To: Members of the Development Management Committee

Councillors:

Chair – T McCarthy
Deputy Chair – J Richards

B Barr, J Davidson, G Friend, T Higgins, L Hoyle, C Jordan, L Ladbury, L Murphy, F Rashid and G Settle

17 October 2012

Development Management Committee
Thursday, 25 October 2012 at 6.30pm

Council Chamber, Town Hall, Sankey Street, Warrington

Agenda prepared by Julie Pickles, Democratic Services Officer – Telephone: (01925) 443212, Fax: (01925) 656278, E-mail: jpickles@warrington.gov.uk

A G E N D A

Part 1

Items during the consideration of which the meeting is expected to be open to members of the public (including the press) subject to any statutory right of exclusion.

Item 1. Apologies for Absence

To record any apologies received.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Code of Conduct - Declarations of Interest Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda no later than when the item is reached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2012 as a correct record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>Planning Applications (Main Plans List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


**Part 2**

Items of a “confidential or other special nature” during which it is likely that the meeting will not be open to the public and press as there would be a disclosure of exempt information as defined in Section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Planning Enforcement Investigation at Land to the Rear of Petersfield Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


*If you would like this information provided in another language or format, including large print, Braille, audio or British Sign Language, please call 01925 443322 or ask at the reception desk in Contact Warrington, Horsemarket Street, Warrington.*
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

4 OCTOBER 2012

Present: Councillor T McCarthy (Chair)
Councillors J Richards, B Barr, G Friend,
L Hoyle, L Murphy, G Settle
J Carter (substitute for Cllr Rashid),
P Carey (substitute for Cllr Higgins)

DM37 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jordan, Davidson,
Rashid and Higgins.

DM38 Code of Conduct – Declarations of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr G Settle</td>
<td>DM 42, 43, 44, 45</td>
<td>Cllr Settle was Chair of Warrington Nature Conservation Forum who have had access to the site during the restoration project, however Cllr Settle had not personally visited the site</td>
<td>Cllr Settle remained in the meeting and took part in both the discussion and voted thereon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DM39 Minutes

Resolved,

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 August 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

DM40 Planning Applications

Resolved,

That Pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 the applications for permission to develop land be considered and dealt with in the manner agreed.
The following application be deferred to enable a site visit to take place. It was noted that this application would be brought before the next Development Management Committee scheduled to meet on Thursday, 25 October 2012:

2012/20175 - Land At Doeford Close, Culcheth And Glazebury, Warrington, WA3 4DL - Proposed residential development comprising 26 dwellings (18 two storey detached and 8 mews type dwellings), access roads and landscape works.

Site visits to take place on Friday 19 October 2012.

DM41 2012/19820 – Land off Tannery Lane, Penketh, Warrington, WA5 2UD - Proposed stable block (resubmission of application 2012/19417)

The Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration submitted the above application with a recommendation of refusal.

Representations were heard in support of the Officer recommendation.

Resolved,

That application 2012/19820 be refused as recommended.

DM42 2012/20365 - Risley Landfill Site, Silver Lane, Warrington, WA3 6BY - Proposed variation of condition 1 on permission 2011/18326 to require the compound, plant and machinery to be dismantled and removed from the site at least 8 weeks prior to site restoration (to allow site restoration in accordance with the approved restoration scheme)

The Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration submitted the above application with a recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

Representations were heard in support of and in opposition to the Officer recommendation.

Resolved,

That application 2012/20365 be approved subject to additional conditions relating to the requirement of monthly monitoring reports in relation to the restoration progress of the site.

DM43 2012/20366 – Risley Landfill Site, Silver Lane, Warrington, WA3 6BY - Application for variation of conditions 2 & 3 of permission 2011/18957 to extend completion of site restoration from 19th October 2012 until, or before, 31st March 2015 and allow continued importation of leachate via site haul road from 19th October 2012 until, or before, the final placement of restoration soils or the implementation of the leachate discharge point at the existing
leachate treatment compound accessed via Silver Lane, whichever is the sooner

The Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration submitted the above application with a recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

Representations were heard in support of and in opposition to the Officer recommendation.

Resolved,

That application 2012/20366 be approved subject to additional conditions relating to the requirement of monthly monitoring reports in relation to the restoration progress of the site.

DM44 2012/20367 - Risley Landfill Site, Silver Lane, Warrington, WA3 6BY - Proposed variation of condition 4 on permission 2010/17206 to allow restoration of the site to be completed on or before 31st March 2015 in accordance with the approved scheme

The Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration submitted the above application with a recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

Representations were heard in support of and in opposition to the Officer recommendation.

Resolved,

That application 2012/20367 be approved subject to additional conditions relating to the requirement of monthly monitoring reports in relation to the restoration progress of the site.

DM45 2012/20604 – Moss Side Farm, Silver Lane, Risley, Warrington, WA3 6BY - Proposed extension of the existing leachate treatment facility to provide a new leachate discharge point accessed via Silver Lane at the former Risley Landfill site

The Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration submitted the above application with a recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

Representations were heard in support of and in opposition to the Officer recommendation.

Resolved,

That application 2012/20604 be approved as recommended.
Agenda Item 3

Signed………………………

Dated ............................
# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Thursday 25th October 2012**

**Start 18:30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>App number</th>
<th>App Location/Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012/20175</td>
<td>LAND AT DOEFDOR CLOSE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 4DL Proposed residential development comprising 26 dwellings (18 two storey detached and 8 mews type dwellings), access roads and landscape works</td>
<td>Approve subject to Sec 106 Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2012/19709</td>
<td>PROSPECT FARM, PROSPECT LANE, RIXTON-WITH-GLAZEBROOK, WARRINGTON, WA3 6EH Proposed change of use to provide a clay pigeon shooting club, clubhouse and associated parking</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2012/19993</td>
<td>LAND TO THE NORTH OF BOOThS LANE, LYMm, WARRINGTON Proposed stables</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2012/20372</td>
<td>CROSFIELD FILLING STATION, CROSFIELD STREET, WARRINGTON, WA1 1UD Proposed extension of time limit for implementation of 2009/14568 (Three storey office block with underground parking and associated landscaping)</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>2012/20433</td>
<td>WOOLSTON COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL, HALL ROAD, WOOLSTON, WARRINGTON, WA1 4PA</td>
<td>Proposed demolition of existing building and construction of a new single storey school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>2012/20462</td>
<td>LAND OPPOSITE GRAMMAR SCHOOL ROAD, LONGBUTT LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0BN</td>
<td>Outline application for proposed detached bungalow with matters of appearance, landscaping and scale reserved for later approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application Number: 2012/20175

Location: LAND AT DOEFDORD CLOSE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 4DL

Ward: CULCHETH, GLAZEBURY AND CROFT

Development: Proposed residential development comprising 26 dwellings (18 two storey detached and 8 mews type dwellings), access roads and landscape works

Applicant: Redrow Homes Ltd (lancashire division)

Recommendation: Approve subject to Section 106 Agreement

Conditions:
1. Development to commence within 3 years
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Energy statement to be submitted & low carbon initiatives incorporated
4. Tree protection scheme to be approved and implemented
5. No trees to be retained to be damaged
6. Finished floor levels shall not be set lower than 21.90m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD)
7. Scheme ensure no raising of levels within the identified 1 in 100 year floodplain submitted & approved
8. Surface water regulation system to be submitted and approved
9. Scheme for the management of overland flow submitted and approved
10. Landscape management plan to be submitted and approved
11. Materials samples to be submitted and approved
12. Parking spaces to be made available
13. Land quality investigation and remediation
14. Fencing to have minimum raised 10cm clearance ground level
15. Features suitable for use by roosting bats shall to be submitted to and agreed
16. Features suitable for use by breeding birds to be submitted and agreed
17. Scheme for the eradication of Himalayan Balsam to be submitted and agreed
18. Details of ponds within the site to be submitted and agreed
19. Landscaping Plan to be carried out no later than within 6 months of the date of commencement use
20. Lighting plan to be submitted and agreed
21. Management Company to be established
22. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 40m to be provided and retained
Description

- The proposal is for 26 family houses predominantly detached but some mews cottages.
- The layout is intended to address the key frontage to Doeford Close and to maintain a suitable stand-off distance to Jibcroft Brook and a combined sewer.
- Access to the proposed development would be taken from Doeford Close with three entrances.

Location

- The site is located approximately 1km to the north of the centre of Culcheth.
- It forms part of the former Newchurch Hospital site (a Victorian Mental Health Hospital).
- The site is reasonably level and currently consists of an area of maintained grassland.
- The land falls to the north of Doeford Close, which is an area of existing housing developed by Redrow Homes in the 1990s – the site is surrounded by agricultural (arable) land to the north and east – an area of public open space is located to the west, beyond which is a golf course – a railway line is located approximately 750m to the north.
- Jibcroft Brook runs adjacent to the northern boundary – tree cover is present along the westerly, northerly and eastern boundaries.
- The site is around 1.61 hectares in size.
Relevant History

- The land forms part of the former Newchurch Hospital site, which was redeveloped by Redrow in the 1990s to provide in excess of 200 new dwellings.
- The applicant states that the site was omitted from Redrow’s detailed proposals at that time because it was within a safeguarding zone of an explosives depot (operated by Orica UK Limited) at Glazebury.

Main Issues and Constraints

- Principle of Housing
- Residential Amenity
- Design Principles
- Highways
- Trees
- Flooding
- Noise
- Land Quality
- Ecology
- Archaeology
- Health & Safety
- Infrastructure

Key policy/guidance checklist

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
- Policy DCS1 Development Control Strategy
- Policy DCS2 Planning Obligations
- Policy DCS3 Engineering Services
- Policy GRN22 Protection and Enhancement of Landscape
- Features
- Policy HOU1 Housing Land
- Policy HOU2 Housing Development – Restrictions
- Policy HOU3 Housing Development – Development Control
- Policy HOU4 Open Space
- Policy HOU6 Housing Density & Mix
- Policy HOU13 Privacy and Daylight
- Policy HOU15 Affordable Housing
- Policy REP4 Protection of the Floodplain
- Policy REP5 Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage Systems
- Policy REP8 Land Contamination
- Policy REP10 Noise
- Policy REP14 Hazardous Uses / Installations
- Policy GRN4 Inset Villages
- Policy GRN18 Key Biodiversity Habitats and Priority Species
- Policy GRN21 Protection of Nature Conservation Resource
- Policy LUT1 Land Use / Transportation Strategy
- Policy LUT2 Transport Priorities in Development Control
- Policy LUT3 Walking
- Policy LUT5 Cycling
- Policy LUT7 Public Transport
- Policy LUT12 Transport Impact Assessments
- Policy LUT20 Parking
- Policy SOC1 Social Progress

**Core Strategy (CS) Emerging Policy**
- Policy CC1 Inset and Green Belt Settlements
- Policy CS1 Overall Spatial Strategy – Delivering Sustainable Development
- Policy SN1 Distribution and Nature of New Housing
- Policy SN2 Securing Mixed & Inclusive Neighbourhoods

**Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UDP</th>
<th>PRINCIPLE OF HOUSING</th>
<th>Insert Village Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU1</td>
<td>Housing Land</td>
<td>Site is within the defined settlement of Culcheth an Inset Village – new build development acceptable in such areas – proposal would not undermine regeneration objectives due to scale and represents low impact infill development within the wider context of Culcheth - no change to village boundaries proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU2</td>
<td>Housing Development – Restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOU15</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Housing Restraint Policies HOU1 and HOU2 of UDP seek to withhold the release of sites unless demonstrated that delay would prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN4</td>
<td>Inset Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Inset and Green Belt Settlements</td>
<td>successful future redevelopment – this approach not compliant with the NPPF - where policies are inconsistent NPPF policies take precedence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CC1     | Overall Spatial Strategy – Delivering Sustainable Development | Greenfield Status  
The site is considered to be previously undeveloped “greenfield” land – Core Strategy seeks to secure 80% of new housing is built on previously developed land - but does not seek to withhold the release of Greenfield land because it is forecast that the nature of supply within the Borough will ensure this 80 % target is met. The release of this site would not therefore compromise the achievement of this 80% “Brownfield” land target. |
| CS1     | Distribution and Nature of New Housing   | UDP Policy HOU1 identifies that permission should not be given for development on Greenfield sites – this conflicts with the NPPF – CS seeks to intentionally move away from this position in order to help maximise opportunities for affordable housing and ensure a more flexible and responsive forward supply of land. |
| SN1     | Securing Mixed & Inclusive Neighbourhoods | Affordable Housing  
Policy SN2 of the CS identifies requirement for 15+ units of 30% on site provision - the eight units proposed thus compliant with this – the units are on site and reasonably well integrated into the scheme - 50% of the required provision (4 units) should be for social rent and 50% (4 units) for intermediate housing – approach should also be tailored to ensure that residents of the village are considered for the housing before nominations are opened up more widely – section 106 recommended to secure this and ensure appropriate delivered. |
| SN2     |                                          | The principle of development is acceptable and adequate provision is made for affordable housing – to be secured via a section 106 agreement. |

| DCS1    | RESIDENTIAL AMENITY Development Control Strategy | Outlook / Privacy / View / Daylight  
The protection of long distance views over neighbouring land cannot be given any weight - this is distinct from the more immediate dominance of a building and the relevance of policy HOU13 retaining minimum separation distances between buildings, i.e. 21m between |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOU3</th>
<th>Housing Development – Development Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU13</td>
<td>Privacy and Daylight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

main face elevations, and 13m to side gable elevations.

All the proposed dwellings retain adequate separation distances to existing dwellings in excess of the minimum requirements set out within policy HOU13.

**The proposal would not have a materially harmful impact upon the living conditions of existing residential property.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS1</th>
<th>DESIGN PRINCIPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU3</td>
<td>Development Control Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Character**

It is stated that the proposed house types are based on Redrow’s award winning ‘Heritage Range’ but would be tailored to create a bespoke scheme - the houses provide a sufficient degree of variety and interest and are of a satisfactory appearance and would relate acceptably to their relatively low density context – car parking is not considered to be overly conspicuous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOU4</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU6</td>
<td>Housing Density &amp; Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP1</td>
<td>The Prudent Use of Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC1</td>
<td>Social Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Area**

Whilst the site is outside the Newchurch Conservation Area with no direct visual connection, vehicles accessing the site would pass through the Conservation Area - there is a duty to ensure that development preserves or enhances Conservation Area character – supporting information identifies the special character of the Conservation Area as the built form and its landscaped setting – this analysis is limited but proportionate having regard to proximity and potential for impact – increase in traffic would be small and not enough to result in a material change – approximately one additional vehicle movement every 3 minutes in
both the AM and PM peak hours - proposal would thus have a neutral impact and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

**Location**
Reference made to proximity of a high school, several primary schools, a public library, supermarket and two shopping areas – site is however on the periphery of the built up area so although facilities and services available within the Village they are not in immediate proximity.

