This issue will be considered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.
Residents Meeting.		Traffic lights on Hale Road/Halegate Road/Mersey Road/Halebank Road are required.	This issue will be considered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.
Residents Meeting.		Why shouldn't there be a weight restriction on Halebank Road and Halegate Road as well as Hale Road?	This issue will be considered as part of a transportation study of Halebank.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
Residents Meeting.		Residents of Heathfield Road concerned about the impact of proposed Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park and proposed warehouse on site. Concerned about height of warehouse and noise from development.	This issue will be dealt with as part of the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD.
Residents Meeting.		Concerned about lack of chemist and Post Office in Halebank. Vacant unit on Co-Op development too expensive for a pharmacy. Concerned about GIST warehouse eyesore. Building too big.	Planners negotiated improvements to GIST application. Planning conditions imposed. If breached then enforcement will be taken
Halebank Businesses Meeting. Halton Business Forum. (35 attendees)	01/05/05 Public Meeting	Is there going to be a pharmacy as part of the Co-Op development? Necessary for elderly people.	Council's aspiration to have a pharmacy as part of Co-Op development. Possible spare land as part of new medical centre could be developed as a pharmacy. Some interest expressed.
Businesses Meeting.		Issue of choice between housing and industry at Halebank. Problem of traffic movement on junction with Broughton Way to Pickerings Road and Foundry Lane. Wagons getting too big to pass side by side on Broughton Way. Improvements needed.	Broughton Way being brought up to adoptable standards. Further improvements may be needed to accommodate abnormal load vehicles.
Businesses Meeting.		Problems with kids playing football on industrial roads. Housing on ASDA site will make people more vulnerable to accidents and effects of industry.	
Businesses Meeting.		Housing is being shown too close to proposed heavy vehicle routes. People will complain. This will restrict industry to suit the residents.	New housing will be designed with road to avoid noise and vibration problems. Through traffic will be discouraged and will be diverted onto the main through routes. Environmental regulations and improvements will restrict businesses' impact on housing. Quoted Exeter City Council High Court case regarding granting planning permission for housing adjacent to existing industry. Halton housing can live in harmony with industry. Businesses need to understand needs of residents. We are here to listen.
Businesses Meeting.		Bias against industry in the document. Gives wrong signal to owners of businesses that it is no longer acceptable and welcome in Halebank.	Industrial applications will be acceptable if it can be shown to have no increased environmental effect. Need to have B1 characteristics (B2 and B8 should be harmless).

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
Businesses Meeting.		Acceptable industry must be part of the plan. Extension of the Action Area over the industrial area is a problem for existing industry.	Council did exclude industry from Action Area but Inspector at public inquiry recommended restoration of boundary to include industrial areas.
Businesses Meeting.		Concern about housing proposals. Relocation difficult for some types of users in Council industrial premises. Will some businesses be extinguished?	Golden Triangle landowner would have to sort out the relocation needs of tenants if housing development took place. Land at Foundry Lane owned by the Council could be made available for relocation.
Businesses Meeting.		Concerned about not being able to pay higher rents and effect on viability of businesses.	
Businesses Meeting.		Concerned about encouraging housing near industrial area. 27 units – 70 tenants – no letters received notifying businesses of meeting.	Agents for owner of Golden Triangle were sent a letter about the meeting. Government encourages housing on brownfield sites. Rail Freight Park was allowed on greenfield site for exceptional reasons.
Businesses Meeting.		Issue of importance of HGV vehicles. Plan does not show any access to their premises. Noisy engines will have an effect on housing. Don't want any more restrictions from nearby housing on their business.	Diagrammatic map cannot show all the detail. Weight restrictions can have an exception for access.
Businesses Meeting.		One abnormal load per day. Would have problem turning on new road. Slow moving with escort. They will affect through traffic using Pickerings Road.	More information on frequency of heavy loads and turning circles required.
Businesses Meeting.		Pickerings Road will not succeed as a through route. It will impede existing business operations on Pickerings Road. Council is only encouraging housing in south Widnes to get the votes. GIST proposals cause more traffic.	Need to encourage housing on brownfield sites. Not rely too much on greenfield land to north of the Borough. GIST proposals have mitigation measures.
Businesses Meeting.		If Golden Triangle is sold for housing, will it be phased to allow for business relocation? If Golden Triangle stays for industry, how will this affect all other proposals?	CPO powers could be used. Any housing development will be 5+ years.
Businesses Meeting.		Why is there a 5% contribution request for highway improvements on a planning application? We are being asked to pay for development not in industry's best interests.	Planning obligations and contributions are perfectly legitimate if they form part of a planning policy.
Businesses Meeting.		Concerned about highly flammable gas transport from Tankfreight. If Company is forced to move then drivers could be put out of work.	No reason why Tankfreight should have to move.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response
Businesses Meeting.		Why not put new industry on ASDA site?	View is that housing is more important for long term future of Halebank. Residents want new housing in the area.
Businesses Meeting.		Is meeting being minuted? Notes should be circulated of meeting.	No. Wait for more formalised stages. Make comments in writing.
Businesses Meeting.		Business on Broughton Way. Lots of industry in area relies on HGV's. Why use employment land for housing? What land should be used for relocating businesses?	Government policy on use of brownfield sites for housing.
Businesses Meeting.		Steve Parkinson, Riverside Truck Rental. Will CPO powers be used? Will it be used for housing or new road?	CPO powers could be used for housing, landscaping and a road.
Businesses Meeting.		Dust blown from ex ASDA site is entering premises. Extra cleaning costs involved. No response.	Council to liaise with Widnes Regeneration.
Businesses Meeting.		Widnes Timber Centre. Has ASDA site been sold for housing? Why have borehole surveys?	Not been sold by developer yet for housing. Only outline planning permission has been granted. Ground conditions have been investigated. Next stage is for a remediation scheme to be submitted before detailed permission is granted.
Businesses Meeting.		Why was application for a portable building refused on Widnes Timber Centre?	This will be checked.
Businesses Meeting.		Housing allocation is different on Maps 6 and 7. Is industry no longer an acceptable use in the Action Area? (question to Councillors). Croda could be relocated by Head Office. SPD document sends the wrong message to industry.	Residents need employment. Need to ensure that housing and industry can exist in harmony. Need to strike a balance. Industry has to get smarter. Councillors will input these ideas to the SPD. Drafting of document and notations on map can be changed to allay fears of industry. Mistake on Maps 6 and 7 which can be rectified. Councillors are not opposed to industry but it must be conducted so not to conflict with residents amenity.
Businesses Meeting.		Need to keep school going with pupil numbers. Is there a demand for new housing in Halebank?	Too soon to know when housing will be built. Lots of interest from house builders. Comments in writing will be used to propose improvements to document but won't be attributed. The Council's Executive Board will get a summary of comments made. Golden Triangle companies will be contacted if they were missed this time.

Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park Public Consultation Response

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the public consultation draft

Consultee	Comments	Response
Judith Nelson English Heritage Regional Planner	14th November 2005 With reference to the scheduled monuments and conservation area " I suggest you also consider how the conservation area and the setting of the scheduled monument and its interpretation, access and understanding can be enhanced as part of the development proposals".	This will be considered as part of any planning applications affecting the scheduled monument and conservation area.
	Whilst the SPD and parts of the SA recognise the specific historic environment assets relating to DSRFP, it is surprising the section on Cultural Heritage (5.41) in the baseline information does not.	These comments are relevant to the contents of the sustainability appraisal and not the content of the draft SPD.
	Also table 6.1 key sustainability issues does not include cultural heritage.	These comments are relevant to the contents of the sustainability appraisal and not the content of the draft SPD.
	Table 7.1 in order to relate to this particular SPD should be modified to reflect the relevant aspects of the historic environment, i.e. scheduled monuments, conservation area and their settings.	These comments are relevant to the contents of the sustainability appraisal and not the content of the draft SPD.
	With reference to table 9.1, it does take some time to disentangle those aspects of the appraisal relevant to cultural heritage. It would aid our consideration of such reports if a short summary could be included on aspects of the SA relevant to cultural heritage, for this SA this would cover effects on the SM, CA and their settings together with proposed mitigation, monitoring and recommendations for improvements to the draft SPD.	These comments are relevant to the contents of the sustainability appraisal and not the content of the draft SPD.
	Section 10 sets out proposals for monitoring, it is important that this monitoring is tailored to this SPD. i.e it monitors effects upon the condition and setting of the SM and CA, this is not currently covered.	These comments are relevant to the contents of the sustainability appraisal and not the content of the draft SPD.
Mr Duncan Prince Halton Community Transport General Manager	14th November 2005 Page 2 - Road access into the rail freight park shows Ditton Road not being used. We hope that this is the case as Ditton road is very busy and in a poor state of repair. It regularly floods after moderate rain - the drains along certain sections cannot cope with taking surface water away. More heavy traffic would make the situation worse.	Noted.