**Housing Mix & Density**
The scheme is relatively low density with a limited mix of dwelling types consisting of 18 detached and 8 mews type properties - this is satisfactory having regard to the existing property types close to the site.

**Landscaping / Topology**
The applicant has aimed to design the scheme to allow a visual connection between Doeford Close and the northern tree belt - provision made for overlooking of public open space to the west with westwards orientation of principal elevation of plots 1 to 8.

**Construction**
Supporting information states construction specification would go beyond requirements of building regulations with all properties constructed to code for sustainable homes level 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS1</th>
<th>Development Control Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUT1</td>
<td>Land Use / Transportation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUT2</td>
<td>Transport Priorities in Development Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUT21</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUT3</td>
<td>Walking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permeability**
Limited scope for increased permeability as site bordered by Green Belt and open land on three sides.

**Public Open Space**
Linear hedge planting and an avenue of trees incorporated but no formal designated open space on site – existing area of public open space exists to the west of the site.

**Renewables**
Application does not include energy statement and there is at this stage no indication of any features that would reduce environmental impact - condition recommended to ensure full consideration as appropriate.

**The proposal demonstrates satisfactory design principles – conditions recommended as necessary to ensure that principles implemented appropriately.**

**Highways**

**Secondary Emergency Access Route**
The Warrington Design Guide for Residential and Industrial Estate Roads advises 100+ dwellings should be served by a secondary emergency access – current proposal increases numbers from 214 to 240 – potential route where a secondary access could be created (between Hutton Close and Public Right of Way 110 Culcheth and Glazebury) is in separate land ownerships – not therefore viable.

Cheshire Fire Service confirmed that they would not object to the proposals on this basis - secondary access link desirable rather than essential - measures to discourage double parking on the existing access routes to the site should be considered.

Although secondary access advantageous it is not considered that sufficient weight can be given to this sufficient to represent a determinative factor.

**Highway Layout**
Visibility splays of 2.4m by 40m satisfactory – condition recommended.
Widths of all 3 access routes serving the development accords with the Council’s minimum standard of 4.8m.

Internal turning heads in accordance with the Council’s design standards.

Plots 9, 10 and 17 revised to provide dropped crossings from Doeford Close, not kerbed accesses as previously proposed.

A turning head is proposed on the access serving Plots 1 – 8 - allows refuse vehicles to turn on site and exit in a forwards direction thus removing the need for reversing back onto the highway of Doeford Close – all accesses routes able to achieve this.

Parking Provision
Proposal to provide 85 spaces = 3.27 spaces per dwelling - excess of maximum standards of 2 spaces per dwelling - Cheshire Fire Service’s identify measures to deter parking on access routes – proposed level thus acceptable and would help ensure reduced demand for on street parking.

Likely Traffic Generation
TRICS trip rate database reviewed - assuming higher than average trip generation (i.e. using 85th percentile trip rates for robustness), the following trip rates and trip totals for the AM and PM peak hours can be expected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>Trip Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Estimated Traffic Generation**
Traffic generation of an average of one additional vehicle movement every 3 minutes in both the AM and PM peak hours anticipated.

Local Highway Network - Site Observations
WBC Highways have observed current traffic conditions at the junctions of Eddisford Drive / Twiss Green Lane and Twiss Green Lane / B5207 Common Lane in the AM and PM peak hours - site observations confirmed that minimal queuing and delay occurs at both of the above
junctions- accordingly, it is considered that an additional 1 vehicle movement every 3 minutes on this network would not be sufficient to justify a refusal on traffic capacity grounds.

Local Highway Network - Accident Review
Personal Injury Accident records covering the access route to the site (from Eddisford Drive and Doeford Close) have been reviewed by the Council’s Collision Investigation Unit - confirmed that there have been no recorded traffic accidents on the above access routes to the site in the last 5 years.

Supplementary Planning Document
SPD “Planning Obligations” reviewed – identifies £413 per additional daily trip to support implementation of the Council’s Local Transport Strategy - using trip rates provided by TRICS, calculation as follows:

\[
26 \times \left( \frac{\text{no of dwellings}}{3} \right) \times 5.320 \times \text{(daily trip rate per dwelling)} = \£413 = \text{£57,126}
\]

Applicant has agreed to contribute 50% of the SPD total (£28,563) to be used towards the implementation of pedestrian crossing facilities on the B5207 Common Lane / Hob Hey Lane.

Council’s Public Realm section has informed that various requests for the improvement of pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction of Common Lane and Hob Hey Lane have been received from residents and ward councillors over recent years.

A scheme for improvement of pedestrian crossing facilities at the Common Lane and Hob Hey Lane can be implemented for the identified sum – this will also offset the negative albeit limited weighting attributed to the lack of a secondary access – proposal acceptable from a highway point of view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRN22</th>
<th>TREES Protection &amp; Enhancement of Landscape Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall choice of planting satisfactory including native shrubs trees and climbers - majority of established stock to be retained and removals required for the development are minor in nature and mitigated by replacement planting – TPO in progress to secure the future of several trees of value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Requirement for adequate tree protection measures – condition recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLOODING</strong></td>
<td>Environment Agency (EA) flood maps currently suggest that parts of the northern section of the site are located in Flood Zones 2 and 3 – i.e. medium and high annual probability of flooding. Site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted which includes an additional hydrological and hydraulic modelling investigation of Jibcroft Brook to more accurately define the anticipated flood risk zones - outputs of this study resulted in a reduction in the anticipated floodplain extents within the site when compared with EA flood maps. EA have confirmed assessment is acceptable - all residential units should subsequently have their Finished Floor Levels (FFL) set at least 600mm above the corresponding 1 in 100 year (climate change) flood level – stated FFL is 21.90m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) – this is approximately 600mm above the indicated 1 in 100 year (climate change level) of 21.46m AOD and is therefore acceptable. Residential part of the site flood zone 1, with only the landscape buffer area to the north being subject to high flood risk - Sequential and Exception Test are not considered to be necessary. <strong>No objection to proposal from Environment Agency subject to controls relating to FFL’s, surface water, discharge rates, landscape management and land remediation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td>The application includes an assessment of the impact of railway noise – this concludes that the land is suitable for residential development and makes recommendations to mitigate impacts from the railway to the north of the site - these mitigation measures relate to the bedrooms of the houses in the north-east corner of the site and include the use of acoustic vents. The site may be subject to some noise from the surrounding transport networks however it is not considered likely that additional acoustic protection measures are likely to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

DCS1

REP10
| REP8 | **LAND QUALITY** | Ground investigations undertaken October 2007 and March 2008 - report identifies that ground contaminants present on site would not constrain residential development - localised remedial measures are likely to be required however.

**Condition recommended ensuring the necessary remediation undertaken.** |
| LAND Contamination |  |

| GRN18 | **ECOLOGY** | Priority & protected species
Bats present in the area and are likely to be feeding and commuting through and around the site - essential that lighting of the site is kept to a minimum and any that is required is directional to reduce light spill.

Inclusion of bat roosting features such as bat bricks, tiles or tubes (eg Schwegler 1FR, 2FR) suitable in this location and should be built into the design of the houses with additional boxes on any suitable trees – condition recommended.

Hedgehogs are present in the area and are suffering dramatic decline - site currently provides suitable habitat for this species but this will be lost through the proposed development - periphery habitat will remain but there is scope to accommodate hedgehog movement through the site by ensuring all fences are set 10cm from the ground – condition recommended.

House sparrows are a UK priority species along with starlings and as recommended in the report boxes should be installed through the development, numbers and locations of these should be shown on a plan - condition recommended.

**Landscape & biodiversity**
The scheme has been amended to introduce ponds to the northern part of the site.

Residential curtilages are outside the landscape buffer zone – condition recommended to ensure no encroachment.

Himalayan balsam present along the brook and within the site boundary and as such this will |  |
| Key Biodiversity Habitats and Priority Species |  |
| Protected Species |  |
| Protection of the Nature Conservation Resource |  |
need treating – condition recommended.

Areas close to brook and tree belts on the east and western boundary of the site should be kept dark – condition recommended.

**With suitable safeguards there would be no significant harm to habitat, protected and priority species and biodiversity interests.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REP14</th>
<th>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</th>
<th>Hazardous Uses / Installations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Health and Safety Executive have advised that if planning permission granted the external population density permitted in this zone would be exceeded – this would necessitate review of the license of the nearby explosive facility (Orica) – this may result in the facilities explosives capacity being significantly reduced, possibly putting its commercial viability in jeopardy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The planning application confirms that Redrow Homes and Orica have entered into an agreement to reduce the capacity for the storage of explosives at the Glazebury depot and apply to the HSE to revise the Explosive Storage Licence accordingly – letter from Orica states the company has been going through considerable change with its main production facility in Wigan closing and a replacement plant constructed in Scotland – less storage capacity thus required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With the safeguard of provision within the section 106 agreement to ensure that no development shall take place until the Explosives Storage Licence is amended, it is not considered that planning permission should be withheld on health and safety grounds and there are no apparent significant adverse commercial implications for Orica.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BH12</th>
<th>ARCHAEOLOGY</th>
<th>Ancient Monuments &amp; Archaeological Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No features currently recorded within the Cheshire Historical Environment record would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No archaeological constraints.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFRA-STRUCTURE</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation received from Children &amp; Young People’s Services that adequate capacity available in local schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS1</td>
<td>Planning Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS3</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Open Space / Children’s Play / Sport & Recreation

Requirement to address the functional public amenity aspects of the proposal - Council’s Supplementary Planning Document for Open Space and Recreation Provision establishes following:

- **Equipped play £18,576** (based on 26 x £714.48 per dwelling)
- **Public Open Space - site is adjacent to formal provision so further contribution would not required**
- **Recreation provision (sports and non-pitch sports) £24,310** (based on 26 x £935 per dwelling)
- **Given monies would be used to enhance existing provision a maintenance contribution is not required.**

A total of £42,886 agreed with applicant to ensure compliance with the Council’s approach to planning for open space and recreation provision.

Water

United Utilities have no objections to the proposal – request that site drained on a total separate system with only foul drainage connected into the public combined sewerage system and surface water discharged to soakaway/watercourse/surface water sewer – condition recommended for surface water regulation system.

Adequate infrastructure in place to accommodate development with safeguard of a legal agreement relating to contribution to children’s play and sport and recreation provision (£42,886) as well as affordable housing (30%), a highway contribution (£28,563) and reduction of explosive capacity at nearby facility.
Consultation Responses

Arboricultural Officer
No objections
Trees of quality retained – TPO recommended - full comments attached at Appendix

Archaeological Officer
No objections
No features affected – full comments attached at Appendix

Education
No objections
Confirmation that additional children could be accommodated within schools in the area at both primary and secondary level

Environment Agency
No objections
Finished Floor Levels (FFL) to be set at min 21.90m AOD - surface water, discharge rates, landscape management and land remediation also to be addressed– full comments attached at Appendix

Environmental Health
No objections
Land quality condition recommended - full comments attached at Appendix

Health & Safety Executive
No objections
License for nearby explosives storage facility would need to be reviewed– full comments attached at Appendix

Highways
No objections
Secondary access desirable but not essential – visibility, parking, traffic generation and road specification satisfactory – agreed contribution would allow for improved pedestrian crossing facilities at junction of Common Lane and Hob Hey Lane - full comments attached at Appendix

Nature Conservation Officer
No objections
Safeguards required to ensure no significant harm to habitat and protected and priority species– full comments attached at Appendix

Planning Policy
No objections
Proposal compliant with NPPF and emerging development plan – full comments attached at Appendix
Primary Care Trust
No comments received
None

Public Art Officer
No comments received
None

United Utilities
No objections

Responses to Notification

Councillors
Letter received from Councillor Chris Vobe
Requests that application presented to Committee for decision and site visit undertaken – additional comments attached in Appendix:

Culcheth and Glazebury Parish Council
Objection
Members wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the above planning application and request Committee site visit – full comments attached in the Appendix to this report;

1. Orica Exclusion Zone - sited close to an Orica UK explosives depot - “Explosion Safeguarding Zone” in place which has, in the past, prevented any kind of building on the land in question.
2. Greenfield sites in Warrington - policy is clear that development should take place first on brown field sites.
3. Traffic - affect on traffic flow in this part of Culcheth village would be near catastrophic.
4. Parking - the layout of the proposed affordable housing has altered considerable from Redrow’s consultation document - inadequate in terms of parking provision.
5. Loss of visual amenity - visual amenity that this land represents enjoyed for the past 20 years - potential for loss of light and overshadowing.
6. Mews Cottages - entirely out of keeping with the surrounding area and are in no way representative of the kind of properties already built in the vicinity.
7. Overdevelopment of the village - already significant overdevelopment of Culcheth village in the last two decades.
8. Sewer capacity - unlikely to be able to sustain an addition 26 properties.
9. Flood risk - boundary of the proposed development falls within the recognised “flood zone” from the flow of Jibcroft Brook.
10. Local employment, construction period and need - Redrow state that the construction work will bring jobs to the village and surrounding community - unlikely that the proposed 26 houses will be built in one fell swoop.
Conclusion - It is the view of both this Parish Council, and its individual members, that this application should be refused. Full support given to the residents of Doeford Close and the surrounding area in their objections and urgent commitment of Council sought to deny Redrow the opportunity for any development on the land in question.

Applicant response to comments of the Parish Council

1. Orica Exclusion Zone - Redrow and Orica collaborating on project and no development will take place in advance of changes to the exclusion zone - this confirmed by Orica. Greenfield Sites in Warrington - site forms parts of the former Newchurch Hospital and was previously excluded from the Green belt for this reason - falls on land that has been previously used which is defined as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (NPPF Annex 2) - likely that this land would have been redeveloped by Redrow in the 1990s, had it not been for the exclusion zone constraint.

2. Traffic - Comments from the Parish Council in regard to traffic are incorrect and based on perception, rather than robust evidence - formal Transport Assessment was not required to support the application in view of the size and scale of the proposal - it was accepted that any increase in traffic would be negligible - applicant not been made aware of any on-going highway safety issues - Twiss Green Primary school is located some 400 metres to the south of the site (pedestrian route), and some 800 metres to the south (via car) - Twiss Green Lane is a loop and it is possible to navigate the area onto the major highway routes without passing the primary school – NPPF that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe - Redrow consider that there would be no compromise in highway safety as a result of the proposed development and as such any impact would be negligible.

3. Parking – Scheme evolved with consultation process - additional car parking proposed for the affordable dwellings when compared to the scheme which was originally presented to the Parish Council – proposal adheres to Warrington BC’s parking standards.

4. Loss of Visual Amenity - site is private land permanently fenced off since the mid 1990’s and not assessed to be of any intrinsic landscape value and is not subject to any statutory landscape designation - would have been developed as part of the redevelopment of the former Newchurch Hospital site in the 1990s, had it not been for the exclusion zone constraint - proposed dwellings are also generously spaced and pay due respect to the privacy and visual amenity enjoyed by the occupiers of existing properties - spacing standards and guidance on interface distances are exceeded.

5. Mews Cottages - existing development surrounding Doeford Close contains numerous mews / terraced houses which important influence on the evolution of the design - cues from scale, aesthetics and materials from the nearby properties - not creating a pastiche but
taking a few important elements from these properties and utilising them on the proposed dwellings - mews cottages elevated and articulated to match the open market dwellings, and would be built using the same materials.

6. Overdevelopment of the Village - site falls within the boundary of Culcheth Village and provides a natural rounding off of the settlement in this area and would continue the themes established by the Redrow development in the 1990s - Culcheth is an established residential area with a variety of supporting village facilities and services - a modest addition to Culcheth village that contributes to the long-term sustainability of the village.

7. Sewer Capacity (we presume this refers to foul sewers) - detailed Drainage Strategy forms part of the planning application package, which does not raise any concerns regarding the capacity of the sewerage network - Redrow and their drainage consultant (AMEC) have been working with United Utilities (UU) from the inception of the scheme and all advice provided to date indicates that the site can be drained to the existing foul sewers which cross the application site - UU have not indicated any on-going issues with regards to the foul network - anticipated that should planning permission be granted, Redrow would need to comply with a planning condition which specifies how the site will be drained.

8. Flood Risk - A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted with the planning application prepared in consultation with the Environment Agency (EA) and confirms that a detailed assessment of Jibcroft Brook has been undertaken to ascertain an accurate flood zone extent adjacent to the development site - EA formally accepted those findings - residential boundary respects the extent of the agreed flood zone - flood zone will not be compromised as a result of the proposed development.

9. Local employment, construction period and need - Redrow Homes consider housing development is a key driver of economic growth and prosperity - also a strong need/demand for quality housing in Culcheth, including affordable housing.

**Neighbours**

**Letters of objection received from 186 residential properties**

1. No need for more housing.
3. Loss of greenbelt.
4. Decision should be deferred until Local Plan updated.
5. Major development in inset village - contrary to policy GRN4.
6. The site has always been a Greenfield site.
7. Reduction or elimination of the Safeguard Zone would be a change that should trigger a review of the Green Belt status of the field.
8. Affordable housing not in keeping with the area - easily visible and not dispersed throughout the scheme – should be pepper potted – should be located elsewhere within the borough via financial contribution.
9. Affordable housing would not be genuinely affordable.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (PRINCIPLE) – residential development acceptable on site in principle**

10. Loss of open land.
11. Loss of view.
12. Loss of privacy.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (RESIDENTIAL AMENITY)**

15. Proposed buildings out of character - use of white render and windows and doors inconsistent. Restrictive covenant for existing properties prevents painting of brickwork or use of render.
16. Overdevelopment of site.
17. Character of development not in keeping.
18. Position of car parking for mews properties unattractive.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (DESIGN)**

19. Additional traffic – congestion - safety issues - close to school - area already accommodates over 200 dwellings with estimated 500 private cars – inadequate parking provision – access road on a blind bend - construction traffic.
20. Additional reliance on the car as means of transport.
21. Members should visit the site during peak period 7.45 – 8.45am.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (HIGHWAYS)**

22. Loss of trees – buildings too close to trees.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (TREES)**

23. Flooding from Jibcroft Brook.
24. Whatever the results of the AMEC analysis might be, the EA Flood Zone designation stands until EA chooses to change it.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (FLOODING)**

25. Noise from railway.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (NOISE)**

26. Harm to animal species – several different species present on site - environmental impact.
27. Light pollution.

**Comment: See policy appraisal above (ECOLOGY)**
28. Site within safeguarding zone for hazardous installation – residential development should not be permitted so close.
29. Planning permission should not be granted until safety zone amended.

Comment: See policy appraisal above (HEALTH & SAFETY)

30. Impact upon infrastructure and services – education, shops, car parking, health, parking in village. Area already overdeveloped.
31. Concerns over the capability of the existing old Combined Public Sewer infrastructure.

Comment: See policy appraisal above (INFRASTRUCTURE)

32. Resident’s comments should not be summarised.

Comment: In order to ensure as concise a report as possible it is not practical to reproduce all submitted comments in full.


Comment: It is not considered that the human rights of nearby residents would be violated by the proposed development – impact upon living conditions and right to a family life are integral to several of the issues assessed above – also interest’s of individuals and the community / society as a whole have to be considered.

34. It could be agued that site should qualify as Green Belt, and possibly Village Green status.
35. Application should be ‘called in’ to secretary of state (section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act).

Comment: Section 77 allows the Secretary of State to give directions requiring certain applications for planning permission to be referred to him instead of being dealt with by local planning authorities – the current application does not fall into a category of development requiring such referral – the site is outside the Green Belt and is not a Village Green.

Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision

It is necessary to assess the proposal against a wider policy context than just the UDP and specifically the NPPF and policies within the emerging Local Plan Core Strategy. The principle of development is subsequently acceptable and there are no justifiable grounds to withhold consent having regard to the previous UDP policies relating to housing restraint. Provision made for 30% affordable housing would be subject of a section 106 agreement. Adequate separation is retained to existing properties and there would be no material harm to outlook or privacy. Layout and design of houses is acceptable with views to landscape belt to north retained and buildings of satisfactory appearance and character. Secondary access is desirable but not essential and visibility, parking, traffic generation and road specification all satisfactory. Agreed contribution would allow for improved pedestrian crossing facilities at
junction of Common Lane and Hob Hey Lane. Majority of established tree stock is to be retained and removals required for the development are minor in nature and mitigated by replacement planting. Finished Floor Levels (FFL) of 21.90m (AOD) is acceptable in respect of flood risk. Surface water, discharge rates, landscape management and land remediation can be satisfactorily addressed as necessary. The nearby railway line is a sufficient distance away so as not to significantly impact upon living conditions of future occupiers. Localised remedial measures are likely to ensure land suitable quality for residential use. Bats are present and lighting needs to be kept to minimum within the northern landscape belt. Provision can be made for bats, birds and hedgehogs and habitat in form of pond, tree/hedge retention and Himalayan balsam removal. No record of archaeological features on site. A reduction of capacity of the nearby explosive storage facility is necessary. Operational changes and agreement with developer have made this viable and inclusion within the section 106 provides assurance that changes would be in place before development commences. Adequate infrastructure is in place having regard to the scale of development proposed and the agreed financial contribution makes provision for equipped play and recreation. The proposal is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the relevant provisions of the Warrington Unitary Development Plan and the Emerging Core Strategy subject to the recommended conditions and a section 106 agreement to secure the financial contributions for equipped play / sport and recreation provision (£42,886), affordable housing (30%), highway improvements (£28,563) and reduction of explosive capacity at nearby facility.
Appendix – Consultees Full Comments

Arboricultural Officer
Further to examination of the proposal, the choice of plantings is satisfactory, including native shrubs / tree species and climbers. The overall retention of the majority of establishing stock is welcomed, minor removals required for the development are minor in nature and mitigated by replacement planting. I would however seek clarification of the positioning of the proposed heras type fencing on the northern and eastern boundaries and would suggest that on the northern boundary, the fencing is erected at 10m from the existing post and rail fence line and on the eastern boundary 10m or more if practicable from the existing thorn hedge line.

Given the impact of the development on the existing tree stock, I would suggest that the northern and eastern plantings receive the added protection of a preservation order and as such, I would welcome your comments and/or instruction as you see fit.

Comment: Tree Preservation Order in process

Archaeological Officer
No features currently recorded in the Cheshire Historic Environment Record would be affected by the development and I advise that further archaeological mitigation will not be required. It may be useful to know that I was contacted by Cass Planning, agents to the applicants, concerning this site in April and informed them that I was unlikely to recommend any further archaeological mitigation for the reason outlined above. A copy of this response is set out below:

“I have checked the data held in the Cheshire Historic Environment Record and confirm that no sites currently included in the record lie within your area of interest. In addition, I have taken the opportunity to check the readily-available historic mapping and aerial photographs and have not noted anything of interest. In these circumstances, I do not think that further archaeological mitigation would be justified and, on present evidence1 I would not advise Warrington Borough Council that further archaeological work was required if a planning application were to be submitted”.

Councillor Chris Vobe
“Once again, I find myself raising concerns about the paperwork issued in respect of a DMC meeting and once again the bone of contention lies with an application within the Culcheth ward.

You will observe that the paperwork for the application to situate over 20 dwellings at Doeford Close is woefully incomplete. Shades of the inaccuracies surrounding the papers issued in respect of the HMS Gosling application earlier this year creep to mind.

The papers, whilst referencing the comments submitted by Culcheth and Glazebury Parish council, omit the objection submitted individually by me as a
Borough Councillor, and by individual Labour members of Culcheth and Glazebury Parish Council who represent this part of the village.

They also omit to mention the 54 objection forms, signed by 107 individual residents in the vicinity of this application, which I hand delivered to the Town Hall this week. Each contain comments which DMC members should be made aware of, and each are the legitimate views of electors within this Borough that the members of the planning committee have a right to see and consider. The same debacle happened with Gosling, when papers were issued that contained inaccuracies in respect of the public's objections.

Sorry, but this is no good. The public’s faith in the WBC planning department is at rock bottom, and confidence in open and transparent decision making is lacking. Inaccuracies such as this go no way towards stemming the tide. At the end of the day, councillors are (rightly) held to account for the decisions that are made at DMC. The decision making process is hindered, nay obfuscated, if they are deprived of information and comments which may alter the way they look at a given application.

The papers should be revised and re-issued.”

Comment: The original committee report was prepared prior to the receipt of additional written objections via Councillor Vobe – this updated report incorporates the comments submitted which reiterate previously received objections.

CULCHETH & GLAZEBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Orica Exclusion Zone
The area of proposed development is sited close to an Orica UK explosives depot. There is an “Explosion Safeguarding Zone” in place which has, in the past, prevented any kind of building on the land in question. Residents in Doeford Close and the surrounding estate have been entered onto an emergency contact database, designed to provide them with alerts in the event that an emergency incident takes place. This Safeguarding Zone still exists, and at no time has it been suggested to the local populace that the situation is otherwise. Orica UK have never communicated with residents in this area of the Culcheth and Glazebury parish to indicate that there has been any amendment or abolition of the Safeguarding Zone. It is simply not feasible, nor realistic; to allow development to take place on this land while such a Zone remains in place.

Greenfield sites in Warrington
The land on Doeford Close is, quite specifically, a Greenfield site. Warrington Borough Council’s own policy is clear that development should take place first on brown field sites. With current strategy presuming in favour of “brownfield first”, it is complete contravention of the council’s own guidance to commit to a development on Greenfield land when brownfield sites elsewhere in the Borough have yet to be built on.
Traffic
It is abundantly clear that the affect on traffic flow in this part of Culcheth village would be near catastrophic were this development allowed to go ahead. On the practical side of things, there is only one exit from the estate onto the nearby Twiss Green Lane – which, incidentally, already suffers from its own congestion problems and is difficult to navigate at peak times. The addition of these properties would simply add to the congestion difficulties suffered by residents in this area. There are around 250 properties already on the estate. This is a naturally car-dependent area, since it is distanced from the centre of the village and the nearest school and shopping facilities. The single point of entrance and exit would be unable to accommodate the proposed addition of 26 houses and their vehicles. There have already been a number of incidents in the past few years which have involved pedestrians and cars in this area. Couple that with the fact that the area around the nearby Twiss Green Primary School remains heavily congested during peak hours, the development would unquestionably create a traffic situation which the road network in this part of Culcheth could not cope with and which, in the long term, would be unsustainable. Members of the parish council do wholeheartedly support the comments submitted by local residents in respect of the safety concerns that this development may bring.

Parking
The layout of the proposed affordable housing has altered considerably from Redrow’s consultation document. The proposed set up is now desperately inadequate in terms of parking provision.

Loss of visual amenity
The development, were it to go ahead, would result in a considerable loss of visual amenity. Residents of Doeford Close and nearby roads have enjoyed the visual amenity that this land represents for the past 20 years. When other land in the town exists that has not been earmarked for development, it is both unsatisfactory and incomprehensible that this visual amenity should be taken away. There is also the potential for loss of light and overshadowing.

Mews Cottages
The proposed eight Mews Cottages are entirely out of keeping with the surrounding area and are in no way representative of the kind of properties already built in the vicinity.

Overdevelopment of the village
There has already been significant overdevelopment of Culcheth village in the last two decades. New housing has been provided at (amongst others) Culcheth Hall Farm Barns, the Newchurch Hospital Estate, Petersfield Gardens, Swinhoe Place, Langcliffe Close, Pendle Gardens and Newsholme Close. The addition of 26 houses to this area of land is therefore unwelcome and undesirable, given that there has been no simultaneous increase in the amenities, services and facilities offered in the nearby area to accommodate them.
Sewer capacity
The sewer system in this part of the village is unlikely to be able to sustain an addition 26 properties. The system here serves a significant portion of Culcheth village already and there are already recorded incidents of residents on the Newchurch Hospital estate highlighting the odours and foul smells emanating from the system – particularly during periods of hot weather. Additional houses would only exacerbate this problem.

Flood risk
The boundary of the proposed development falls within the recognised ‘flood zone’ from the flow of Jibcroft Brook. It is, at best, questionable whether such a development should be permitted so close to the flood zone, when recently-commissioned reports highlight the fact that this area remains at risk.

Local employment, construction period and need
Redrow state that the construction work will bring jobs to the village and surrounding community. Since the process for building the existing estate was one of “build only what we can sell” and coupled with the current economic climate, it is unlikely that the proposed 26 houses will be built in one fell swoop. Redrow’s assurance of sustainable local jobs is, therefore, somewhat dubious and the sporadic building process is also indicative of a lack of need in the Warrington area for these type of houses.

Conclusion
It is the view of both this Parish Council, and its individual members, that this application should be refused. We give our full support to the residents of Doeford Close and the surrounding area in their objections and seek Warrington Council’s urgent commitment to denying Redrow the opportunity for any development on the land in question.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

Flood Risk
Our flood maps currently suggest that parts of the northern section of the site are located in Flood Zones 3 and 2, which are defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as having a high and medium annual probability of flooding from rivers and the sea.

The applicant has submitted a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in support of their planning application, which was undertaken by AMEC Environmental & Infrastructure UK Limited (their ref: Final Report 12185i1, May 2012). Their assessment of flood risk also included an additional hydrological and hydraulic modelling investigation of Jibcroft Brook to more accurately define the anticipated flood risk zones within the application area. The outputs of this study have resulted in a reduction in the anticipated floodplain extents within the site when compared with our own flood map.
During various pre-application discussions about this site we have had some involvement in reviewing the modelling exercise and have subsequently concluded that the assessment is generally fit for the purpose of supporting development proposals on the site.