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mr Harold Prescott H. Prescott & Sons Ltd Director	14th November 2005	<p>My Company own land marked "K" on your plan. I would like to know if this is to be incorporated within the DSRFP, because although shown as such on the plan, we have been told that this is not the case.</p> <p>If this is the case, what time scale are we looking at, before this is implemented?</p> <p>how far ahead to we have to look for the relocation, as land within the location we have now will be very hard to find.</p> <p>Also can you tell me if the strip of land in the white at the rear of Finn Forrest and the main railway line is to be incorporated in the plan.</p>	<p>Site K is not within the core area of the DSRFP which is confined to Sites A (253), B (256) and C (255). The policy of the SPD affecting adjoining land currently in industrial use is careful to point out that the existing use is expected to continue and would apply only if the existing use was to cease and be re-developed. The site is only within the DSRFP policy boundary because it may have potential for development in association with the rail freight park.</p>
Helen barrett Environment Agency Planning Liason Officer	15th November 2005	<p>The Agency is pleased that previous comments have been considered and amendments made to the revised draft. We support the Supplementary Planning Document and have nothing further to add.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Richard Watkin Individual	28th November 2005	<p>Developing on former greenbelt, removing greenspace.</p> <p>Pollution & noise from development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Edna Lowe Individual	28th November 2005	<p>Main road around development too close.</p> <p>Too much traffic expected, too noisy.</p>	<p>There is no commitment to build a peripheral road around Site 253 in the SPD. If the road is built, it is necessary to provide landscape and noise buffers to protect residential amenity.</p>
Diane Kisiel Highways Agency - Network Sterategy North West	29th November 2005	<p>In relation to both the Halebank Regeneration Area and Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park, the Highways Agency are keen to work in partnership with Halton Borough Council on any matters which impact on the strategic Road Network.</p> <p>Also as there is no direct impact on the Highways Agency road network, i have no further comments to make in relation to teh Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Consultee		Comments	Response
Stephen Hedley The Countryside Agency - North West Regional Office	29th November 2005	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 2 November 2005 consulting the Agency on the three draft SPDs - Design of New Industrial and Commercial Development Halebank Regeneration Action Area and Ditton Strategic Rail Park.</p> <p>We do not wish to comment on the draft documents. This is simply an expression of our current remit and priorities and, of course, does not imply lack of interest or indicate either support for or objection to the proposals.</p>	Noted.
Agnes Viggers Individual	30th November 2005	You have steamrolled this through - How will you measure its success? - How many local people will get jobs on park?	This will be measured through the Annual Monitoring Report and monitoring of the Sustainability Appraisal.
		I understand the tenants if the smallholding have served notice to quit - aren't you presuming ahead of this survey?	Not relevant to the SPD.
		How tall will the sheds be?	Only relevant at Planning Application stage.
		Will working hours be limited?	Only relevant at Planning Application stage.
		When was Hutchinsons tip renamed Hutchinsons Hill? - do you know what it is contaminated with? - How can it even be considered a "greenspace opportunity" when it could be so badly polluted as to render it a health risk?	Hutchinson Hill will only ever be made available for public recreation when a suitable reclamation scheme has made it safe for public access.
		Do you know what is under "the mound"? - as above?	Chemical waste.
		Map too small and complex EJP who owns what? - should be at least A4 size.	Noted. This will be addressed in final document.
		Who is making money out of this development?	Not relevant to SPD.
	What's wrong with the "land Connection" to Halebank? - why waste money on upgrading something which already works?	Comment not understood.	
Steven Broomhead Northwest Regional Development Agency Chief	1st December 2005	Para 2.3 describes the component parts of the wider Ditton SRFP site. To help identify them on the plan at Figure 5, it would be useful if the text was revised to incorporate cross-references to the relevant site references (Site P, L, M, F, etc).	Noted.

Consultee		Response
Executive	<p>Section 3 sets out the Council's Vision for DSRFP. The Agency envisages that Ditton will be developed as a modern inter-modal exchange, logistics and strategic rail freight facility serving, in particular, the needs of Merseyside, North Wales and the Cheshire sub-region, with potential links to Liverpool Airport and Port of Liverpool. We envisage that Ditton will:</p> <p>Accommodate strategic distribution development Accommodate businesses that will utilise the railway for the transportation of freight; and Provide a significant number of jobs for local people.</p> <p>Strategic regional sites should act as flagship developments for the North West, accommodating the needs of inward investment and indigenous business. Standards of design, energy conservation, landscaping, quality of construction and urban design should ensure that all new development at the site contributes positively to environmental quality. There should be a presumption in favour of innovative and quality architectural design solutions on the site.</p> <p>We suggest that the vision for Ditton, as set out on page 6, is expanded to reflect the above.</p>	Agreed. Text now added to SPD.
	Policy PRI2 relates to 'COMAH' sites. However, this acronym is not explained until paragraph 6.3. For the benefit of readers who may be unfamiliar with this term, it should be explained at the point where it is first used.	Agreed. Text amended.
	Pg 18 - The Agency welcomes and supports the references to the need for good design in the context of Policy BE3. Strategic regional sites should be flagship sites for the region with high standards of design, energy conservation, landscaping and quality of construction to ensure that all new development at the site contributes positively to environmental quality.	Noted.

Consultee	Comments	Response
	Pg 19 - We are unclear why the policies on Sites of International/National Importance for Nature Conservation appear to have two policy reference numbers (one in parentheses and one without).	Agreed. Text amended.
	It is unclear why the references to ERDF, NWDA and SRA in paras 5.3 to 5.6 appear in a Section entitled "Ditton SRFP Masterplan and Development Framework". These may be more appropriate in the Introduction, or in a new section, perhaps sub-headed "Wider Context".	Agreed. Add new section 'Wider Context' and re-number paragraph as Section 6.0.
	Para 7.1 refers to DSRFP's physical design and impact as a "tool". This seems inappropriate; we suggest "will be an important tool" is deleted and replaced with " <i>will be important</i> ".	Agreed. Text amended.
	The section on 'Accessibility' provides only brief details of the highways improvements that are required to serve the site. We are aware that more detail is provided in the Council's Provisional Local Transport Plan, 2006/7 to 2010/11 ('LTP2'), which identifies key components of the necessary highways infrastructure. We suggest the Draft SPD is amended to acknowledge that DSRFP is the subject of a major scheme bid in LTP2 and to reflect its wording with regard to the key components this scheme.	Agreed. Text amended.
	In the sentence under "Sustainability", the words "to aim" are superfluous and can be deleted. Some of the requirements identified in the subsequent list of bullet points may need to be addressed as part of a formal Environmental Impact Assessment. The SPD should therefore refer to the potential need for an EIA.	Agreed. Text amended
	Many of the sites identified on Figure 5, lie in whole or in part within the English Nature Consultation Zone as shown on Figure 4. For several of these sites, nature conservation is not flagged up as a development constraint (e.g. sites E, F, K, L and T). On sites G, I and J, "English Nature" is identified as a development constraint. We suggest this is amended to either "Nature Conservation" or "English Nature Consultation Zone".	Agreed. Text amended.
	Fig 3.a The extract from the UDP Proposals Map should include a key to aid interpretation.	Agreed.

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mr Roberts Individual	4th December 2005	<p>My main concern is the transport proposal when will this be in operation as it is necessary if the freight park goes ahead the amount of traffic will increase and my concern is the bridge will not be able to cope.</p> <p>I am against the park as it think is should not always be about money and we need to protect our green belt which is disappearing rapidly. I do think the road should be priority before landscape around the site.</p>	<p>Ditton Station road bridge is being re-designed and will be re-built to cope with HGV movements arising from the rail freight park.</p> <p>The Site 253 is now removed from the Green Belt as a result of the adoption of the Halton Unitary Development Plan. Landscaping of Site 253 is required in advance of development.</p>
Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes Planning Manager	9th December 2005	<p>Redrow support the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park (DSRFP) proposal, although we have serious concerns that it will not achieve its full potential in terms of attracting new investment in the absence of significant opportunities for complementary housing. The limited scope for housing within the Halebank Action Area will not provide the quantity or quality of housing required. Indeed those regional/national companies which Policy E7 seeks to attract will be heavily dependent upon car borne community, creating unsustainable travel patterns.</p>	Noted.
Mr William & Mrs Brenda Wheeler Individual	12th December 2005	<p>How can you plan and build in advance a bund for the freight park when you do not know what will be contained within as the planned and built Environmental Defences may not work thus putting the area environmental and people there as risk of noise light and health pollution on this 24 hour operating site.</p>	<p>The Halton UDP Policy E7 requires the landscaped buffer zones to be implemented in advance of development of Site 253.</p>
		<p>Who is going to pay for the scheme it certainly should not come from Council funding or council tax as this money should be used to get the basic requirements in the area up to scratch building in advance bund; roads; bridge; widening bridge is going to cost an astronomical amount.</p>	<p>Funding is not relevant to the planning policies of the UDP.</p>
		<p>The area is already subject to aircraft noise and pollution from fuel used to propel them; noise and fuel pollution from traffic and HGVS and speeding road users.</p>	<p>The Halton UDP policies and those in the draft SPD are designed to ensure that residents surrounding the proposed rail freight park are protected from increased noise and pollution. This will also be controlled through the consideration of detailed planning applications and conditions imposed on any planning permissions. Other environmental legislation can impose additional controls on pollution sources.</p>