During those discussions we had advised that all residential units should have their Finished Floor Levels (FFL) set at least 600mm above the corresponding 1 in 100 year (climate change) flood level. Referring to drawing number CUL-ENG-02 (Vehicle Swept Path Analysis) it would appear that the minimum proposed FFL on the development is 21.90 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD). This is in the region of 600mm above the indicated 1 in 100 year (climate change level) of 21.46m AOD and is acceptable in principle.

As such, we are of the view that the proposed development will only meet the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policy if the following planning conditions be imposed on any planning approvals - no raising of ground levels within the identified 1 in 100 year floodplain - finished floor levels are set no lower than 21.90m (AOD) - provision and implementation of a surface water regulation system.

In line with the Water Framework Directive, the required SUDS scheme linked to development within flood zone 3 should have biodiversity benefit as good ecological potential may be compromised by the loss of natural floodplain functionality within domestic and landscaped settings e.g. gardens. Flood risk management functionality provided by e.g. an underground storage tank would have no biodiversity benefit and hence the development would result in a net loss of ecological potential along this stretch of main river – recommended conditions - management of overland flow from surcharging of the site’s surface water drainage system

**Landscape management plan**
This needed to ensure that the landscape within the site is managed in such as way as to protect and enhance the ecological value of the site including the Jibcroft Brook and floodplain.

The scheme shall include the following elements:
- detail extent and type of new planting (NB planting to be of native species)
- details of maintenance regimes
- details of any new habitat created on site
- details of treatment of site boundaries and/or buffers around waterbodies
- details of management responsibilities

**Contamination**
We have reviewed the AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UL Limited, Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study (May 2012), with respect to potential risks
posed to controlled waters from potential land contamination.

Based on the reviewed information, the site has not been associated with significantly contaminative historic land uses. However, the site is located in a sensitive location with regards to controlled waters – condition recommended.

**Flood Defence Consent & Land Drainage Byelaw Consent**

Please advise the applicant that under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws (North West Region) the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any works or structures located in, under, over or within 8 metres of the bank top of Jibcroft Brook, designated “main river”.

**Environmental Health**

The application was supplied with a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA), and a number of potential pollutant linkages were identified and recommendations made. The conclusion of the risk assessment was to carry out a Phase II intrusive investigation. [Land contamination condition recommended].

The site may be subject to some noise from the surrounding transport networks however it is not considered likely that additional acoustic protection measures are likely to be required – standard fit glazing should provide adequate acoustic protection.

**Health and Safety Executive**

From the plans it is clear that the development falls within the consultation distance of the nearby explosives facility licensed by the HSE. Based on the information provided, the Explosives Inspectorate has considered the effect that the explosives operations allowed under the licence might have on the new development. If this development is allowed to proceed, the external population density permitted in this reference zone for this explosives facility will be exceeded. Our conclusion is that whilst the probability of a major accident involving explosives is low, the consequences to people at the development could be serious.

Therefore I advise you that should planning permission be granted for the development, the Explosives Inspectorate would review the explosives facilities licence. The planning authority may wish to note that this review may result in the facilities explosives capacity being significantly reduced, possibly putting its commercial viability in jeopardy.

The planning authority may wish to discuss the development with the licensee of the explosives facility before making its decision. The licensee is Orica UK Ltd, contact Mr Andy Rossiter on 01257 256100. We would be grateful if the planning authority would advise the Explosives Inspectorate at the above address of the outcome once a decision has been made.
Comments of Orica
Orica UK Ltd over the last 18 months has been going through considerable change with its main production facility at Roburite, Wigan closing and a replacement plant constructed at its Muirside Depot in Scotland.

Changes have also been made at the Glazebury Depot, Culcheth where UK market conditions have meant a reduction in the supply of traditional packaged explosives to more site mixed bulk explosives.

In supplying these changing market conditions Orica requires less explosive storage capacity.

The company still intends to use all of the buildings on the Glazebury Depot Site with licensing arrangements likely to be modified such that there will be a reduction in the amount of explosives each magazine can hold and the change of use of some buildings.

Orica has consulted with the HSE and written to Warrington Borough Council informing them that if the Council is minded to approve the planning application submitted by Redrow at Doeford Close, Orica will commence the necessary explosive storage reductions application so that the current safe guarding distances can be reduced eliminating the current impediment to the proposed development.

HIGHWAYS

Further to highways comments issued on the 3rd August 2012, revised plans have been received and the following comments are now offered.

Proposed Development
The application seeks approval for proposed residential development comprising 26 dwellings (18 two storey detached and 8 mews type dwellings, access roads and landscape works).

Secondary Emergency Access Route
Previous highways comments noted that the Warrington Design Guide for Residential and Industrial Estate Roads advises that developments in excess of 100 dwellings should be served by a secondary emergency access, and that the proposals would increase the number of properties served from the single access of Eddisford Drive from 214 to 240.

WBC Highways therefore requested that the applicant investigates the feasibility of delivering a secondary access to serve the proposals.

Subsequently, the applicant has confirmed that the route where a secondary access could potentially be created (between Hutton Close and Public Right of Way 110 Culcheth and Glazebury) is in two separate land ownerships.
Further research by WBC Highways has confirmed that the above information accords with current Land Registry records and that provision of a secondary access via this route may also affect additional land ownerships.

**Consultations with Cheshire Fire Service**

In respect of the above issue, WBC Highways have consulted Cheshire Fire Service to determine whether a planning objection would be forthcoming from the Fire Service given that a secondary access route is not proposed.

In an email to WBC Highways of the 7th September 2012 the Fire Service has confirmed that they would not object to the proposals on this basis, and would consider provision of a secondary access link as desirable rather than essential.

The Fire Service also advise that measures to discourage double parking on the existing access routes to the site should be considered.

In view of the above land ownership constraints and a lack of objection to the proposals from Cheshire Fire Service, WBC Highways accept that a secondary access cannot be insisted upon as part of this application.

**Proposed Site Plan**

Revised proposed site plan (drawing number CDC/DSL/001/Rev A) has been received. This incorporates a number of amendments, in response to previous highways comments.

1. Visibility splays of 2.4m by 40m are now shown from all three proposed accesses onto Doeford Close. This is acceptable.

   Provision and maintenance of the proposed visibility splays should be ensured via way of planning condition.

2. The proposed widths of all 3 access routes serving the development now accords with the Council’s minimum standard of 4.8m.

3. Internal turning heads within the accesses have been increased in size to generally accord with the Council’s design standards.

4. Plots 9, 10 and 17 are shown to be served from dropped crossings from Doeford Close, not kerbed accesses as previously proposed.

5. A turning head is now proposed on the access serving Plots 1 - 8. This is welcomed, as it will allow refuse vehicles to turn on site and exit in a forwards direction thus removing the need for reversing back onto the highway of Doeford Close.

The proposed site plan is therefore acceptable.
Proposed Servicing Arrangements
Further to previous highway comments, a revised swept path analysis (drawing number CUL-ENG-02 Rev A) has been provided by the applicant.

This demonstrates that a refuse vehicle can now satisfactorily enter all accesses, turn on site and exit in both directions onto Doeford Close in a forward gear.

The proposed servicing arrangements are therefore acceptable.

Proposed Parking Provision
It is noted that the planning application forms confirm that it is proposed to provide 85 car parking spaces to serve the development. As 26 dwellings are proposed, this equates to provision of 3.27 spaces per dwelling.

Such provision is in excess of the Council’s adopted maximum standards which permit a maximum of two spaces per dwelling.

However, in view of Cheshire Fire Service’s comments that measures to deter parking on access routes should be considered, provision of additional parking over and above the Council’s adopted maximum standards, as proposed, is likely to be beneficial in that it can be expected to reduce the need for on street parking in the vicinity of the proposed development.

The proposed parking provision is therefore acceptable.

 Likely Traffic Generation
The nationally accepted TRICS trip rate database has been reviewed in order to determine likely traffic generation arising from the proposals.

Assuming higher than average trip generation (i.e. using 85th percentile trip rates for robustness), the following trip rates and trip totals for the AM and PM peak hours can be expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>Trip Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>Departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Estimated Traffic Generation

As can be seen from the above, it is likely that the proposed development would result in traffic generation of an average of one additional vehicle movement every 3 minutes in both the AM and PM peak hours.
Local Highway Network - Site Observations
WBC Highways have observed current traffic conditions at the junctions of Eddisford Drive / Twiss Green Lane and Twiss Green Lane / B5207 Common Lane in the AM and PM peak hours.

Site observations confirmed that minimal queuing and delay occurs at both of the above junctions.

Accordingly, it is considered that an additional 1 vehicle movement every 3 minutes on this network would not be sufficient to justify a refusal on traffic capacity grounds.

Local Highway Network - Accident Review
In terms of local highway safety, the Personal Injury Accident records covering the access route to the site (from Eddisford Drive and Doeford Close) have been reviewed by the Council's Collision Investigation Unit.

It has subsequently been confirmed that there have been no recorded traffic accidents on the above access routes to the site in the last 5 years.

Supplementary Planning Document
The Council's Supplementary Planning Document “Planning Obligations” (approved by the Council’s Executive Board on the 17th September 2007) has been reviewed. This seeks to secure a financial contribution of £413 per additional daily trip arising as a result of proposed development, in order to support implementation of the Council’s Local Transport Strategy.

In this instance, using trip rates provided by TRICS, the calculation for transport improvements would be as detailed below:

\[26 \text{ (no of dwellings)} \times 5.320 \text{ (daily trip rate per dwelling)} \times \£413 = \£57,126\]

In respect of the above, an email from the applicant received on the 30th August 2012 confirms an offer to contribute 50% of the above SPD total (£28,563) to be used towards the implementation of pedestrian crossing facilities on the B5207 Common Lane / Hob Hey Lane.

The Council’s Public Realm section has informed that various requests for the improvement of pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction of Common Lane and Hob Hey Lane have been received from residents and ward councillors over recent years.

In respect of the applicants proposed contribution of £28,563, the Council’s Public Realm section has confirmed that a scheme for improvement of pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction can be implemented for this sum.

The above financial contribution is therefore welcomed.
Conclusions

In view of the above, no highways objections are raised in respect of the proposed development, subject to a S106 agreement securing payment of £28,563 towards the implementation of sustainable transport improvements.

Should planning permission be granted we would also request attachment of the following planning condition:

"Prior to first occupation of the dwellings, visibility splays of 2.4m x 40m, as shown on drawing number CDC/DSL/001 Rev A, shall be provided from all access points in both directions on Doeford Close, and shall be retained thereafter with nothing being erected or allowed to grow above a height of 0.6m within the splays unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority."

Additionally, the following informative is also offered:

"In order to construct the proposed site access roads to a standard capable of future adoption, the applicant will need to enter into a S.38 agreement with the Council. To action, the applicant is advised to contact Chris Bluck, the Council’s Highways Adoption Engineer on 01925 442688."

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT OFFICER

Legislative Context

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006 places a duty on Local Authorities to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. In the context of planning applications, conserving Biodiversity includes restoring and enhancing species populations, as well as protecting them. When this duty is taken into consideration with the NPPF, as an authority Warrington Borough Council need to ensure that when granting any planning permission it would not conflict with these policies. The results of any surveys and landscape master plans will be used to determine this when considering any planning permission.

One of the key aspects of NPPF 11: Conserving & Enhancing the Natural Environment is that planning decisions should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and incorporates it into and around developments. Where a planning decision would result in significant harm to biodiversity and geological interests which cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated against, appropriate compensation measures should be sought. If that significant harm cannot be prevented adequately mitigated against, or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Public authorities have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. This Duty was introduced by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act and came into force on 1 October 2006. Through the NPPF the Government has indicated that local
authorities should take steps to further the conservation of habitats and species of principal importance through their planning function and promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of ecological networks.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Implement the Habitats Directive. Schedule 2.40 (1) of the Regulations makes it an offence to deliberately capture, kill or disturb a member of a European Protected Species or to damage or destroy the breeding site or resting place of such an animal. These Regulations require all local planning authorities in the exercise of their functions to have regard to the provisions of the Habitats Directive so far as they might be affected by those functions.

Supporting information
This application is supported by an Ecological Appraisal (ERAP Ltd) Nov 2011 which was carried out to nationally recognised standards by suitably qualified persons. Whilst the survey was carried out at a sub optimum time of year I have no cause to disagree with the findings of the survey.

No protected species were found to be at this location and the development will have no direct impact on any designated sites. There is currently a variety of vegetation on the site which will provide habitat for invertebrates, birds and small mammals including bats. Through any proposed development I would expect to see these species catered for within any landscaping proposals.

Priority & protected species
Bats are present in the area and are likely to be feeding and commuting through and around the site. Therefore its essential lighting of the site is kept to a minimum and any that is required is directional to reduce light spill. The tree canopy areas and Jibcroft brook zone must remain dark. A mature ash was noted in the ERAP survey as having potential feature suitable for use by bats. This tree’s trunk sits just outside of the site’s eastern boundary and is shown on the submitted plans as being retained. Provided there will be no impact to this tree there is no further requirement for detailed investigation to determine use by bats.

The inclusion of bat roosting features such as bat bricks, tiles or tubes (eg Schwegler 1FR, 2FR) would be suitable in this location and should be built into the design of the houses with additional boxes on any suitable trees. These require careful sighting as guided by an ecologist.

Hedgehogs are present in the area and are suffering dramatic decline. The site currently provides suitable habitat for this species but this will be lost through the proposed development. The periphery habitat will remain but there is scope to accommodate hedgehog movement through the site by simply ensuring all fences are set raised 10cm from the ground, this information should be shown in any relevant plans and conveyed to contractors.
House sparrows are also a UK priority species along with starlings and as recommended in the report boxes should be installed through the development, numbers and locations of these should be shown on a plan.

The applicant is reminded that under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981(Section 1) (as amended) it is an offence to take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Planning permission for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this Act. Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1 March and 31 August. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and should be assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates unless survey has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.

**Landscape & biodiversity**

The site holds a number of mature trees which make up important linear features on the site, the majority of these are proposed to be retained through the development, and Tree Preservation Orders on these groups would be supported.

The proposed site layout plan as submitted and commented on at the pre-app stage in February 2012 showed a pond located towards the north eastern side of the site at the top of the access road near plots 21 & 22. This feature has been omitted off the submitted plans. A pond at this location is welcomed and would be seen as a biodiversity enhancement to the site, this should be added to any plans minded to be approved and include details for size, depth and any aquatic planting. There has previously been a pond on site as identified in the ERAP survey and a replacement would be appropriate through the proposed development.

The site is bordered to the immediate north by Jibcroft Brook, it’s noted that the development will leave a landscape buffer zone between the development and this feature which is welcomed. This buffer should remain in perpetuity for the life of the development and should be left undeveloped which includes a restriction on garden expansions by the adjacent properties. This is to protect the brook and riparian habitat.

The Ecological Appraisal survey noted native species were not present within the site boundary but did note Himalayan balsam (Impatiens glandulifera) is present along the brook. From my site visit in Spring Himalayan balsam was present within the site boundary and as such this will need treating, the spread of this alien species is prohibited under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981. Without measures to prevent its spread as a result of the development there would be the risk of an offence being committed and avoidable harm to the environment occurring. Therefore we advise that a detailed method statement for the removal or long-term management /eradication of Himalayan Balsam on the site is undertaken, this can be achieved via a condition.
The development will no doubt result in an increase in lighting within the site. Lighting has a negative impact to many nocturnal species and habitat corridors such as the brook and tree belts on the east and western boundary of the site should be kept dark.

Hedges are proposed within the landscape scheme as indicated on drawing number 4103.02. The species detailed for these hedges are Beech (Fagus sylvatica) and Box (Buxus semperivens). A length of hedge is proposed along the sites western boundary along with additional areas around plots 10, 17, 19 and to the front of other properties. These locations are welcomed but the species mix should be replaced with that of the native shrub mix as a native hedgerow which would be more appropriate for this rural location and more beneficial for UK priority farmland birds which are a material consideration. With regards to the detailed mix I would recommend reducing the percentage of Prunus spinosa to 10% and supplementing it with 5% Lonicera periclymenum.

The ERAP survey noted a hedgerow (H1) to the sites eastern boundary which is not an ‘important hedgerow’ as classified under the Hedgerow regulations however it is UK priority habitat and should be retained and protected through the development. It would also be beneficial to improve this hedgerow by infill planting in any gaps.

The wildflower meadow mix is welcomed however details are required as to how this area will be established and maintained (including access provision for any mowers to aid cut and lift operations). This information could be provided within the condition as suggested by the Environment Agency. As discussed above this area to the north of the site does hold Himalayan balsam however and will require treating for this prior to any works within this area. The soil will hold a seed bank and any disturbance/movement of the soil could cause this non native invasive plant to spread.

PLANNING POLICY

The Development Plan
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into effect on 27th March 2012 and introduced new transitional arrangements for development plans. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF is the most relevant in clarifying the status of existing policies within Warrington because Warrington’s policies, saved beyond 2009 from the UDP by the Secretary of State, do not automatically benefit from the provisions set out in paragraph 214 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework [the NPPF]. It further states that the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given, i.e. the determining factor as to how much weight can be attributed to any of Warrington’s existing policies is therefore the degree of conformity between that policy and the NPPF.
The NPPF also identifies at paragraph 216 with regards to emerging Local Plans (Development Plans) that:

*From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight relevant policies in emerging plans according to:*

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); and;
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and;
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

The provisions of paragraph 216 are particularly pertinent in Warrington given the Council published their emerging Local Plan Core Strategy for formal ‘publication’ consultation on 21st May 2012. There have been no significant objections to the policy approaches of relevance to this application within the plan in previous rounds of consultation and hence the Local Plan Core Strategy is considered to constitute a significant material consideration in the determination of planning applications from this point forward. A formal statement which confirms the exact weighting to be attached to policies will be issued by the Council post the 6th July when formal consultation has closed and analysis of responses is complete.

**Assessment of the Proposal**

The application site is within the defined settlement of Culcheth which is defined through the existing UDP as an Inset village. The emerging Local Plan rolls forward this designation and proposes no change to the village boundaries.

Policy CC1 of the Council’s emerging Local Plan Core Strategy identifies that within Culcheth, new build development will be allowed providing such proposals comply with national policy and are sustainable by way of reference to Policy CS1. This approach essentially continues the approach of UDP Policy GRN4.

Policy SN1 of the Council’s emerging Local Plan Core Strategy identifies that the Council will support “small-scale, low impact, infill development” within all of the Borough’s defined settlements. The proposed development appears to be small-scale in nature when considered within the context of the wider village. The extent to which it can be regarded as ‘low-impact’ however is evidently dependent on more detailed matters and hence is a matter for the consideration of the development management officer. If impacts associated
with the proposal are however concluded as being within acceptable limits, then the proposal is acceptable in principle from a planning policy perspective.

With regards to assessment against UDP Policies HOU1, HOU2 and the Managing the Housing Supply SPD, it is not considered that the proposal would undermine the key objectives which underpin these policies i.e. the proposal (owing predominately to its scale) is not considered to compromise regeneration efforts. Whilst these policies have previously sought to withhold the release of sites, unless it can be demonstrated that a delay in developing the site would prejudice its successful future redevelopment, this element of the policy is not considered to be compliant with the NPPF. Paragraph 215 makes clear that where policies are inconsistent with the NPPF then (as is the case in Warrington) the NPPF should take precedence.

Whilst the applicant contends that the site should be regarded as previously developed land, it is my opinion that the site should be regarded as Greenfield. Whilst accepting that the site was once within the curtilage of the former New Church hospital, the land now subject to this application was understood to have fulfilled playing pitch purposes and as such constituted open and undeveloped space.

Whilst the Council’s emerging Local Plan Core Strategy seeks to secure that 80% of new housing is built on previously developed land, the resultant policy approach does not seek to withhold the release of Greenfield land because the nature of supply within the Borough should ensure that this target is met. The release of this site would not therefore compromise the 80% target being achieved and as such there is no objection to the release of the site.

Whilst it is acknowledged that UDP Policy HOU1 identifies that permission should not be given for developments on Greenfield sites, this is also considered to conflict with the NPPF. The Council’s emerging Local Plan Core Strategy also seeks to intentionally move away from this position, in order to help maximise opportunities for affordable housing and importantly ensure a more flexible and responsive forward supply of land, and I see no reason on this occasion why this more pragmatic approach should not prevail.

Policy SN2 of the Council’s emerging Local Plan Core Strategy identifies that the Council will require schemes of 15 or more units, on sites out with Inner Warrington, to make 30% of the total number of units available as ‘affordable’ provision – a requirement which would apply to this proposal. The provision of eight affordable units would therefore have to be made to ensure compliance with Policy SN2. Policy SN2 identifies that the affordable provision should be on-site and I see no reason why a departure from this approach would be justified on this occasion.

Policy SN2 also specifies that 50% of the required provision (4 units) should be for social rent and 50% (4 units) for intermediate housing. This mix, alongside actual onsite provision, should therefore be appropriately secured. Similar to previous agreements within the Borough’s outer lying villages I see no reason why such an approach could not be tailored to ensure that
residents of the village are considered for the housing before nominations are opened up more widely.

Conclusions

In conclusion it is considered appropriate to assess the proposal against the NPPF and policies within the Council’s emerging Local Plan Core Strategy. By way of reference to policies of relevance the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to 8 of the 26 units being secured as on-site affordable housing provision.

UNITED UTILITIES

This response is based on the details submitted on the planning application form.

With reference to the above planning application, I will have no objection to the proposal provided that the following conditions are met:

- This site must be drained on a total separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the public combined sewerage system. Surface water should discharge to the soakaway/watercourse/surface water sewer and may require the consent of the Local Authority.
- If surface water is allowed to be discharged to the public surface water sewerage system we will require the flow to be attenuated to a maximum discharge rate equivalent to the existing Greenfield run-off rate.
- Several public sewers cross the site and therefore a modification of the site layout, or a diversion of the affected public sewer at the applicant's expense, may be necessary. To establish if a sewer diversion is feasible, the applicant must discuss this at an early stage with (John Lunt) Developer Enquiries Analyst by email, planning.liaison@uuplc.co.uk, contact No. 01925 678305, as a lengthy lead in period may be required if a sewer diversion proves to be acceptable.
- A water supply can be made available to the proposed development.
- Our water mains will need extending to serve any development on this site. The applicant, who may be required to pay a capital contribution, will need to sign an Agreement under Sections 41, 42 & 43 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

A separate metered supply to each unit will be required at the applicant's expense and all internal pipework must comply with current water supply (water fittings) regulations 1999.

Should this planning application be approved, the applicant should contact our Service Enquiries on 0845 7462200 regarding connection to the water mains/public sewers.

United Utilities offer a fully supported mapping service at a modest cost for our water mains and sewerage assets. This is a service, which is
constantly updated by our Property Searches Team (Tel No: 0870 7510101). It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any assets that may cross the site and any proposed development.

Please note, due to the public sewer transfer, not all sewers are currently shown on the statutory sewer records, if a sewer is discovered during construction, please contact a Building Control Body to discuss the matter further.
Reason for referral

This application has been referred to Committee in view of the objections received from Birchwood Town Council and Councillor Brinksman (who also recommends that members visit the site prior to reaching a decision) and comments received from Councillor Keane.

Proposed development

- Proposed change of use of former agricultural land to provide a clay pigeon shooting club, clubhouse and associated parking
- site covers an area of 3.76 hectares
- proposal includes:
  a) 34 car parking spaces
  b) clubhouse building- 14.6m x 15m x 3.2m (high)- incorporating café'(12m²), store (8m²), shop (5m²), kitchen(17m²), internal training/sitting area (126m²) and external decking area (124m²)
  c) 10 timber acoustic shooting enclosures (3m x 15m x 2.4m high)
  d) 10 timber air rifle enclosures (3m x 15m x 2.4m high)
  e) 5 timber archery enclosures (3m x 15m x 2.4m high)
  f) 15 individual timber 1.5m x 1m x 2.3m high) acoustic enclosures
  g) 3m wide internal pathway

- The application seeks to retain the previously constructed 2m high earth bunds to the south and west perimeters, and proposes a further earth bund to the west and south-west - existing 2m high earth bunds exist to the south perimeter
- native trees have been planted on parts of the site and additional planting is proposed as part of the planning application
• a 4m high timber observation tower
• 4 new vehicle passing points to be constructed to south-east of site on Prospect Lane
• applicant states that 10 new jobs would be created (together with retention of 5 existing jobs)
• the site would be only be used on the following days/times:
  
  Tuesday - 10am to 3 pm
  Thursday - 10am to 3 pm
  Saturday - 10am to 3 pm

• applicant states that the site would be used by individual shooters and group parties (not exceeding 15 people) and special event days (i.e.: charity/corporate events) may also take place with groups not exceeding 15 people
• the site is currently in use for clay pigeon shooting and mounds/hardsurfaced area/structures have already been placed on the site without planning permission. Material has been imported onto the site and to create the soil mounds/hardsurfaced area and 2 wooden buildings have also been erected. If planning permission is not granted it would be appropriate to consider enforcement action to secure the removal of the previously undertaken works.

• Retrospective planning permission was also previously sought under a separate application (ref: 2011/19014) for the retention of works previously undertaken to an existing private track to the north of Holly Bush Lane (to the south of the application site. Clay pigeon shooting activities can/have been undertaken on the site under the permitted rights contained in the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 – Schedule 2, Part 4, Class B, which allow such activity to take place for 28 days in any calendar year without the need for planning permission

• a previous application (ref: 2011/19010) also sought confirmation (via a Lawful Development Certificate) that an existing 2 metre high timber post and mesh fence which has been erected around the perimeter of the site is development that is permitted by virtue of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. Members may recall that decisions on the above applications were deferred, pending the outcome of the current planning application

Location

• The site lies approximately 2 kilometres to the north of the existing junction of Manchester Road and Holly Bush Lane
• The land lies within the Green Belt and lies immediately to the south of the Warrington/Manchester railway line
• To the north of the existing railway line lies Risley Moss (a Special Area for Conservation/European Site of International Importance), whilst Woolston
Moss Site of Importance for Nature Conservation is located approximately 150 metres to the west.

- Vehicular access can be gained either via Holly Bush Lane (from the A57) or via Prospect Lane the east). Prospect Lane is a designated public footpath, whilst the access track to the site itself is a privately owner track.

**Applicants' Supporting Statement**

- approval of the application would provide essential/secure training to both amateur and professional shooters
- the applicant is a British Association for Shooting & Conservation (BASC) accredited shotgun coach
- there are currently 300 members of the BASC in Cheshire/Warrington but only 1 accredited BASC facility at Mouldsworth
- site has/will be used to host fund raising/charity events for national/local charities (eg: National Society for the Prevention of cruelty to Children, Macmillan Cancer Support, Help for Heroes, Alzheimer's Society)
- application is supported by the National Disabled Shooters Club
- 10 new jobs would be created and 5 existing jobs retained
- facility would attract £200,000 in consumer expenditure in first year and £400,000 in year 3 supporting local hotels, food, retail and leisure industry
- bulk of site given over to landscaping - 8000 trees planted/in process of being planted - trees/shrubs will eventually mitigate any noise disturbance
- site designed to allow inclusive access for wheelchair users

**Relevant History**

- 2011/18349 - Change of use of land to provide clay pigeon shooting club - Withdrawn
- 2011/19009 - Change of use of land to provide target shooting club with associated parking - Withdrawn
- 2011/19010 - Certificate of Lawfulness application for 2 metre high fencing - Deferred at Development Management Committee on 8th March 2012 to enable consideration concurrently with planning application 2012/19709 for the wider development of the site.
- 2011/19014 - Retrospective application for upgrade of existing track surface - Deferred at Development Management Committee on 8th March 2012 to enable consideration concurrently with planning application 2012/19709 for the wider development of the site.
Comments
Applications 2011/19010 & 19014 remain undetermined, previous applications withdrawn in view of objections received from consultees

Main Issues and Constraints

- Visual impact on green belt/countryside - appropriateness in green belt
- Ecological impact
- Impact on amenity of adjoining residents - (noise/disturbance)
- Impact on traffic and highway safety
- Agricultural land quality
- Safety of users of railway line/pedestrians/adjoining land owners

Key policy/guidance checklist:

National Planning Policy Framework

Warrington Borough Council Unitary Development Plan
Policy DCS1 – Development control strategy
Policy REP10 - Noise
Policy GRN1 – Green Belt
Policy GRN2 – Environmental Protection & Enhancement
Policy GRN3 – Development Proposals in the Countryside
Policy GRN15 – Sites of International Importance for Nature Conservation
Policy GRN17 – Sites of Local Importance for Nature Conservation
Policy GRN22 – Protection & enhancement of landscape features
Policy DCS7 – Provision & enhancement of landscaping in new development
Policy REP1 - Prudent use of resources
Policy REP10 - Noise
Policy GRN9 - Outdoor activities in the countryside

Warrington BC Local Plan Core Strategy
Policy QE5 - Biodiversity & Geodiversity
Policy QE6 - Environment & Amenity Protection
Policy CC2 - Protecting the Countryside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on residents (noise/disturbance)</th>
<th>DC Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCS1</td>
<td>Outdoor activities in the countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN9</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP10</td>
<td>paras' 109 &amp; 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- large number of residential properties located within 2 km of application site likely to suffer from reduction in existing level of amenity due to gunfire being audible from application site - 20 houses within 1km (on Holly Bush Lane), between 45-75 houses located within the general direction of shooting within 1.5 km of the site and between 200-300 dwellings (to the
north at Birchwood) would be to the rearward direction of shooting