Consultee		Comments	Response
		<p>These threats to the Environment and Health of people in the area will increase not only from the freight park but from the aircraft.</p>	<p>The Halton UDP policies and those in the draft SPD are designed to ensure that residents surrounding the proposed rail freight park are protected from increased noise and pollution. This will also be controlled through the consideration of detailed planning applications and conditions imposed on any planning permissions. Other environmental legislation can impose additional controls on pollution sources.</p>
		<p>Liverpool Airport continues to expand and aircraft use the chemical factory at Lower Road as a Beacon and are continually passing over or near it. This is a risk in itself, as we know Phosgene gas and other chemicals have been stored there and on at least one occasion there was a release of gas which crossed the A562 Speke Road, what if a plane crashes on this site? How can we know that light, noise airborne pollutants, as well as any other pollutants which could go to drain and affect any watercourse or land will be contained by the bund which would have been built in advance; and how would we know what the increases would be on noise levels and pollution outside the bund due to the increase in traffic in the area, and the question of leisure and pleasure pursuits in the area walkers, cyclists, runners, play areas for children and safety of all people who live in the area would be affected.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
		<p>The dispersal of traffic from the bund is of great concern as road safety, health issues from fumes, cancer causing particulate emissions and noise levels 24 hours per day will be escalated, particularly if traffic does not follow designated routes to and from the area of the bund.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
		<p>How will tv, radio, mobile phone or any other communication signals be affected by this site.</p>	
<p>J Illing Individual</p>		<p>Can we claim against the Council if the value of are property goes down because of the planned freight park.</p>	<p>The proposal for the development of open land at the north of Halebank road and to the south of the railway is contained in the Halton Unitary Development Plan that was adopted in April this year. This is the statutory plan for the Borough that guides decisions on new development. It was the subject of a lengthy inquiry before being adopted where the proposals for the development of the land off Halebank land was considered and confirmed as being acceptable.</p>
		<p>If not, what our the names of the people who planned and past it, someone has to be responsible if the value of are houses depreciates because of the freight park.</p>	<p>The Council considered the results of the public Inquiry and was responsible for adopting the plan and the proposals for the Ditton Rail Freight Park.</p>

Consultee		Comments	Response
		We should not have to pay for their mistakes.	However a planning application for the development of the freight park on land off Halebank Rd has not yet been made so the detailed impact in terms of noise and the hours of working cannot be assessed at this time.
		Has the Halton Borough Council checked on the noise level of another freight park this size if so where., and what level was it?	A planning application for a landscaping scheme designed to shield any rail freight development by mounds and planting has been granted and residents notified. This will reduce any noise and visual effects of the proposed development.
		Will the freight park be working 24 hours a day 7 days a week?	As regards any effect on the value of your property, this cannot be claimed against the Council.
		Will the residence of Halebank be able to sleep at night?	
Mr Nicholas Hastie Individual	13th December 2005	We are already short of green spaces in the north west (official Lord Roger's) the ground proposed for this development is farm land and green openspace and not brown fields as stated by HBC.	These issues were considered by the public local inquiry into objections to the proposals for the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park, and the adoption of the Halton UDP means that these issues cannot be addressed by the SPD.
		Ditton Golf Course is an empty block of ground and could be used for commercial purposes.	As above
		The rail terminal could be transferred to St Helens they have brownfield sites; which are away from residential areas.	As above
		The additional employment that this development would create for local people would be minimal.	As above
		Halebank has always been treated by Halton B.C as a non-entity and this development is no more than an ego trip for Halton B.C	Not relevant
		Planning/Development and would look good on the C.V's of staff looking for employment elsewhere.	Not relevant.
Mrs Margaret Fahey Halebank Community Action Group Secretary	13th December 2005	Presumably there are firms interested in the Park so things will be settled before money is spent on the bund. Certainly the bund will need to be planted in the winter to avoid the waste of money that accompanies summer tree planting.	These issues have been considered as part of the consideration of the planning application for the landscaped bund around Site 253 that has now been granted, having taken account of resident's comments.
		The bund seems to be a useful boundary surrounding the Freight Depot, but if quad – bikes or motor – bikes using the paths, narrow entrances and security will be necessary.	As above

Consultee		Comments	Response
		<p>The fact that this Bund, as planned up to now, covers only three quarters of the area around the Depot seems very unwise. The emphasis on security in the Public Enquiry suggests to me that the firm will not be happy with the plan giving access or at least an open view for the public. Certainly being open to the village will increase the Park's unpopularity as its noise, light and smells will invade the houses as other firms do in the centre of the village.</p>	As above
		<p>There are a lot of spots in Halebank that suffer from flooding. The increase in ponds will help to drain the area, as much of this land will be covered in asphalt. Will these all be open to the public for fishing? The safety of these ponds is certainly paramount. The original pond must not be spoilt in anyway and access to it must be open to the public or to the angling club so safety can be maintained.</p>	As above
		<p>Mr Garratt, the railway adviser at the Public Enquiry stated that the Freight Park would have to operate for 24 hours daily to make it financially viable. Obviously, local people would prefer it to have much shorter hours to avoid loud sounds and light pollution.</p>	<p>The hours of operation for design, noise and lighting issues of any rail freight park development will be considered as part of any planning application against the relevant planning policy tests that are designed to protect residential amenity.</p>
		<p>As Mrs M Fahey of Halebank raised in the Public Enquiry, lighting must be pointing downwards so that it does not disturb any residents in the area nor the air route overhead. Radio's, tannoy systems and machinery sounds must be kept as quiet as possible. No smells must be released to upset local people (Univar, particularly at night).</p>	As above.
		<p>15 metre high buildings should be the highest to avoid troubling the residents that own the houses behind the freight depot. Certainly the building should be hidden by the bund and the established trees.</p>	As above.
<p>Mr John Martin Fahey Halebank Community Action Group</p>	<p>13th December 2005</p>	See above	
<p>Mr David Hodson Halebank Community Action Group</p>	<p>13th December 2005</p>	See above	
<p>Mrs Kim Longmire Halebank Community Action Group Chair</p>	<p>13th December 2005</p>	See above	

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mrs Marian Allen Resident	14th December 2005	No development of any kind should take place on this site until a full planning application covering the whole development i.e. warehouses. roads, sidings in line with the planning inspection report at the UDP and the Council's own planning guidance. Also a full Environmental Impact Study should be done before a planning application is accepted and certainly no more Council tax payers money should be used.	Development will have to take place in accordance with policy E7 of the Halton UDP and the guidance in this SPD.
Mr Bernard Allen Resident	14th December 2005	No development of any kind should take place until a full planning application covering the whole development i.e. warehouse, roads, sidings. In line with the planning inspectors report at the UDP and certainly no Council money should be spent on this development. Also a full Environmental Impact Study should be done before a planning application is accepted.	As above
Mrs Sandra Foster Resident	14th December 2005	No development of any kind should be allowed on this site in Halebank until a full Environmental Impact Study has been carried out and reported only if a full planning application to cover the whole site is submitted should any development considered in line with the inspectors report at the UDP and no tax payers money should be used to finance this development.	As above.
Mr Robin Greenway C/o Robin Greenway & Co Agent Hale Estate	15th December 2005	The Hale Estate are fully supportive of the Council's proposals for the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park as a means of attracting new investment into the area and creating much needed employment. However, it is felt that the proposal will fail to achieve its full potential without the provision of adequate complementary housing of a quality compatible with the employment prospects.	Noted.
		Based upon the current U.D.P, there is insufficient scope for the provision of suitable new housing within the Halebank Action Area. In the absence of suitable new housing provision, major companies will be reliant upon employees travelling greater distances, contrary to policies for sustainable development.	Noted.
Dianne Wheatley Government Office North West Local Planning Team	15th December 2005	Our main comment would be that the end of the document relating to sites could explain more about how the Council will manage the phasing process and how developers should take this into account when bringing forward proposals, in order to provide strategic consideration.	Agreed. A section on phasing will be added to the text.
		In relation to Figure 3a, it would be helpful if the final drawing could include a key to illustrations/shading in the same way as other figures.	Agreed. A key will be added.

Consultee		Comments	Response
		In addition, para 5.5 refers to the Strategic Rail Authority. We understand that the SRA is being closed down with DfT Rail Division taking over many of its responsibilities. The text needs amending to reflect this.	Agreed. Text will be amended.
Mr David Thompson Peel Airports (Liverpool) Ltd Development Planning Manager	15th December 2005	Liverpool Airport Plc requested that this chapter includes reference to Halton's Unitary Development Plan Policy PR10 'Development within the Liverpool Airport Height Restriction Zone'.	Agreed. Text will be amended.
		It should also be noted that Liverpool Airport Plc should be consulted upon Planning Applications in accordance with Aerodrome Safeguarding Procedure.	Noted.
Mrs Teresa Hornby Individual	16th December 2005	Until a full masterplan of whole of Site 253 and its buildings are put forward to the public it is difficult to follow what your proposals are.	Noted
		HGV route to be built first.	Noted. A new section on phasing is added to the text.
		Ponds - these are open and for the safety of residents - children not suitable.	These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253 which has now been granted, having taken account of resident's comments.
		Pathway & Cycleway from Clapgate Crescent to Beehive no advantage to residents, nuisance for residents nearby.	These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253 which has now been granted, having taken account of resident's comments.
		No need for second football pitch - already ball park and adult football pitch (consult for alternative use)	These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253 which has now been granted, having taken account of resident's comments.
		Bonded road going through Lovell terrace - Clapgate crescent from innovis to link with A5300	
		Not necessary for HBC to pay for landscaping - strongly against this point.	Funding is not relevant to the planning policies of the SPD.
Mr Keith Hornby Individual	16th December 2005	Comments relating to: Land drainage from site 253 to open planned ponds.	These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253 which has now been granted, having taken account of resident's comments.
		How will drainage into Ditton Brook be possible, land lies lower than brook also railway in between.	As above
		Site 253 Land drainage - how will it affect resident's homes - flooding.	As above
		Footpath / cycleway not necessary causing noise and nuisance for residents.	As above
		No need for emergency access in Halebank Road if Bonded road is build - this can be used.	Direct access to the A5300 is not necessary for the development of Site 253, but the layout of the site should allow for this as a longer term possibility.
		Bonded Road is being used as access from Innovis to A5300	As above

Consultee		Comments	Response
		No need for Bonded road to enter Halebank use A5300	As above
		No need for landscaping to be funded by HBC.	Funding is not relevant to the planning policies of the SPD.
Mrs Fio Woodward Individual	14th December 2005	I don't think a landscape masterplan should go ahead until a full Environmental Study has been carried out.	These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253, which has now been granted, having taken account of resident's comments.
		How can we comment on landscaping around field 253 when we don't know what you plan to build behind and until you have a plan I don't think any plans should be put forward. Height, Size, How many buildings	These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253, which has now been granted, having taken account of resident's comments.
		Also don't forget the old and young living in the village which you now want to turn into a rat race.	Noted.
Mr David Smith Individual	14th December 2005	I oppose the proposed spine road running at the back of Havelock cottages, the back of bedrooms are going to be subjected to noise, Diesel pollution, artificial lighting twenty four seven. Why can't the road run parallel to the railway siding out of sight of mind.	Direct access to the A5300 (Knowsley Expressway) is not necessary for the development of Site 253, but the layout of the site should allow for this as a longer term possibility.
		The emergency access road that's proposed I think runs close to the houses, can't you build a more secluded area. The fence line at the back of the cottages should not restrict access to the gardens and should not be a choice hiding place for burglars and muggers.	
Mr John Woodward Individual	14th December 2005	How can we make a decision on landscaping around field 253 when we do not know what type of buildings is to be built inside the landscaping - Height, Size, How Many	These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253, which has now been granted, taking into account resident's views.
Mr Alistair Grills Alistair Grills Associates Principal	19th December 2005	Amend final bullet point under "Accessibility" to road	
		"subject to further detailed study, a road link to the A5300/A562 roundabout may be required to serve Site A"	Direct access to the A5300 (Knowsley Expressway) is not necessary for the development of Site 253, but the layout of the site should allow for this as a longer term possibility.
		This amended wording reflects on-going discussions regarding the best way of sending this site in Environmental and Financial terms, in mind the correct uncertainty concerning the alignment for the proposed Airport Road.	
		Remove final sentence of first bullet point under "ease of movement" which St Michaels Road example, as this is no longer appropriate due to barriers resulting from the creation of New Road and Rail Links within the site.	Agreed. Text will be deleted.
		Amend bullet point no II to road "consideration of Road and Bridge Link to A5300/A562, subject to further study" for the reasons set out above.	See response to first comment of Mr Grills.

Consultee		Comments	Response
		Amend bullet point no 8 to read "proposed greenspace to West, exact boundary to be determined following further study to provide required quantity or rail-related warehousing to ensure overall viability of DSRFP.	Agreed. Text amended, but add "subject to no encroachment into Green Belt".
Mr J Maxwell Friends of Halebank	15th December 2005	Obviously our attitude towards this development is well know to Halton BC but for the avoidance of doubt I reiterate: We welcome a Rail Freight Park for Ditton but have strenuously opposed its incursion into Halebank, in particular into that section of land which has been taken from the Greenbelt for this purpose and is identified as "253". We continue to oppose this particular section of the Rail Freight Park but recognise that our opposition is not a material consideration within the body of a Supplementary Planning Document.	
		Having stated that we do have a number of things to say about this SPD which, we are advised by our planning consultants is defective and contrary to the UDP.	
		Under section 7of the Draft SPD "Adaptability" you state "Not withstanding the aim to develop a strategic rail freight park, proposed buildings should nevertheless be capable of adaptation to accommodate alternative uses, complementing the DSRFP, should the need arise." This gives rise to the gravest cause for concern.	
		The raison d'□tre for removing 253 from the Greenbelt was the exceptional circumstance of the then perceived need for a strategic rail freight park.	
		Further the planning limitations in the UDP <u>as adopted by Halton BC</u> precludes any development on 253 save and except as set out in the UPD.	
		This section of the SPD is contrary to the UDP and ought to be amended. We suggest the following: " <i>Not withstanding the aim to develop a strategic rail freight park, proposed buildings other than those to be sited on 253 should nevertheless be capable of adaptation to accommodate alternative uses, complementing the DSRFP, should the need arise</i> ".	Disagree. Government Planning policy Statement 1. 'Delivering Sustainable Development' states that developments should be durable and <i>adaptable</i> . However any change of use of a rail served warehouse on site 253 would be contrary to UDP policy E7.

Consultee	Comments	Response
	<p>At Section 8 of the Draft SPD are site specific proposals for DSRFP. The document states that a rail-served warehouse facility in excess of 25,000 m² is the most appropriate use for the site. There is no mention within this section of the need for the site to be developed sequentially, in line with the Inspectors comments. A failure to put this limitation in means it is contrary to the UDP. We submit that, for the avoidance of any doubt it ought to be included.</p>	<p>The sentence does state that the development should be in accordance with UDP Policy E7 that does contain the sequential test in Section 2.</p>
	<p>It is imperative that no "preparatory" work be allowed in respect of 253 before a genuine bone fide developer with a realistic feasible and demonstrably funded plan. Any such preparatory work (by which we mean landscaping and access roads) must be part of an integrated plan. If any such work is allowed before a developer has been identified and made their interest the subject of a planning application in respect of 253, it is impossible to know exactly what landscaping and/or road system is needed for the site. It is tempting for Halton BC to seek to attract developers by undertaking such works themselves (as evidenced by their current planning application) but such a course is dangerous:</p>	
	<p>Mr Andrew Pannell has told me that, in the event of the landscaping presently being considered becoming an actuality AND no developer coming forward, the land, in planning terms will be blighted. We submit that no SPD can be drafted in such form as to allow for this possibility.</p>	
	<p>By reason of the matters set out under section 7 "Adaptability" referred to at paragraph 5 supra, the SPD at the very least concedes the possibility of there being no strategic rail freight park.</p>	
	<p>In these circumstances a specific limitation upon any works relating to 253 ought to be clearly stated within the body of the SPD. In particular, the developer to be obliged to design build and fund all landscaping and access roads as a part of an integrated plan for the development of 253 as a part of the DSRFP.</p>	<p>It is not considered that the SPD needs to be amended to include any specific limitation upon any works relating to Site 253 beyond those already in Policy E7 of the Halton UDP.</p>

Consultee		Comments	Response
		<p>We also have grave concerns about contamination. One potential developer has told us that the huge bunds which would form a part of the landscaping scheme would provide an opportunity to bury some Galligoo and other contaminated material. Particularly from "the Mound". We are worried that such an opportunity might be taken by a developer and we trust such an approach will be opposed in principle by Halton BC. Mere re-assurances are insufficient to prevent such a course of action further contaminating land to which the general public is likely to have access and we ask that a specific section be put into the SPD forbidding such deposits as part of any planning permission.</p>	<p>These comments are relevant to the planning application for the landscaped bund on Site 253, which has now been granted, having taken into account resident's comments.</p>
		<p>We are concerned about the road access to 253, there being no apparent link to the main roads system. A temptation will be to use access onto Hale Bank Road. We are concerned the Draft SPG does not include any access by way of bridge or tunnel across the West coast mainline onto the roundabout at the end of the Knowsley Expressway.</p>	<p>A range of options have been considered within the Masterplan and SPD process for linking Site 253 to the A562 (Speke Road) and the A5300 (Knowsley Expressway). It is considered that access to the A562 would be preferable by making use of a rebuilt Ditton Station bridge. Direct access to the A5300 is not necessary for the development of Site 253, but the layout of the site should allow for this as a longer term possibility avoiding Halebank Road except for emergency access.</p>
<p>Mrs Arlene Nicholson Individual</p>	<p>1st December 2005</p>	<p>Given that this freight terminal is unfair & completely unsuitable for this already over industrialised area, if and when it goes ahead we will most certainly need all the screening we can get. However in my opinion this dressing up operation is designed to entice a developer to the freight terminal, thus showing any such developer that they would be making a considerable saving at this site because the screening and landscaping have been done, with our money.</p>	<p>Not relevant to the planning policies of the SPD..</p>
<p>Mr Malcolm Nicholson Individual</p>	<p>1st December 2005</p>	<p>The landscaping is premature & the money should be used for the new road which is more urgent.</p> <p>Let any developer pay for the landscaping.</p>	<p>Funding is not relevant to the planning policies of the SPD</p>
<p>Mr Paul Nicholson Individual</p>	<p>1st December 2005</p>	<p>It is too soon to spend rate payers money on a scheme which is not a priority.</p> <p>Let the people who will benefit from the freight terminal pay for the landscaping to disguise it, the people who will benefit do not live in Halebank.</p>	<p>Funding is not relevant to the planning policies of the SPD</p>

Halebank Regeneration Action Area

Public Consultation Response

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the public consultation draft

Consultee		Comments	Response
Judith Nelson English Heritage	14th November 2005	I have no comments to make on either document. If you have not already done so I suggest you consult the County Archaeologist regarding any archaeological potential for the area, particularly for the river frontage.	Noted.
Mr R C Jones Resident	14th November 2005	We object to all development in the area with particular ref to proposed road link around perimeter of proposed developments. We feel that the link road should be developed at Ditton old station site where it is already an industrial area already. This would obviously cause least disruption to residential areas.	A range of options have been considered within the Masterplan and SPD process for linking Site 253 to the A562 (Speke Road) and the A5300 (Knowsley Expressway). It is considered that access to the A562 would be preferable by making use of a re-built Ditton Station bridge. Direct access to the A5300 is not necessary for the development of Site 253, but the layout of the site should allow for this as a longer term possibility avoiding Halebank Road except for emergency access.
Mr D G Girling M&B Tools	21st November 2005	<p>I basically object to the Halebank Regeneration scheme because Option 2 for joining Pickerings Road to Merseyview means that our factory and the jobs of my employees are at risk, because it would mean the demolition of our premises to obtain your objective in this scheme.</p> <p>I would like to have a one to one meeting as soon as possible with the Planning Officers involved as our expansion programme has now been put on hold until we know what the intended route is for the road joining Pickerings Road with Merseyview road.</p>	Agreed. Option 2 to be deleted. Option 1 is preferred due to highway design and safety reasons and because it cuts through undeveloped land.
Patric E Whitby Roger Haydock & Co Ltd C/O Dixon Webb	21st November 2005	We are extremely concerned regarding a number of the proposals which it is felt may adversely affect not only the future usage of the site but also the prospects for the advancement and financial wellbeing of the business.	