- prevailing wind from south/south-west/north west would increase audibility of shooting to residential area to north
- levels of noise would not be significantly above ambient noise levels but would be audible from surrounding residential areas as an irritating/irregularly spaced/impulse noise, out of character with existing relatively low level steady forms of noise currently existing - gunfire would be immediately apparent to large number of surrounding residents and discernible from existing background noise leading to a reduction in the existing level of amenity enjoyed by residents
- proposed acoustic shelters/direction of shooting would assist in mitigating harm but not to a sufficient degree to overcome such concerns
- proposal conflicts with policies GRN9, DCS1 and paragraphs 109 and 123 in the National Planning Policy framework - it is not considered that the fall back position (i.e. the use of the site for shooting for no more than 28 days in any calendar year) is of such significance in this respect bearing in that the proposed use of the site would be 5 times greater in terms of the total number of days over which shooting (and hence disturbance) would take place
- harmful noise impact also felt
| **Green Belt/visual impact on countryside** | **National green belt policy** | • Low level timber buildings/mounds (majority of buildings/enclosures 2.4m high/main club house building 3.2m) does not result in significant harm to openness of the green belt - 1.3% of site would be covered by buildings, 4% of site covered by paths/parking area - 96% of the site therefore remains landscaped/open - majority of buildings spread across site - would be seen as insignificant structures amid rural landscape - clubhouse larger buildings but low height, unlikely to be viewed as significant "building" bearing mind planting/mounds which surround the site |
| **GRN1** |  | • National planning policy advises that "appropriate" buildings for outdoor sport/recreation are appropriate development in the green belt provided they maintain openness of the green belt and prevent urban sprawl/encroachment in the countryside/merging of towns - no conflict in this instance - surrounding land almost predominantly open/agricultural- existing gap between urban areas almost 4 km - no reduction as a result of the development- site visually/physically enclosed |
| **GRN2** | Environmental Protection & Enhancement |  |
| **GRN3** | Development Proposals in the Countryside |  |
| **National Planning policy Framework** | Para’s 79-92 |  |

| **Highway safety** | **Development control strategy** |  |
| **DCS1** | Land use/transportation strategy |  |
• No technical objection to level of traffic using/accessing facility – proposed passing places would allow vehicles to pass on narrower stretches of Prospect Lane to Moss Side Lane thereby integrating with existing highway network without harm to highway safety – passing places avoid need for vehicles to reverse – speed of vehicles low/naturally regulated by width/surface of tracks – ensures pedestrian users of Prospect Lane would not be put in danger as a result of the additional traffic associated with the use – not considered that harmful disruption/conflict between traffic/pedestrians using the footpaths would therefore result

• Applicant intends to encourage all traffic visiting/leaving the site would do so via Moat Lane and Prospect Lane by highlighting the route/preferred route on their web site/by placing a “Turn Left” sign (advising those leaving the site to use Prospect Lane rather than Holly Bush Lane). In addition, should planning permission be approved it would be conditional upon the applicant funding a “No Access (Except for Residents & Farm Vehicles)” Traffic Regulation Order (enforceable by the Police) preventing general vehicles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ecological Impact</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sites of Importance</strong></th>
<th><strong>Protection Measures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRN15</strong></td>
<td>Sites of International Importance for Nature Conservation</td>
<td>Sites of National Importance for national importance from accessing the site via the Manchester Road/Holly Bush Lane route – such measures would ensure that vehicles associated with the site only accessed the site via Moss Side Lane/Prospect Lane rather than from Manchester Road/Holly Bush Lane and would prevent potential highway safety concerns by preventing vehicles using a sub-standard junction (in terms of visibility splays) and protecting the amenity of existing dwellings on Holly Bush Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRN16</strong></td>
<td>Sites of National Importance for national importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRN17</strong></td>
<td>Sites of Local Importance for Nature Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRN18</strong></td>
<td>Key biodiversity habitats &amp; protected species</td>
<td>• Application site located 85m from Risley Moss which is a European Site of International Importance/ a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Local Nature Reserve with shooting ranges located approximately 150 metres to the south/south-east – sites designated in view of habitats and wide range of breeding/wintering wildfowl &amp; raptors (birds of prey) and to provide public access to areas of natural beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRN21</strong></td>
<td>Protection of nature conservation resource</td>
<td>• Site lies within 1km of Rixton Clay Pits – also a SSSI and European Site of International Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRN2</strong></td>
<td>Environmental protection &amp; enhancement</td>
<td>• Risley Moss is an internationally important site supporting a range of endangered bird species at all times of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
<td>Para 109, 118</td>
<td>the year (i.e. from winter feeding times to summer feeding/breeding territory) – applicants’ own ecological assessment accepts that the development would deter raptors from utilising Risley Moss and that already declining farmland birds in the local area will also be affected as a result of the development – the raptors include protected birds (who are very sensitive to the sound of gunshots in view of their association with grouse shooting/upland areas – the species affected are therefore likely to retreat from their current favourable habitat or leave the area completely – many of the species affected are species which are in either global or European decline/concern, whose numbers/breeding population have declined considerably or are in decline in the UK - the development would therefore conflict with policies GRN16, 17 &amp; 18 via the adverse affect on the integrity of the ecological importance of the SSSI and Local Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Core Strategy</td>
<td>Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE5</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not considered that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP1</td>
<td>Prudent use of resources</td>
<td>the reasons for the development or any social/economic benefits arising would outweigh the need to safeguard the nature conservation value of the adjoining land or surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP2</td>
<td>Protection of best and most versatile agricultural land</td>
<td>• Application site classified as Grade 1 on the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries &amp; Food map (from 1983) – map indicates land quality at the regional scale – applicant has undergone assessment of site and concluded that the land would be better described as Class 2 in view of water logging/wetness on parts of the site – NPPF describes best/most versatile land as either Grade 1 or 2 – loss of best/most versatile land relatively small scale – not considered significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 96% of site (over 3.3 hectares) would remain undeveloped/open/natural and therefore capable of being reverted back to agricultural use if required – permitted development rights likely to be utilised were planning permission to be refused (enabling use of site for clay pigeon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shooting for 28 days per year) – although detailed assessment not undertaken by applicant highly unlikely that alternative site for clay pigeon shooting could be identified on lower grade agricultural land or on previously developed land elsewhere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety of users of railway line/pedestrians/adjoining land owners</th>
<th>Environmental Protection &amp; Enhancement</th>
<th>Development proposals in the countryside</th>
<th>Hazardous uses/installations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRN3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Safety considerations would be considered via the necessary application for a firearms licence, under the Firearms Act 1968 - no objections from Police – relevant licence has been issued
- Nearest public footpath located 260m to south of site – nearest shooting ranges (firing in direction of footpath) set 335m from footpath – Chartered Institute of Environmental Health guidance document advises that a minimum safety zone of 275m should be maintained (in front of the shooting stands) within which no public highways/footpaths/bridleways etc should be located – this would be the case in this instance

Responses to Notification

Birchwood Town Council
Objects - proposal totally unacceptable of a number of reasons:
- Proximity to noise-sensitive developments.
- Proximity to SSSI.
c) Proximity to other conservation and recreation areas.
d) Proximity to Public Right of Way.
e) Proximity to other developments.
f) Inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
g) Lack of demonstrable need.
h) General material considerations regarding noise pollution (from gunfire and any public address systems) and resultant detrimental impacts on amenity of surrounding residents, distress to animals and increase in the sound of dogs barking.
i) Environmental impacts not thoroughly assessed such as impacts on land and water quality from chronic accumulation of lead shot - advice not sought from the Environment Agency or United Utilities.
j) Security of storage of equipment and shooting supplies questioned.

Comment
See assessment under policy assessment

Rixton with Glazebrook Parish Council
Object:
  a) Application should be considered by full committee
  b) concerned about traffic impact on unmade roads with limited passing places
  c) concern at public safety adjacent/near site to users of public footpaths
  d) possible danger to users of adjacent railway line
  e) affect on Rixton/Risley Moss nature conservation areas in terms of the rare wildlife, birds and flora/fauna
  f) visual impact on green belt via hard surfacing and buildings
  g) proposed landscaping consists of mounds and trees – proposed planting not boundary treatment but normally planted in copse - unacceptable
  h) noise nuisance
  i) traffic routing cannot be enforced – use of other local roads is still possible/an issue

Comment
a) to h) – see policy appraisal
i) Planning conditions unable to control traffic routeing, however use of Traffic Regulation Order, signage and routeing strategy proposed should ensure that all vehicles use Moat Lane/Prospect Lane access rather than via Manchester Road/Holly Bush Lane

Councillor Settle
Objects on the following grounds:
Nothing has changed from the previous application. Serious concerns for the welfare of birdlife on Rixton Moss which includes extremely rare, protected and Red Listed species. The applicant has developed his plans to the point of near or actual completion despite WBC’s advice not to do so. Requests Members visit the site prior to making a decision
Comment
See comments under policy appraisal

Councillor Bowden
Views to be reported

Councillor Keane
Democratic approach welcome whereby all parties get to out their views to Committee prior to a decision.

Councillor Brinksman
Objects on the following grounds:
a) Proposal retrospective as engineering works have been carried out without consent against WBC's advice to cease.
b) Official classification of agricultural land grade unclear.
c) Loss of amenity to residents, lifestyle & culture in a rural part of town.
d) Substandard vehicle access.
e) Loss of wildlife including migratory birds.
f) Damage already done by unlawful works including earth imported during nesting period & destruction of typical rural lane only meant for light agricultural vehicles with hardcore and planings.
g) Access via Holly Bush Lane & Moss Side Lane possible to the detriment of residential amenity.
h) Loss of tranquil area, asset to town & greenfield for leisure users far outweighs the needs of a shooting club.
i) Committee site visit recommended and consideration by full Development Management Committee.

Comment
a) Majority of works are retrospective, however planning application needs to be assessed in normal way. Enforcement action would follow any refusal of planning permission
b) see comments under policy appraisal
c) d) e) f) g) h) i)– see comments under policy appraisal

Network Rail
No objections, subject to details of any further earthworks in close proximity to the railway line to be agreed beforehand with Network Rail

Environment Agency
No objection, subject to foul and surface water drainage details to be submitted

Natural England
No Objection, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure proposed activities do not destroy or damage features of the SSSI including access to SSSI for post noise monitoring and conditions 5.6-5.11 of the Breeding Bird Report. If suitable conditions cannot be provide, English Nature would have concerns about the development proposed.
Comment
Conflicts with advice of Warrington BC Natural Environment Officer – not considered possible to word conditions that would mitigate the concerns of Natural England – conditions would not be able to ensure that should protected bird species leave/not return to the area, further noise mitigation measures would resolve harm

Campaign for the Protection of Rural England
Objection - Inappropriate development in terms of impacts on wildlife, residents and local roads. Loss of agricultural land and continued adverse impact into the future.

Comment
See policy appraisal

Civil Aviation Authority - Aerodrome Standards Department
No objection - Provides general comments in principle given regarding safety of aerodromes, which is a matter of Public Interest, and recommend consultation with operators (including Barton Aerodrome) by the LPA.

Comment
Confirms acceptability in relation to adjoining airstrip

Warrington Nature Conservation Forum
Objects on the following grounds:
Nothing has changed from the previous application. Serious concerns for the welfare of birdlife on Rixton Moss which includes extremely rare, protected and Red Listed species. The applicant has developed his plans to the point of near or actual completion despite WBC's advice not to do so.

Comment
See policy appraisal

Health & Safety Executive
Views awaited

National Grid Pipelines
Views awaited

Comment
Likely that changes to location of activities on site is such that any concerns with regard to the location of the shooting activities to the existing natural gas pipelines is now acceptable

Police
No objections

WBC Natural Environment Officer
Objects on the following grounds:
Activities/noise from gunfire would result in disturbance/ unacceptable impact on bird species using the SSSI which is contrary to national planning policies and in direct conflict with section 28 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act. Landscaping/ trees proposed not sufficient to remove this impact, some species of which would be inappropriate in this setting. Great Crested Newt survey required establishing presence or otherwise of protected species required in relation to proposed passing places required before planning permission is granted. Watervole survey needed to determine if this species are present/ using the ditch proposed to be culverted.

Comment
See policy appraisal

WBC Environmental Protection
Objects on the following grounds:

- Gunfire (and especially the irregular impulsive source of noise that it creates) would be an unacceptable irritant to large numbers of adjoining local residents, resulting in harm to the existing level of amenity enjoyed.
- noise from gunfire on some part of Risley Moss and Rixton Clay Pits would have significant impacts on users of those areas bearing in mind close proximity and prevailing wind direction
- tree planting/fencing/restrictions on number of shooters/acoustic shielding et would lessen but not overcome harm identified above

Comment
See policy appraisal

Warrington BC Highways Section
No objection, subject to conditions to ensure passing places are provided/signage details (to route traffic along Prospect Lane) rather than Holly Bush Lane/a scheme to ensure that parking restrictions are provided at junction of Holly Bush lane and Manchester Road

Comment
See policy appraisal

WBC Legal Services
Licensing of guns & gun clubs generally is handled by the Police.