Consultee		Comments	Response
		<p>6.3.4(6) At present our clients only access to the site is via Mersey View Road. If their premises are to be "re-orientated" this would mean a new access would need to be created which would likely involve considerable upheaval to the site and the likely demolition of existing buildings. Clearly this would significantly disrupt our clients business and incur considerable cost/loss of revenue. At present access to the site is considered to be favourable. Assuming the proposals are introduced as planned the route to the property would be considerably more difficult and we are of the opinion that the location at the very extremity of the site offers reduced visual impact to the detriment of value both to the business and also the land and buildings.</p>	<p>Agreed. Delete requirement to re-orientate premises and creation of new accesses onto Pickerings Road in Paragraph 6.3.4 (6).</p>
		<p>6.3.6 & 6.3.7 This will stifle business and future employment in the area. The fact that the outcome of planning applications will be directly related to the applicant making a financial contribution to the scheme is unreasonable.</p>	<p>This is not considered unreasonable and is in accordance with policies in the Halton UDP (S25) and in Government Planning Policy, as set out in the draft SPD, Paragraph 7.14.</p>
		<p>6.3.8 It seems unfair that revenue will be sought from the current occupiers of the estate who have no benefits but only disadvantages imposed upon them as a result of the scheme.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
		<p>Whilst our clients appreciate the reasoning behind the scheme they do not feel the position of the existing land owners/occupiers have been adequately catered for and indeed strongly object to the physical and financial impact on their business. Roger Haydock & Co Limited have long standing business connections in the area and have been a consistent employer of local people over many years. They have a progressive business strategy for the site, which as a result of this scheme is at best difficult to implement.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Edna Lowe Individual</p>	<p>29/11/2005</p>	<p>Screening of Pickerings Industrial estate Lorry Sleeping Over Gist - Have not planted trees on mound, planning permission said they should. No chemist or doctors</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD requires landscaping as part of new development to improve the appearance of the industrial areas. New housing development should help increase population and may boost demand for better public services and facilities.</p>

Consultee		Comments	Response
Diane Kisiel Highways Agency	29/11/2005	<p>In relation to both the Halebank Regeneration Area and Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park, the Highways Agency are keen to work in partnership with Halton Borough Council on any matters which impact on the strategic Road Network.</p> <p>Also as there is no direct impact on the Highways Agency road network, i have no further comments to make in relation to the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park.</p>	Noted.
Stephen Hedley Countryside Agency - North West Regional Office	29/11/2005	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 2 November 2005 consulting the Agency on the three draft SPDs - Design of New Industrial and Commercial Development Halebank Regeneration Action Area and Ditton Strategic Rail Park.</p> <p>We do not wish to comment on the draft documents. This is simply an expression of our current remit and priorities and, of course, does not imply lack of interest or indicate either support for or objection to the proposals.</p>	Noted.
Agnes Viggers Individual	30/11/2005	The maps on the leaflet are too small for clarity and reading by pensioners.	Noted.
		Page 2 How is access to car parking near Lovell Terrace achieved.	Access will be off Hale Road.
		Page 2 How does new housing in Mersey View road tally up with the industrial traffic route?	New housing will be designed to reduce the impact of any industrial traffic by access to and orientation of new housing from Mersey View Road
		Page 2 Houses on old Asda Site - Do you know it is the former site of around half a dozen pits. All badly polluted?	The planning permission has taken full account of ground conditions and full remediation has taken place prior to construction.
		Page 2 How can you "encourage industrial expansion" with no harmful effects to the environment? - please explain how they are compatible.	Industrial expansion in this area will only be allowed if it has a lower environmental impact than currently exists. The SPD policies are designed to achieve this.
		When you say "minimise the effect of the DSRFP on housing" are you saying that it will have an effect - Previously we have been told it will have no effect .	It is acknowledged that there will be some effect.
		When you say "sustain local community facilities" - what do you mean? No chemist, doctor, dentist, leisure centre, cash point, etc. One bus every half hour.	New housing development will help to increase population which will help boost demand for new public services and facilities.
		What dereliction is being removed?	Redevelopment for new housing and business will help remove dereliction.

Consultee		Comments	Response
		Can someone document the significant planned changes to Halebank of the last 40 years. Hoe many plus points have there been?	This is not the role of the SPD.
		<p>With reference to SA/SEA</p> <p>I do not understand the question - I Can't see how the framework is explained anywhere in this leaflet.</p> <p>What is "SEA Screening Statement"</p> <p>This is not plain English!</p>	The SEA Screening Statement is simply a way of deciding what environmental effects are most likely to occur so that concentration on those effects can be made when assessing their impacts. The "Strategic Environment Assessment" can then be tailored to the local circumstances.
Mrs Arlene Nicholson Individual	1st December 2005	<p>I fully support the transport proposals, new road diverting heavy traffic away from Hale Road and the centre of Halebank village.</p> <p>I will not be holding my breath though because Halton Council are not famous for considering the needs & wishes of halebank residents.</p> <p>This road could be started with the money set aside for the landscaping around the freight terminal. This landscaping would be required later but is premature at present.</p>	Noted.
Mr Paul Nicholson Individual	1st December 2005	<p>Halebank village has been in need of a relief road to take heavy traffic away from the centre of the village for many, many years.</p> <p>Halton Council should begin this work now as a show of good faith to the people of Halebank all of whom are very disillusioned with Halton Council & the way our area is treated.</p>	Noted.
Mr Malcolm Nicholson Individual	1st December 2005	<p>The new road around Halebank is a good idea and we need it now.</p> <p>The money <u>MUST</u> be found now.</p>	Noted.
Mr Gary Broad Individual	5th December 2005	I have read the various documents on your website with regard to the above proposals. I notice that no analysis appears concerning the effects on Halebank Rd and Halegate Rd of the proposed transport proposals. You are diverting heavy traffic from one area to another. Merseyview road can barely sustain 2 cars passing let alone HGV traffic.	The Atkins transport study shows that most heavy traffic will be diverted from the residential areas northwards to the A562 Speke Road, and not south onto Halegate Road or west to Halebank Road.
		<p>The junction of Merseyview Rd with Halegate Rd is already a dangerous spot. Have any proposals been made to look into these issues and has a traffic analysis been done, as it has for lots of other areas, for this particular spot.</p> <p>I comment as a resident of Halebank who knows the traffic problems in the area and would welcome some response to my questions.</p>	The capacity of this junction has been considered as part of the Transport Study and any improvements to the design and safety of this junction will be considered in more detail when proposals to link Merseyview Road and Pickerings Road are brought forward.

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mr John Illing Resident	2nd December 2005	<p>This is the best opportunity you will ever have of using the contaminated golf course, the golf course can be levelled and concreted, you may be eligible for a government grant to cap the golf course in concrete.</p> <p>It will be higher than the rail sidings that should not be a problem with containers.</p>	The land allocations for the proposed Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park, including alternatives, were considered by the Halton UDP public inquiry and subsequently the UDP was adopted. The SPD cannot allocate alternative sites for the rail freight park.
		Road access to and from the F/Park are made easy by the close proximity of the roads, making the Ditton road a no through road would help contain the dirt smells and the pollution that can only be good for everyone who lives in Widnes.	
		Build houses on your proposed Freight park and you will have more people. People pay Council Tax.	As above.
		Are you building the proposed freight park on the wrong side of the Widnes and Runcorn bridge. Have you though about the traffic impact it will have on the bridge, it will cause road chaos.	As above.
		The Ditton Road should be closed as it is a health hazard.	As above.
		<p>Respondee has included a map with comments form with the following statement.</p> <p>I hope you will be able to see the good points of this plan, and it will help to save the little and very precious uncontaminated green fields we have left, please don't destroy what little greenery we have in this dirty place.</p>	As above.
Helen Barrett Environment Agency	28th November 2005	The Agency supports the SPD in its aim of improving environmental quality and sustainability of the area. The main concerns from the agency will be any environmental constraints or impacts from development.	Noted.
		With regard to chapter 4.2 and contaminated land, the agency would request that in accordance with PPS23 any site investigation work is completed prior to an application being determined. The agency will assess impact to controlled waters and provide guidance where necessary.	Noted.
		Chapter 4.4 highlights that some of the area is liable to flooding. Please find enclosed a copy of the flood zone map for that area. Any development in these areas will need a flood risk assessment to accompany the planning application, this is in accordance with PPG25.	Noted.