Neighbours
358 individual objections received and two petitions (signed by 269 persons) objecting on the following grounds:

1) proposed landscaping will not disguise daily amount of gun noise- flat nature of local landscape of the moss results in sound travelling easily - noise will be intrusive/disturbing/irritating to local residents/wildlife/walkers/joggers/anglers/horse riders over wide area -
noise will disturb hundreds of residents of Gorse Covert & Birchwood - conflicts with Policy GRN9 of Local Plan - noise survey submitted by applicants not considered appropriate/accurate

2) Risley Moss nature reserve (SSSI)/Woolston Moss/Rixton Clay PitsGorse Covert Mounds located very close- site are important for biodiversity/nature conservation - bats/hares/swallows/house - noise will affect breeding patterns/nesting birds/wildlifemartins/owls/buzzards/skylarks/lapwings/partridge/pheasants/ migratory geese/curlews - gunfire will harm ecological importance of area and harm protected species - applicants own ecological assessment acknowledges that harm to protected species would result

3) Holly Bush Lane/Prospect Lane- poor condition/unsuitable- already suffer via current use - majority of traffic likely to originate from Warrington/west (satellite navigation systems direct via Holly Bush Lane) and therefore access via Holly Bush Lane rather than Prospect Lane - Holly Bush Lane unsuitable/poor visibility onto Manchester Road (A57 recently designated Red Route) - passing places not on land under control of applicant therefore not enforceable - Holly Bush Lane not maintained/owned by Warrington BC

4) Proposed use will harm surface and noise will impact on residents/wildlife - existing use of airstrip has damaged surface of Brook Lane

5) agricultural land is high quality - good quality land would be lost - applicants assessment of land as Grade 2 incorrect - moss land always likely to be prone to wetness - even at Grade 2 land should be considered best/most versatile land - Borough Portrait designates site as Grade 1 - no need for development - site was previously cropped with carrots - adjoining land continues to be cropped successfully

6) will undermine green belt designation - results in harm to openness - mounds conflict with openness bearing in mind flat terrain - no very special circumstances exist to outweigh harm to green belt

7) bearing in mind that works have already been commenced on site, integrity of planning process is of concern - should not approve retrospective development - blatant disregard for planning laws - unauthorised tipping works have caused visual damage and left unsightly material in full view

8) would spoil enjoyment of tranquil countryside

9) existing other clay pigeon facilities at Thelwall, Frodsham, Eccles, Worsley - no overriding need for new site such as this

10) hundreds of tonnes of waste material deposited on site previously - not easily removed contrary to applicants statement

11) charity/fund raising use of site commendable, however development inappropriate in this location - application is a commercial venture - no evidence from disabled groups supporting application - job creation benefits should be weighed against harm

12) clubhouse would become source of noise nuisance

13) will increase crime/thefts in local area

14) will increase dust via use of local tracks

15) would compromise safety of walkers/pedestrians using local footpaths/tracks

16) proposal is not farm diversification
17) would breach human rights/loss of amenity
18) private access track adjoining site considered to be public right of way with rights of access acquired by prescription/use
19) safety of walkers from guns being discharged
20) Environmental Impact Assessment should have been submitted in view of proximity to SSSI
21) would cause serious safety concerns for users of adjoining private airstrip - need to ensure shooting days are not increased at future date - long range shooting capabilities would result in further safety implications for use of airstrip
22) safety implications for users of railway - stray bullets could kill walkers/users of paths/tracks
23) shooters would be firing towards the sun - firing positions on clay pigeon shoots normally to north - firing positions likely to change - no details of types of weapons/ammunition to be used
24) unsafe distance for owners farming directly adjoining agricultural land
25) reduction in house prices would result
26) would spoil the peace and quiet at adjoining fishery

Comment
1) to 8) – see policy appraisal
9) lack of need not a reason to refuse planning permission in its own right
10) enforcement action would follow refusal of planning permission
11) supporting information submitted by the applicant not sufficient to outweigh harm to residents/nature conservation identified
12) isolated location – nearest dwelling over 300m away – daytime hours of use unlikely to be harmful
13) no evidence that crime/fear of crime likely to increase
14) not significant increase in vehicle traffic likely
15) see policy appraisal
16) farm diversification can involve ventures such as this
17) amenity considered under policy appraisal
18) 19) – see policy appraisal
20) not considered EIA required – type of development does not fall within Schedule 1 or 2
21) see comments under Civil Aviation Authority comments
22) to 24) – see comments under policy appraisal
25) Reduction in house prices not material consideration
26) see policy appraisal comments

Risley Moss Action Group

Objects;

1. Noise pollution to residents of Birchwood and Rixton
2. Will disturb wildlife at Risley Moss via noise/daily barrage of sound
3. Will disturb wildlife on Rixton Moss and endangered species thereon as acknowledged by applicants report
4. Would result in safety to users of adjoining Woolston Moss airfield
5. Other clay pigeon shoots nearby

Comment
See policy appraisal
Woolston Eyes Conservation Group
Objects:

1. Noise level from shooting inevitably high and effect on Risley Moss would be profound
2. Applicants surveys do not assess number of breeding/wintering birds
3. Skylark, Corn Bunting in decline -numbers would be further reduced by noise levels resulting
4. Activities on existing clay pigeon shooting site at Thelwall results in birds (especially wildfowl) leaving the site, some never to return - levels of disturbance on that site less than that proposed under this application

Comment
See policy appraisal

Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision

The development would result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of adjoining residents/users of the adjoining nature reserves, by virtue of the noise disturbance associated with the use of the site for clay pigeon shooting. The development conflicts with Policies GRN9 and DCS1 of Warrington Borough Councils’ Unitary Development Plan, Policy QE9 (of Warrington Borough Councils’ Local Plan Core Strategy) and paragraphs 109 and 123 of the National Planning Policy framework. It is not considered that the resultant harm to amenity could be satisfactorily mitigated/resolved.

The noise disturbance resulting from the use of the site for clay pigeon shooting would deter protected bird species (already in declining numbers) from breeding/feeding/visiting Risley Moss and the surrounding local area and therefore damage its nature conservation value and its attractiveness to subsequent visitors. It is not considered that the planning conditions could adequately mitigate the resultant harm. The development therefore conflicts with policies GRN2, GRN16, GRN17, GRN18 and GRN 21 of Warrington Borough Councils’ Unitary Development Plan, Policy QE9 (of Warrington Borough Councils’ Local Plan Core Strategy) and paragraphs 109 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
Application Number: 2012/19993

Location: LAND TO THE NORTH OF BOOTS LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON

Ward: LYMM

Development: Proposed stables

Applicant: Mr Sheehy

Recommendation: Approve subject to Conditions

Conditions:
- Standard Time limit -full 3 years
- development in accordance with amended plans
- private recreational use only
- requirement for submission/approval of cheme to widen access as per approved plan
- 2.4m x 70m visibility splays to be provided/maintained from access point
- midden to be positioned 10m to the north of the stable block
- temporary fencing to protect trees & hedge
- maintance of roadside hedge at 1.8m height
- staining of external timbers mid-/dark brown
- removal of stable when no longer required to accommodate horses/ponies
- drainage details to be submitted/agreed/implemented
- access roadway surfacing details to be submitted/agreed
- bo external lighting to be installed without prior approval of LPA

Reason for referral

The application is reported to Committee as a consequence of the objections from Lymm PC, Cllr Woodyatt & Cllr Marks.

Description

- Proposed erection of pitched roofed L-shaped timber stable for private recreational use, comprising 5 loose boxes, with long dimensions of approx. 12.5m & 3.5m high to roof ridge – floor area: 63.4m² measured internally / 74.5m² measured externally.
- To be sited within 2.64 ha field, with associated alterations / improvements to access & provision of internal access track between access & proposed stable.
• As originally submitted, application also proposed an ancillary storage barn, but this element has been omitted following negotiations with the agent.

**Location**

• Within Green Belt.
• Field adjoins policy boundary of Lymm inset village, the character of which is predominantly residential at this point. Public footpaths adjoin site’s northern & eastern boundaries.
• Stable would be sited in SW corner of field, adj. Booths Lane, the field boundary to which is screened by a 2–2.5m high hedge.
• Access is odd Booths Lane, in the SE corner of the field.

**Relevant History**

• 79/7892 – Residential development (outline) – refused *(Green Belt)* – part of a much larger site

**Main Issues and Constraints**

• Principle of proposal / Green Belt
• Visual amenity / appearance
• Odours / neighbour amenity
• Highway safety
• Trees

**Key policy/guidance checklist**

| GRN1, GRN3, GRN9 | Green Belt / devt in countryside / outdoor activities in countryside | • Appropriate use in Green Belt – small scale private recreational facility – private use can be reinforced via a condition.  
• Negotiations successfully resulted in omission of initially proposed ancillary storage barn.  
• Appropriate scale / materials – in line with definition of small scale in terms of the British Horse Society’s standards.  
• Boundary hedge to Booths Lane will help minimise potential impact on Green Belt openness.  
• Access details amended in line with Highways initial comments, to ensure no unacceptable detriment to highway/pedestrian safety. |
| DCS1, REP11 | DC Strategy / odours | • Nearest dwelling approx 40m from proposed stable, which is not |
Pre-application discussions took place with Environmental Protection aimed at minimising potential impact on residential properties – submission takes account of this.

Responses to consultation

Highways:
No objections to revised plans, subject to conditions in respect of access/visibility & restricting to private recreational use.

(Full comments in Appendix 1)

Comment:
• Initial concerns raised Highways resolved through submission of appropriately amended plans.

Environmental Protection:
No objection, subject to conditions restricting number of ponies & restricting to private recreational use.

(Full comments in Appendix 2)

Comment:
• Also appropriate to include a condition to require midden to be positioned 10m north of the facility (as stated in the Design & Access Statement).
• In response to a query from a nearby resident to Environmental Protection as to why objections are not being raised (whereas it objected to a previous application for stables on Higher Lane), Environmental Protection has provided further clarification regarding its response – detailed in the final section of Appendix 2.

Arboriculturalist: No objection, subject to condition to require temporary fencing to protect mature tree on adj. lane & roadside hedge, & that consideration be given to the type of surfacing for the fenced area at the entrance to the site.

(Full comments in Appendix 3)

Comment:
• Condition & informative attached.

Lymm PC: Objections – overdevelopment / highway safety / Green Belt / environmental health. Also draw attention to a nearby property not having been notified.

(Full comments in Appendix 4)
Comment:
• With the omission of the associated storage building, proposal represents a small-scale private recreational facility, which is appropriate development in Green Belt – in terms of the standards recommended by the British Horse Society, small-scale is considered to be around 70 m² floor area;
• Difficult to justify refusal on highway safety grounds in the absence of an objection from Highways, which is happy with the amended access details proposed;
• Environmental Protection has been involved from the pre-application stage & was consulted on the application – it has not raised objections;
• A representation was received from the neighbour noted as not having been initially consulted, who was duly notified when the amended plans were received.

Ward Members:

Cllr S Woodyatt has raised objections on the grounds of overdevelopment & detriment to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, with concerns re. sub-standard access.

Cllr I Marks has raised objections on the grounds of Green Belt, highways / traffic, access to field, use, water supply, waste, care of land & suspicious re. future intentions for the land, with concern that a nearby property was not notified.

(Full comments in Appendix 5)

Comment:
• With the omission of the associated storage building, proposal represents a small-scale private recreational facility, which is appropriate development in Green Belt – in terms of the standards recommended by the British Horse Society, small-scale is considered to be around 70 m² floor area;
• Difficult to justify refusal on highway safety grounds in the absence of an objection from Highways, which is happy with proposal, including the amended access details proposed;
• Environmental Protection has been involved from the pre-application stage & was consulted on the application – it has not raised objections;
• The absence of water supply to the site at present is not a valid reason to withhold planning permission;
• Not appropriate to withhold permission on the basis of speculation on applicant’s future intentions – each application must necessarily be determined on its own merits in the relevant planning policy context;
• A representation was received from the neighbour noted as not having been initially consulted, who was duly notified when the amended plans were received.

Responses to Notification (Full details on file)
Objections received from the occupants of 30 nearby properties & a Parish Councillor – main points summarised as follows:
• Erosion/loss of Green Belt
• Had fair share of unsuitable development
• Visual impact/affect on rural character
• Impact on local residents
• Allergy to animal droppings
• Unsuitable/dangerous access
• Highway dangers/traffic increase
• Horse mess on roads/footpaths
• Booths Lane unsuitable – too narrow/busy for horse boxes – nuisance to pedestrians & other road users
• Amended access details do not alter the narrowness of the road
• Loss of view
• Thin end of the wedge
• Lymm is targeted by developers because it is a beautiful village
• Stables excessive for commercial use – more consistent with a commercial operation
• Stables too close to the road
• Design/construction – imply some degree of permanence
• No need for access/roadway on site
• Question need – other stables in vicinity underused
• Question applicant’s good faith & motive, citing history of present ownership – site acquired at auction by applicant in 2005 – who outbid local residents ho wished to ensure preservation of land
• Applicant/owner does not live locally – not financially viable to come to site every day to look after horses/security issues
• Question applicant’s long term intentions for the site, given that works carried out to drainage 3-4 years ago – potential future development of site
• Lack of a water supply to the site (for cleaning/maintenance) & drainage, with associated animal welfare concerns
• Vagueness of description of ‘horses’ & ‘tack’
• Storage barn superfluous/no requirement for a tractor
• Reference to ‘optional blockwork’ on plans (storage barn)
• Too large/out of keeping
• Too close to houses
• Overlooking of properties from stable
• Nuisance/noise/disturbance – incl. from use of access
• Odours from midden
• Vermin
• Risk of insect bites
• Change from agricultural to equestrian use
• Inadequate provision for waste disposal
• Siting of stable is in narrowest part of field
• Land becomes waterlogged
• Query scale of drawings & statement that the field is not part of an agricultural holding (given that haymaking has occurred)
• Lack of maintenance of hedge since owner purchased site in 2005 – double its original height
• Do not consider overgrown hedge should be permitted to be regarded as effective screening – LPA should consider impact if hedge was properly maintained/reduced in height
• Inconsistent with ruling in South Staffordshire
• Lack of site notice & notification of one of the neighbours

One of the objectors also advises that an action group of local residents has been formed, with a barrister’s opinion sought, as well as the views of CPRE & the British Horse Society.

(Barrister’s comments summarised/appraised in Appendix 6)

Comment:
• **Proposed storage barn omitted on amended plans;**
• **Stable is of appropriate scale/design/construction/materials for its Green Belt location;**
• **A small-scale private recreational facility, which is appropriate development in Green Belt – in terms of the British Horse Society’s recommended standards small-scale is considered to be around 70 m² floor area;**
• **Appropriate to condition removal when no longer required;**
• **Difficult to justify refusal on highway safety grounds in the absence of an objection from Highways, which is happy with proposal, including the amended access details proposed;**
• **In terms of odours/vermin/waste issues, Environmental Protection has been involved from the pre-application stage & is happy with proposals;**
• **At 2–2.5m high, the Booths Lane boundary hedge is not considered excessively high – a condition to require it to be maintained at minimum height of 1.8m is considered a reasonable requirement to screen the proposed stable;**
• **At around 40m from the nearest dwelling, the stable would not result in overlooking at less than the normal WBC standard of 21m;**
• **The absence of water supply to the site at present is not a valid reason to withhold planning permission;**
• **Not appropriate to withhold permission on the basis of speculation on applicant’s future intentions – each application must necessarily be determined on its own merits in the relevant planning policy context;**
• **Inappropriate to afford weight to the applicant’s personal circumstances (incl. his place of abode), in view of the fact that planning permission runs with the land (rather than an individual);**
• **Considered unlikely that the land would form part of a DEFRA-registered agricultural holding – harvesting of hay on an ad hoc basis does not imply this;**
• **Whilst not all dimensions individually marked on plans, they are drawn to scale;**
• **Site notice not displayed as adj. neighbours were individually notified – the neighbour not initially consulted was duly notified when the amended plans were received;**
• **Loss of views not a reason to withhold permission;**
• **Allergy to animal waste not a reason to withhold permission – particularly given that the field can be used livestock grazing without the need for any planning permission;**
• **Inappropriate to attempt to apply a South Staffordshire policy approach in Warrington, where the UDP does not include such a policy – in any case, South Staffordshire’s Planning Team Leader has advised that the policy in question has no status in planning terms, not having not been adopted, & is not referred to when considering planning applications; adding that, in his
view, the Booths Lane proposals would be ‘small scale’ & therefore, appropriate development in the Green Belt.