Consultee		Comments	Response
		The watercourses in the area will need to be protected from development for ecological and practical reasons. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the land drainage Bylaws, the prior written consent of the Agency is required for any proposed works or structures in , under, over or within 8 metres on top of the bank of the river as well as flood defences.	Noted.
		We support the inclusion of SuDS in paragraph 5.2 and recommend it in any development where applicable.	Noted.
		PPG25 paragraph 25 recognises that there is a great need for brownfield regeneration and whilst certain development may not be suitable mixed development and the use of open spaces (7.3) may be preferable in flood risk areas.	Noted.
		The agency is pleased to see that the Council will seek to pursue environmental improvements through planning. With regards to any landscaping the Agency would want to see incorporation of native species in any development.	Noted.
Chris Parlane Director JH Davies Haulage Ltd	9th December 2005	Whilst we have no particular queries about the overall scheme, we are extremely concerned about how the access to our premises will be affected. We operate a fleet of HGV's and it would appear from what we can see that, as proposed, access will be difficult and we would therefore like the opportunity to discuss this potential problem with you.	The detailed design of the proposed road works associated with the HGV's by-pass and traffic management measures are not the subject of this SPD. However when detailed design takes place and any necessary planning applications are made, then the concerns of the business can be considered in detail.
		We have operated from this site for many years and employ over 30 people and do not wish to see anything occur that will prejudice our position here. Also we would not wish the service that we offer our customers to be affected in any way.	
Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes	9th December 2005	Redrow support the overall strategy for the Regeneration Action Area, particularly the need to stabilise and increase the population of Halebank to sustain local facilities. However, this is also essential if the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park (DSRFP) is to be developed in a sustainable manner, without creating significant long distance car borne commuting. This should be included as a specific aim of the overall strategy.	Noted.

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mr and Mrs William Wheeler Individual	9th December 2005	Health Safety Leisure Pursuits and Traffic Flow – the relief road taking the HGV's and other traffic out of the area of Halebank is very important and the users from this to and from this industrial park should be policed and made to follow designated routes, the area of Halebank Village and the hamlet of Halebank i.e. Halebank Road should not be used as a rat run by these huge dangerous vehicles as they are at present cycling, walking, jogging, running and other leisure pursuits are discouraged in the area by the activity of the traffic, industrial, HGV and others in this area.	It is the aim of the SPD proposals to ensure that HGV movements are diverted away from sensitive areas and reduce noise, pollution, health and safety concerns.
		It has always been of great concern that Council Planning Permission has been given to turn Halebank and area into a HGV and industrial park without having got the infrastructure of bridges and roads to and from the park causing a blight of noise, pollution health concerns and road safety issues to descend on the area.	As above
		As to the costs, huge costs!	
		Who is funding all these costs for the improvements to roads provision of roads in this area?	The use of developer contributions through 'Section 106 Agreements' will help to fund the highway improvements proposed by the SPD.
		Creating industrial HGV parks by bit planning has created this problem, which if with a forward vision and concept of good value, good environment planning may not have allowed this of businesses to arrive in a housing area.	
Vitti Osborne Cronton Parish Council	9th December 2005	The Parish Council has no observations on the proposal	Noted.
Mr Mike Goodwin Univar Limited	13th December 2005	Transport proposals – we would support option 2 for the area reserved for the future Highway scheme as option 1 would place the road adjacent to our flammable storage and very toxic storage areas which would obviously not be ideal in the case of a road accident. We have no other issues to raise on this plan.	Option 1 is the preferred option and it will be carefully sited and designed to ensure that the risk posed by vehicle movements to chemical storage areas will be minimised.
Mrs Margaret Fahey Halebank Community Action Group	13th December 2005	See Halebank Community Action Group representations	

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mr John Martin Fahey Halebank Community Action Group	13th December 2005	See Halebank Community Action Group representations	
Mr David Hodson Halebank Community Action Group	13th December 2005	See Halebank Community Action Group representations	
Mr Richard Hodson Halebank Community Action Group	13th December 2005	See Halebank Community Action Group representations	
Kim Longmire Halebank Community Action Group	13th December 2005	The people of Halebank would welcome the reopening of Ditton Station, which would of course contribute to the reduction of road use. The railway will need to get on with re-designing the Ditton Station bridge and strengthening it to improve the route in and out of Halebank.	Noted. Railtrack are actively working on a design to overcome the Ditton Station bridge strengthening problem.
		Hale Road from the Bridge should only carry 7.5 tonne wagons and cars so the village will be quieter and have less traffic. No HGV's should be allowed through the village.	The highway and traffic management proposals will divert HGV's away from Hale Road that runs through the village.
		The relief road from Ditton Station bridge should be started as soon as possible. It should be wide enough for the wide HGV's on Broughton way to pass each other. At present vehicles are left parked there, blocking the road. Halegate Rd and Halebank Rd should be for 7.5 tonne wagons and cars only, once the new road to the A4300, the Knowsley expressway is completed. This would also keep Hale free from the HGV's. The only acceptable use of these roads for heavier vehicles would be when an emergency is declared by the police.	These comments, although very helpful, cannot be addressed directly by the SPD's highway proposals as they are too detailed. These matters can be considered as part of the detailed design and implementation of the highway and traffic management proposals.
		Please note that until recently, whenever Forward Planning Speakers including Mr Brough mentioned the new road, they promised that it could be used by Halebank HGV's to reach the roundabout and clear the village. As this is to be a publicly built road, this should still be true.	These comments, although very helpful, cannot be addressed directly by the SPD's highway proposals as they are too detailed. These matters can be considered as part of the detailed design and implementation of the highway and traffic management proposals.

Consultee		Comments	Response
		At the junction of Halebank, Halegate, Hale Road and Merseyview Road there should be traffic lights as agreed by one of the planning officers at one of the recent December meetings, because the turning on to Hale Road offers a very limited view.	These comments, although very helpful, cannot be addressed directly by the SPD's highway proposals as they are too detailed. These matters can be considered as part of the detailed design and implementation of the highway and traffic management proposals.
		Whatever happens, the utility vehicles from the sewage works in Halegate Road should no longer be allowed to go along Hale Road, through the village, so should turn right into Merseyview Rd. An Alternative to these tankers going out into Cheshire several times daily should be considered eventually.	These comments, although very helpful, cannot be addressed directly by the SPD's highway proposals as they are too detailed. These matters can be considered as part of the detailed design and implementation of the highway and traffic management proposals.
		Traffic parking should be strictly adhered to cut down the dangers suffered at present where parking outside the Goldmine, the newspaper shop and Café, and Luke's chippy even on actual corners is illegal.	These comments, although very helpful, cannot be addressed directly by the SPD's highway proposals as they are too detailed. These matters can be considered as part of the detailed design and implementation of the highway and traffic management proposals.
Mr Stuart Allen Individual	14th December 2005	No development of any kind should take place on this site until a full planning application covering the whole development it warehouses, roads, sidings. In line with the planning inspectors report at the UDP and the Council's own planning guidance also a full Environmental Impact Study should be carried out before a planning application is excepted and I object to Council tax payers money being used to fund this development.	Noted
Miss Colleen Ditchfield Individual	14th December 2005	No development of any kind should be allowed to take place on this site in Halebank until a full Environmental Impact Study has taken place. There should be no landscaping done until a full planning application is granted and no Council tax payers money should be used to make this development more acceptable to a developer.	Noted. A phasing plan is to be included in the adopted version of the SPD.
Mr Bernard Allen F.O.H	14th December 2005	No industrial development should be allowed to take place in Halebank until the HGV relief road has been constructed. The houses are badly needed as is the relief road but I feel that the Council should ensure that there is no job losses if they C.P.O The Golden Triangle Complex.	Disagree. New industrial development will continue to be considered as long as it does not have an adverse environmental impact and may also help to make a financial contribution to the HGV route.
Mrs Marian Allen Resident	14th December 2005	The HGV relief Road should be constructed as a priority before any more industrial development is allowed to be built I agree with the housing being built but I am concerned about the loss of jobs if the Council CPO the Golden Triangle complex.	Disagree. New industrial development will continue to be considered as long as it does not have an adverse environmental impact and may also help to make a financial contribution to the HGV route.

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mr Robin Greenway C/o Robin Greenway & Co	15th December 2005	The Hale Estate are fully supportive of the Council's strategy for the Halebank Regeneration Area as a means of providing widespread improvements and increasing the pollution of Halebank. The results of such a strategy will assist in sustaining local facilities.	Noted.
		However, it is felt that the regeneration of Halebank is inextricably linked to the development of the Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park and, in the interests of sustainability, policies should be adopted which ensure the provision of adequate quality housing in the immediate area without reliance upon long distance commuting for employees.	New housing development is being proposed in the Halebank area as shown in the Draft SPD.
Mr Eric Turner Tarmac	15th December 2005	The proposed new road indicated on maps 5,7 and 9 in the Halebank Regeneration Action Area, Draft Supplementary planning Doc will require the removal of Tarmac's ready mixed mortar batching plant.	It is acknowledged that the Company wish to continue in this location but there is no alternative route for the proposed new highway. The justification for the route is set out in both the DSRFP SPD and the Halebank SPD. Relocation of the business rather than its extinguishment will be an important consideration by the Council.
		The plant was established in 1988 and the lease has a further eight years remaining. The company's landlord is Halton B.C, Tarmac's mortar plant at Halebank is a very profitable business and the Company have invested considerable capital over recent years to keep the plant environmentally acceptable.	
		The company therefore wish to continue operating in this location.	
		Tarmac therefore object to the proposed new highway which will terminate their business in its present location. If a C.P.O is served for Tarmac to vacate the site prior to the end of the term the company will seek significant compensation for the loss of their business.	
		Tarmac would also like to comment on the lack of communication by the Borough Council on the Regeneration Project. It was by the chance that Tarmac became aware of the Council's proposals on the 14 December had it not been for this chance tarmac would not have met the 15 December deadline for comments.	The Council carried out extensive consultation to ensure that all affected parties were aware of the proposals. The Council apologise if this did not reach Tarmac.
Mr David Thompson Peel Airports (Liverpool) Ltd	15th December 2005	Liverpool Airport Plc requested that this chapter includes reference to Halton's Unitary Development Plan Policy 'Development within the Liverpool Airport Height Restriction Zone'.	There is no need to include this policy in the SPD because any planning application in this area would have to take this policy into account to comply with the UDP.
		It should also be noted that Liverpool Airport Plc should be consulted upon Planning Applications in accordance with Aerodrome Safeguarding Procedure.	Noted.

Consultee		Comments	Response
Mrs Flo Woodward Individual	16th December 2005	Stop HGV's going down Halebank Road. Several times they have been observed going up and coming back down. When followed they have gone onto Speke Road.	It is not intended to prevent HGV's from using Halebank Road. According to the Atkins Transport Study for Halebank, the number of HGV's using Halebank Road is very low in comparison with those using Hale Road, and westbound flows (45) is lower than eastbound (70). The proposed link to and from Merseyview Road to Pickerings Road is an important part of the HGV diversion scheme for Halebank.
		If the New Road plan for relieve of HGV been kept of our roads, we must not allow HGV to exit Mersey View to the west and all HGV to enter Mersey View Rd for access only from Pickerings Road and no other way.	
		We must remember Mersey View rd is use by the children and walkers to Pickerings Pasture and don't want any more pollution	
		Warehouses are great for Halebank.	
		We must not loose sight that the golden triangle employs about 250 people and they could loose their jobs.	Businesses on the Golden Triangle site displaced by housing development will have the opportunity for relocation.
Mr John Woodward Individual	16th December 2005	To link Mersey View rd with Pickerings Rd will put a lot more traffic on Mersey View Rd making is unsafe for families walking to Pickerings Pasture.	Road and junction design will ensure safe passage for pedestrians.
Mr Lesley Nuttall Individual	15th December 2005	Concerned about the road near out cottages also pathway being so close.	These comments concern the possible future route for vehicles from the rail freight park at Site 253 having direct access to the A5300 Knowsley Expressway. This is not a requirement of the development of this site although it remains to be safeguarded as a future road link. If any proposed road link comes forward, the effect on residential amenity will be a way of consideration. These are detailed matters that will be considered as part of the consideration of any planning application on Site 253.
		We are going to have traffic 24/7. Also our cottages are going to devalue	As above
		We will have no privacy what ever.	As above
		So can't other options be taken in to account of the road being so close.	As above
		Also the emergency road has to be moved	As above
Mr Dominic Fahey Individual	15th December 2005	Page 15: concerned about noise levels ie the loading and unloading of freight containers. The earth mounds should be as high as is physically possible. 4m might be adequate visually but it may not block the noise.	These are detailed matters that will be considered as part of the consideration of any planning application for development on site 253.

Consultee		Comments	Response
		Page 27: all lighting should face inwards and down.	As above
		Page 18: All highway construction and development diverting traffic away from residential areas should be completed before any construction to rail freight terminal starts.	As above
		Diversion measures must be put in place before any development. As quality is already at poor levels.	As above
		Page 26: if the landscaping is carried out prior to freight terminal buyer actually being found it will change the land use and it will become another industrial area, and the land will be lost to agriculture and the greenbelt hence rendering it waste land. The landscaping may not be suitable for other usages.	There is a clear expectation from the evidence presented at the UDP public inquiry that there is demand for this proposed development for a rail served warehouse. Any other industrial development will be against planning policy.
Mr John Maxwell Friends of Halebank	15th December 2005	We are concerned about the future of the Golden Triangle. Although there are no major companies based there, looked at as a whole, it is probably the largest source of employment for the inhabitants of Halebank. We understand nearly 300 hundred individuals are either employed or are self employed on the Golden Triangle. A significant portion of them live in Halebank. Since Asda closed, a considerable number of local jobs have disappeared. We believe it is important that local people can have local jobs they can reach on foot if necessary.	The Golden Triangle site has been identified as being suitable for housing development in order to help increase the population of Halebank and underpin the sustainability of the neighbourhood. It is of course up to the owners to decide whether they want to re-develop the site.
		It is our view that, whilst we understand the need to use the land for a different purpose, any local plan must have, as an absolute imperative, provision to "re-house" all of the Golden Triangle businesses within walking or cycling distance of the centre of Halebank.	Consideration will be given to help any businesses affected by redevelopment to find alternative premises.
		We are concerned that strict limits are placed on industries which deal with either toxic products or which create contamination. Further, unless the relief road is a certainty we are against any further industrialisation which may result in any increase in HGV traffic however small.	Existing Halton planning policies deal with pollution and risk matters. These are sufficient to deal with planning application proposals in the Halebank area. However new business developments will be restricted to B1 use in accordance with UDP Policy RG5 Action Area South Halebank.

Consultee	Comments	Response
	<p>The removal of HGV's is an absolute priority. In the main we approve of the ideas set out but they take no account of Hale Bank Road. Once the road schemes set out in purple have been accomplished. We see no necessity for there to be any HGV access to Merseyview Road from the West. If it remains, a natural shortcut for Liverpool/Speke/Garston traffic will be used by HGVs. We accept it is impractical to place a weight limit on Hale Bank road itself BUT there are no such impracticalities for Merseyview Road. The removal of HGV access in or out of Merseyview Road from the West will not cause any business premises to become inaccessible by road and is considerably easier to manage than any other form of control. Given the prospect of more residential property being developed on Merseyview Road, and it being the sole means of vehicular access to Pickerings Pasture, the removal of HGV's will improve that part of the environment as well as reducing the nuisance of HGVs on Hale Bank Road.</p>	<p>It is not proposed to prevent HGV's from using Halebank Road and entering Merseyview Road from the west. According to the Atkins Transport Study for Halebank, the numbers of HGV's using Halebank Road is low in comparison with those using Hale Road. The proposed link from Merseyview Road to Pickerings Road is an important part of the HGV diversion scheme for Halebank.</p>
	<p>We are concerned about the financing of these road relief schemes. Frankly we do not see that hoping for funding from developers is an appropriate approach. As we see it, the scheme would largely depend upon finding a developer for the Freight Park but none is yet forthcoming. Further, we doubt that any attempt to impose a Planning Condition to pay for roads specifically excluded from use by the developers or the users of a freight park, would survive Judicial Review in being too far detached from the actual User of the land in question.</p>	<p>Funding from developers can be an appropriate approach. Where the existing highway infrastructure is inadequate and there is a plan to improve it, new development should contribute to the cost of improving it. This is in line with Government Planning Policy on "Planning Obligations" (see Circular 1/93) and the use of "Section 106 Agreements" under the Planning Act. It is also in line with Policy S25 on Planning Obligations in the Halton UDP.</p>
	<p>Further, suppose no developers come along within a reasonable period of time? These "plans" will remain an interesting exercise to gather dust along with all the other regeneration plans for Halebank. We do not want interesting theoretical solutions which, apart from being something for a Planner to put on his or her CV at the next job application, have no practical benefit.</p>	

Consultee		Comments	Response
		We believe that Halton must reconsider its funding plans. It does seem to us that the funds may be available in any event. The Council seeks to develop landscaping around part of the Freight terminal. This is a planning consideration which ought properly to be imposed on the developer rather than, as it the present intention, being funded by Halton. As our submission on the Freight Depot points out, any such development is entirely premature in any event.	See below.
		We believe the cost of the landscaping etc. will be roughly the same as the cost for the new road scheme, although we are happy to be challenged on this point if we are wrong. These funds ought properly to be diverted to the more appropriate development of the relief road. If this is not possible, realistic funding alternatives must be explored otherwise the whole scheme will fail.	Noted. The SPD is a planning policy document and does not deal with funding matters for the infrastructure, except for that which can be achieved through the negotiation of planning obligations through Section 106 Agreements.
		We recognise the need for more housing in Halebank, with an emphasis on the type of properties which younger people can afford. Some reservations have been expressed about development on Clapgate Crescent but otherwise housing development as set out is acceptable.	Noted.
Dianne Wheatley GONW	16th December 2005	Section 7.14.2: the reference to 'requiring planning gain' should be changed to 'seeking planning obligations' as policy S25 refers to seeking contributions/s106 obligations	Noted. Text amended.
		Para 7.6: this paragraph refers to a new district centre. This is confusing in terms of the retail hierarchy: references in the UDP are to a neighbourhood centre/shopping area at Halebank. This section should be amended accordingly so that the appropriate scale of centre is indicated in the SPD: a district centre would be much larger than a neighbourhood centre: see PPS6 annex A. It should be made clear that the decision to re-site the centre was one which was subject to the development plan process, in accordance with PPS6. Reference should also be made to policy TC9 in the UDP	Noted. Text amended.
		Section 8.4: this should refer to the draft SPD on design of new industrial and commercial developments, in the same way that the residential development section refers to the residential design SPD, taking into account the need to make environmental improvements to the area.	Noted. Text amended.
David Hardman United Utilities		Map 7 of the three greenspaces shown, the north easterly one has two public sewers crossing. Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of underground/ overhead utility services.	Noted.

Consultee	Comments	Response
	The level of cover to our utility services must not be compromised either during or after landscaping works.	Noted.
	Map 8 Five of the six areas for improving visual quality through landscaping and boundary treatment include underground utility services.	Noted.
	Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of underground/overhead utility services. The level of cover to our utility services must not be compromised either during or after construction.	Noted.

Proposed Final Amendments

Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park SPD

Proposed amendments to text of draft SPD in response to representations.

Paragraph 3.5 – add the following text:

Sites outside the core areas for the freight park, as defined by the Halton UDP, are included in the wider boundary of the SPD. This is so that all land with the potential for development in association with the rail freight park is considered. It is also because it needs to take account of and control development on adjoining sites that may have an impact on the operation and possible expansion of the rail freight park. The policy of the SPD affecting adjoining land currently in industrial use is careful to point out that the existing use is expected to continue and would apply only if the existing use was to cease and be redeveloped. The SPD therefore gives explicit support to the rail freight park development on adjoining land and establishes the principles to be applied on it.

Reason

The Inspector's report of public inquiry into the Halton UDP and Policy E7 of the UDP both describe reasons for including land outside of the core area Sites 253, 255 and 256. This needs to be explained in the SPD.

Para.3.5 add paragraph suggested by the NWRDA as follows:

The North West Regional Development Agency envisages that Ditton will be developed as a modern inter-modal exchange, logistics and strategic rail freight facility serving, in particular, the needs of Merseyside, North Wales and the Cheshire sub-region, with potential links to Liverpool Airport and Port of Liverpool. We envisage that Ditton will:

- accommodate strategic distribution development;
- accommodate businesses that will utilise the railway for the transportation of freight; and
- provide a significant number of jobs for local people.

Strategic regional sites should act as flagship developments for the North West, accommodating the needs of inward investment and indigenous business. Standards of design, energy conservation, landscaping, quality of construction and urban design should ensure that all new development at the site contributes positively to environmental quality. There should be a presumption in favour of innovative and quality architectural design solutions on the site.

Reason

This reflects the part that the rail freight park will play in the wider economic development context for the North West region.

Paragraph 7.6 Accessibility

Amend second bullet point as follows:

- “Direct movement of goods vehicles from Site 253 to the local road network in Halebank will not be permitted except for emergency access”.

Amend third bullet point as follows:

- “A new road system is required to connect Sites 253, 255 and 256, and incorporates measures to actively discourage the direct movement of goods vehicles from these sites to the local road network in the Halebank area”.

Delete fourth bullet point and replace with the following:

- “A range of options have been considered within the Masterplan and SPD process for linking Site 253 to the A562 (Speke Road) and A5300 (Knowsley Expressway). It is considered that access to the A562 would be preferable by making use of a re-built Ditton Station bridge. Direct access to the A5300 (Knowsley Expressway) is not necessary for the development of Site 253, but the layout of the site should allow for this as a longer term possibility, avoiding Halebank Road except for emergency access.

Reasons

This is a reflection of the UDP Inspector’s report which concluded that access to the A562 may be possible by making use of a re-built Ditton Station bridge with separation of rail freight park traffic movements. He concluded that a new direct A5300 link need not be a requirement of policy. Subsequently the costs and feasibility of road links to Site 253 have been investigated and Network Rail are co-operating in a design solution to Ditton Station bridge. This has led to a preferred connection via a re-built bridge.

Add the following section:

Impact on Residential Areas

- “Development should include mitigation measures for noise and light pollution such as landscaped buffers and a separate road system for HGV’s as set out in the UDP Policy E7 and described more fully in this SPD.

Reason

Although the Halton UDP policies would require any development proposal for rail freight development to minimise its impact on the amenity of nearby residential areas, it is worth re-emphasising in this SPD.

Ease of movement

Delete the following text:

'For example, works to improve the footpath tunnel linking site C(255) to St. Michael's Road will be expected.'

Reason

This is no longer appropriate due to barriers resulting from the proposed creation of new road and rail links within the site.

Paragraph 7.6 Sustainability

Add to text "Some of these may need to be addressed as part of a formal Environmental Impact Assessment".

Reason

This is to make clear that certain development proposals will have to be assessed through an EIA in accordance with the EIA Regulations, and this will need to accompany any planning application.

Site A (UDP Site 253)

Amend text as follows:

Development Constraints

- adjoining Conservation Area on Halebank Road.
- sludge pipeline crosses the site but will need to be diverted to accommodate the proposed development

Development Principles

- Landscape buffers to south east and south west to screen the proposed rail served warehouse and associated infrastructure from surrounding residential areas, in order to minimise noise and light pollution.
- Proposed greenspace to western boundary. The exact position of this western boundary can be decided in more detail as part of any planning application, but development cannot encroach over the Green Belt boundary.

Delete bullet point

- "creation of road and bridge link to A5300/A562" and replace with

- “access to the A562 would be preferable by making use of a re-built Ditton Station bridge. Direct access to the A5300 (Knowsley Expressway) is not necessary for the development of Site A (253), but the layout of the site should allow for this as a longer term possibility, avoiding Halebank Road except for emergency access”.

Delete bullet point:

- “improvement of and access to Lovell’s Hall” and replace with
- “there is an opportunity to improve the site of Lovell’s Hall which is the remains of an ancient moated house and an “ancient monument”. Public access could also be improved, provided the monument is protected. A scheme should be drawn up in consultation with the Council’s advisor on conservation and archaeology and English Heritage”.

Delete bullet point

- “the provision of a road to link the site with other sites” and replace with
- “the provision of a road system to link Site A (253) with Site B (256) and Site C (255) within the DSRFP will be sought through a condition and/or planning obligation in order to discourage the movement of goods vehicles from the site to the local road network. This road system should also enable a link to the strategic road network via a re-built Ditton Station bridge to the A562”.

Reasons

These proposed amendments expand and explain the development principles, particularly with regards to clarifying the road access principles.

Site T

Add to “Amenity Open Space” as follows:

“only when the site is made safe for public access through a suitable land reclamation scheme”.

Reason

This is to make clear that the site, a former chemical tip, although having longer term potential for open space use can only be open to public access if made safe.

Add new Section 9 as follows:

Phasing

Following public consultation on the draft DSRFP SPD and the feasibility work that has been undertaken to consider the infrastructure requirements of the development of the rail freight park, the following phasing programme has been devised. This programme is necessary in order for the SPD to comply with Policy E7 of the Halton UDP. This requires that a 'phased strategic inter-modal rail freight park will be developed on land at Ditton, Widnes in accordance with an overall Masterplan to be approved as supplementary planning guidance'.

The phasing of development and infrastructure is as follows:

1. Development should commence on Site 255 in accordance with planning permissions granted for rail freight development.
2. Sludge main pipeline diversion on Site 253.
3. Implementation of structural landscaping on Site 253, in accordance with the planning permissions.
4. Design and planning permission for rail sidings on Site 256.
5. Design and planning permission for re-building of Ditton Station bridge.
6. Design and planning permission for east/west link road and link to primary route network to service Sites 253 and 255.
7. Construction of rail sidings of Site 256.
8. Re-construction of Ditton Station bridge.
9. Construction of east/west link to primary road network to service Sites 253 and 255.
10. Design and planning permission for the rail served warehouse on Site 253 .

Maps

Figure 3a Extract from Unitary Development Plan. Add key from the UDP for clarity and interpretation.

Figure 6 Delete public footpath link between Site C (255) and Ditton Road.

Reason

This is no longer appropriate due to barriers resulting from the proposed creation of new road and rail links within the site.

Halebank Action Area SPD

Proposed amendments to text of draft SPD (September 2005) in response to representations.

Paragraph 6.3.4 (6)

Delete

‘re-orientate businesses to face and use Pickerings road instead of Mersey view Road to create new access onto Pickerings Road and remove access onto Mersey View Road’

Change to:

“When an opportunity occurs, through redevelopment of existing premises, consider the re-orientation of individual premises to the north of Mersey View Road to create a new access onto Pickerings Road and remove any existing access onto Mersey View Road”.

Map 8

Delete symbol and key for ‘re-orientate businesses to face and use Pickerings Road instead of Mersey View Road’.

Reasons

It is acknowledged that this requirement would be too onerous and disruptive for existing businesses who rely on access onto Mersey View Road. However, if these premises become available for redevelopment, then this would be the opportunity to explore the feasibility of creating a replacement access onto Pickerings Road, thereby reducing heavy vehicle movements onto Mersey View Road.

Paragraph 6.3.1

Amend bullet point:

- ‘connecting the freight park to the A5300 at its western end’ and replace with
- ‘connecting the freight park to the A562’.

Reason

This is to ensure that this reference is in line with the relevant UDP policy and the DSRFP SPD that remains flexible about how Site 253 is connected to the strategic road network.

Paragraph 6.3.4 (3)

Amend ‘closure of access from the AHC warehouse site onto Foundry Lane’ and replace with ‘provide for a link from the AHC warehouse site onto the proposed new road link between Foundry Lane and Hale Road to allow for a road connection between the east and west parts of the proposed Ditton Strategic Rail Freight Park’.

Reason

This will allow for a road connection between Sites 253 and 256 to the west and Site 255 to the east, that is required by Policy E7 (f) of the UDP.

Maps 5, 7 and 9

Delete Option 2 for the proposed road link between Pickerings Road and Mersey View Road.

Reason

Option 1 is the preferred route for the link because it is a better and safer highway design for its junction with Pickerings Road, and it currently passes through undeveloped land. As such it would not require the relocation of any businesses.

Maps 7 and 9

Revise boundary for 'area reserved for future highway scheme'.

Reason

More detailed road design work has resulted in a change to the southern extent of any highway works, and this will in turn affect the area of land available for future housing development.

Paragraph 7.14.2

Delete 'require planning gain' and replace with 'section 106 planning obligations'.

Reason

This is to ensure the wording of the SPD is in line with the UDP Policy S25 that refers to seeking contributions/Section 106 obligations.

Paragraph 8.4

Add new Paragraph 8.4.3 as follows:

'New employment development should also conform with the Council's SPD on Design of New Commercial and Industrial Development (February 2006).

Reason

This SPD has been adopted subsequent to the preparation of the draft Halebank SPD.

Paragraph 7.6

Delete reference to 'District Centre' and replace with 'Neighbourhood Centre'.

Reason

In the retail hierarchy a 'District Centre' would be much larger than a 'Neighbourhood Centre'.