External Planning Consultants’ appraisal:

In view of the substantial objections received, particularly the submission form the Barrister acting on behalf of local residents, the Council commissioned external Planning Consultants (Urban Vision) to carry out an independent appraisal of the application, in the context of the Barrister’s comments, the main conclusions of which are summarised as follows:

• The Barrister’s submission states that development of outdoor sport and recreation activities are only considered appropriate development in the Green Belt where the following 3 criteria are satisfied: -
  (i) It is genuinely required for outdoor sport and recreation;
  (ii) It is essential for such uses; and
  (iii) It preserves the openness of the Green Belt
• In terms of the ‘genuine requirement’ criterion (i), note that PPG2 has now been replaced by National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which no longer includes an explicit policy requirement to give this consideration.
• UDP policy GRN1 makes no reference to the acceptability of a proposal being dependent upon it being genuinely required, albeit that determining whether the facilities are ‘appropriate’ implies that they should be genuinely required.
• In terms of criterion (ii), under the provisions of NPPF, development of recreational & outdoor facilities must now be appropriate rather than essential.
• Note that UDP policy was prepared with regard to PPG2, but consider that a policy conflict exists, and, as such NPPF, should be given greater weight in consideration of this aspect of the application.
• Nevertheless, the stables should be as small as possible to ensure that they are appropriate in Green Belt policy terms – a standard stable should have an approximate floor area of 3.7m x 3.7m (although larger horses may need stables up to 3.7m x 4.3m).
• In terms of the access issues, the transportation of horses to & from the site, would constitute an appropriate form of activity associated with the recreational uses of a horse.
• Satisfied that the Council are in a position to support the type and scale of proposed development, in this Green Belt location which is considered to be appropriate for this form of outdoor recreation use.
• In terms of criterion (iii), note that stables would be well screened by existing trees & hedges, whilst avoiding a prominent position on the site, with the materials being considered appropriate to the semi-rural setting, ensuring that the impact on the landscape and openness of the Green Belt is minimised.
• Conclude “that keeping horses on the land and its associated built development (stables / access road) by virtue of its siting, scale, massing and materials would not have a detrimental impact on preserving the openness of the Green Belt, nor any other reason for
including land within it (NPPF paragraph 80) and as such would not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.”

- In terms of the distance between the applicant’s home & the site, note that the applicant lives in Davyhulme, which is approximately a 20 minute drive to the site and as such consider that this to be a wholly acceptable time to travel to enjoy a recreational pursuit.
- With regard to trees, note that the WBC Arboriculturalist raises no objections & is content that issues can be addressed via conditions.
- With regard to drainage, consider that conditions could be attached to ensure that suitable means of drainage are provided as part of the scheme.

(Full comments in Appendix 7)

Comment:
- The applicant’s agent has advised that the horses to be accommodated are “Connemara ponies” (smaller than most breeds of horses but classed as large ponies), owned by the applicant, & presently in Ireland as there is not suitable accommodation on the site.
- From the plans, 4 of the stables scale off at 3.6m x 3.4m (slightly smaller than the size of a standard stable cited above), with the 5th measuring 4.7m x 3.4m, which the agent has confirmed may be used as a tack room.
- The agent has advised that it is not proposed to have a tarmac or other finished/ sealed/ tarmac road within the site, with the preference being that the access track be formed in hardcore, but advising that this could be dealt with by means of a planning condition if considered appropriate.

Applicant’s submission:
Following the concerns raised by Ward Members, the Parish Council & nearby residents, the agent has further clarified the applicant’s intentions with regard to the proposals, summarised as follows:
- **Number of horses**: The applicant intends to accommodate 3– 5 Connemara Ponies on the site. There are 5 proposed stables but it is envisaged that one of the stables would be used as a tack room that would also serve as a small feed store.
- **Who would use the horses and how regularly and for what purpose**: The horses would be owned by the client & used by his family (mainly children) only. It is envisaged that they would be used daily for leisure purposes around the fields & on neighbouring roads / bridleways.
- **Horse feeding arrangements**: Some feed would be stored on site; some would be brought by the applicants each day when they visit the site from their home in Davyhulme (less than 10 miles away & is certainly not too far to travel on a daily basis). The applicants would feed / water & look after the welfare of the ponies themselves, & it is not envisaged that any other parties would be involved.
- **Storage of feed**: Envisaged that some feed would be stored on site (in the fifth stable/ tack room), which would be supplemented on a daily basis when the applicants visit the site. The applicant has a pick up truck, which is capable of moving the feed.
• **Arrangements for watering the horses:** The applicant’s intention is to collect & store rainwater from the roof of the stables for watering the horses, to be supplement as required by additional water brought to site.

• **Stabling of horses by others?** Confirmation that there are no arrangements for others to stable their horses on the site.

**Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision**

• Reasonably required to facilitate outdoor recreation (appropriate use in Green Belt), & requisite in terms of design/scale/materials.

• Not reasonable to attach undue weight to applicant’s personal circumstances, given that any planning permission runs with the land.

• Maintenance of roadside hedge at 1.8m would afford reasonable screening & assist in maintaining the rural feel of the area.

• By positioning the stable at the SW corner of the site, the length of the access road has been kept to a minimum, whilst at the same time ensuring that the stable is not unacceptably close to the nearest dwellings (in line with pre-application advice from Environmental Protection).

• Access/highway issues satisfactorily addressed through submission of amended access details.

• Would not impact unacceptably on the amenities which could reasonably be expected to be enjoyed by residents living in properties adjoining the field.

**Appendix 1 – Highways comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The application seeks approval for the erection of a stable block, consisting of 5 individual stables, located on land between 32 and 38 Booths Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The application site is served by an existing gated agricultural access, approximately 3m in width, located adjacent to a Public Right of Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is noted that Booths Lane is an unclassified road, set within a semi-rural location, which a site visit confirmed is only lightly trafficked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additionally, the applicant has confirmed within the Design and Access Statement that the proposed stables will purely be for private use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal access arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A revised site layout received on the 31st May 2012 (Drawing No.12/SHEE/01/100 Rev A) demonstrates provision of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The existing vehicle access will be widened to 5m and the existing lighting column (sited within the access) relocated in liaison with the Local Authority. This will provide an improved vehicle access point, which a supplied vehicle swept path demonstrates can accommodate a vehicle and horsebox, ensuring adequate access/egress to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The existing agricultural access gate will be removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and a replacement gate installed, set back 12m from the access point, which will allow a vehicle and horsebox to stand clear of the highway.
- Achievable visibility splays of 2.4m x 70m in both directions either side of the vehicle access point on Booths Lane.
- A newly constructed vehicle access track from the existing access point covering the site width, leading to a turning area located to the west of the site, which a supplied vehicle swept path demonstrates can accommodate a vehicle and horsebox.

### Public Right of Way
- The Council's Public Rights of Way Officer has confirmed that no objections are raised to the stables, as the proposals are purely for private use and the alterations to the site access will allow a vehicle to stand clear of the highway. This will ensure that access to the public footpath remains unobstructed.

### Summary
- Therefore, as the applicant has confirmed that the proposed stables will purely be for private use, and taking into account the proposed improvements to the site access/layout, it is considered that the proposals are unlikely to result in any significant additional highway issues.
- In view of the above, no highway objections are raised in respect of the proposed development, however, should approval be granted, we would request that the following conditions are applied:
  - The proposed development will be constructed as per revised site layout plan received on the 31st May 2012 (Drawing No. 12/SHEE/01/100 Rev A) and shall not be varied without the written consent of the LPA.
  - The proposed stables hereby approved shall remain for private recreational purposes only, and there shall be no commercial use without the prior express consent of the local planning authority.
  - Prior to the commencement of the development, a scheme for the construction of the widened vehicle access, including relocation of the street lighting column, shall be submitted to the LPA. Such scheme as is agreed shall be implemented prior to first occupation of development.
  - Visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 70 metres shall be provided in both directions at the application sites junction with Booths Lane (as per revised site layout received on the 31st May 2012 12/SHEE/01/100 Rev A) and nothing shall be subsequently erected or allowed to grow to a height in excess of 0.6 metres within them. The visibility splays shall be implemented prior to occupation and shall be retained thereafter.
- **Informative:**
  - As the development requires alterations to the existing
vehicle access, a widened vehicle crossing will be required to serve the altered access. The applicant will therefore need to liaise with the Council’s Public Realm section on 01925 442505 prior to undertaking any works in the highway.

Appendix 2 – Environmental Protection comments

| Background | Pre-application and myself concerning this application. The number of ponies to use the site was a consideration as was the location and disposal arrangements for the manure created. The use of the site was also discussed for private vs. commercial use, it was confirmed that a private use only was sought.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the case of the application along Booths Lane, Lymm, I have considered the location of the stables in relation to the nearest residential property. The property itself is circa 40m away from the stables block itself, the extent of the garden at the nearest point being 8m from the stable block. The discussions on the location of the midden have indicated that this will be located approximately 60-70 metres from the nearest residential properties.  
| Background | I have no objection subject to the following conditions and/or informatives being applied should consent be given.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| Additional comments following query by nearby resident | I considered both the application in question here and also the application for stables in the field adjacent to Higher Lane. Whilst the applications are for similar uses, the layout and positioning of the sites is different in relation to the surrounding residential properties. It is this that has dictated a different recommendation on my behalf.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| Additional comments following query by nearby resident | I considered both the application in question here and also the application for stables in the field adjacent to Higher Lane. Whilst the applications are for similar uses, the layout and positioning of the sites is different in relation to the surrounding residential properties. It is this that has dictated a different recommendation on my behalf.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| Additional comments following query by nearby resident | I considered both the application in question here and also the application for stables in the field adjacent to Higher Lane. Whilst the applications are for similar uses, the layout and positioning of the sites is different in relation to the surrounding residential properties. It is this that has dictated a different recommendation on my behalf.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| Additional comments following query by nearby resident | I considered both the application in question here and also the application for stables in the field adjacent to Higher Lane. Whilst the applications are for similar uses, the layout and positioning of the sites is different in relation to the surrounding residential properties. It is this that has dictated a different recommendation on my behalf.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| Additional comments following query by nearby resident | I considered both the application in question here and also the application for stables in the field adjacent to Higher Lane. Whilst the applications are for similar uses, the layout and positioning of the sites is different in relation to the surrounding residential properties. It is this that has dictated a different recommendation on my behalf.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| Additional comments following query by nearby resident | I considered both the application in question here and also the application for stables in the field adjacent to Higher Lane. Whilst the applications are for similar uses, the layout and positioning of the sites is different in relation to the surrounding residential properties. It is this that has dictated a different recommendation on my behalf.  
| Conditions | Restriction To Private Use.  
| Restrictions | The use hereby permitted shall be for private use by the applicant only – i.e. the site shall not be permitted to be used for any commercial gain or commercial use.  
| | Restriction On Number Of Ponies  
| | No more than 5 ponies shall be permitted on site at any given time.  
| | In the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| | Reason: in the interests of protecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.  
| Additional comments following query by nearby resident | I considered both the application in question here and also the application for stables in the field adjacent to Higher Lane. Whilst the applications are for similar uses, the layout and positioning of the sites is different in relation to the surrounding residential properties. It is this that has dictated a different recommendation on my behalf.  
|
properties to maintain more acceptable separation distance. These distances are in all cases greater than the application on Higher Lane.

- The stables are also limited by condition as to both the number of ponies permitted on site and there is a requirement for the site to remain in private use only.
- Discussions with the applicant have indicated that the ponies will spend approximately 75% of their time outside in the field rather than in the stables. The limitation for a maximum of 5 ponies on site at any time is another restriction on site - which is a significant limitation bearing in mind the size of the field they are proposing to occupy. In combination, these measures will minimise the possibility of unacceptable impacts occurring to surrounding residential properties.
- In its existing use as agricultural land a much more intensive use could occur if it was used to graze cattle for example - which would not require planning permission nor would it have any maximum permitted number of animals on site - potential impacts being more significant for all residential properties surrounding the site.
- The proposal here will limit the number of ponies permitted on site to 5 and ensure that the site remains in non-commercial use - thus limiting unreasonable impacts.
- It is not envisaged that the proposals here will have any adverse impact on residential amenity from an Environmental Protection viewpoint.

Appendix 3 – Arboriculturalist comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>I have no real issues with the siting of the stable block, provided that the location is as indicated, being something in the region of 7m from the adjacent large oak in the private garden.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary fencing requirement</td>
<td>A pre condition should be the erection of heras fencing or similar along this elevation prior to any construction works commencing to avoid excavations or stockpiling of spoil within the crown spread of these particular trees in the adjacent private property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spoil arising from the construction of the access road and hardstanding should not be stored along the hedge line and ideally this too would receive temporary fencing during the construction phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing of access</td>
<td>Consideration should actively be given to the type of surfacing for the fenced area at the entrance to the site. The surfacing should be porous and excavation minimal in nature to avoid damaging the root zone of the oak in the adjacent private property. Further consideration should be given to the use of geoweb or similar cell mat to avoid/prevent future root compaction during the active use of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of</td>
<td>The removal of several thorns to facilitate modification of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thorns for access | gateway would not be contested, ideally, the hedge would receive several thorn whips within existing gaps to offset the loss of the thorns and maintain the hedge in sound condition.

### Appendix 4 – Parish Council comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>Lymm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>2012/19993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key areas of concern</th>
<th>Objections:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. This would be an over-development of the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Booths Lane is a sub-standard highway and not suitable for additional traffic. There are currently problems with turning traffic damaging walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The proposed development would be detrimental to the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. There are concerns about the horse waste and Environmental Health need to be consulted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key policy references</th>
<th>GRN1, GRN3, DCS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Considered by Parish Council on | 14.5.12 (original submission) & 11.6.12 (amended plans) – comments the same in response to both consultations. |

### Appendix 5 – Ward Member comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member name</th>
<th>Cllr S Woodyatt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward represented</td>
<td>Lymm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>2012/19993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key areas of concern</th>
<th>I wish to object to this proposal which I consider to be overdevelopment of the site and detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We in Lymm have had a lot of intrusion into our very precious Green Belt in recent years and this stretch of Booths lane is one of the few remaining areas of unspoilt Green Belt in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have looked at the amended proposals and although this is an improvement on the original application I still wish to object. This is one of the very few areas of unspoilt green belt left in Lymm and any development on this site would be detrimental to the openness of the precious green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also, in spite of highway’s comments this is still a sub-standard highway with difficult access for large vehicles turning into the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Key policy references | GRN1, GRN3, DCS1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member name</th>
<th>Cllr I Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward represented</td>
<td>Lymm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>2012/19993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key areas of concern | I object to this application for the following reasons:-  
- **GREEN BELT** - While the field is ideal for grazing horses I believe this is over development in the Green Belt. This particularly applies to the stable block and the barn.  
- **HIGHWAYS / TRAFFIC** - Because of the access problems, there could be problems on the highway due to vehicles negotiating the access.  
- **ACCESS TO FIELD** - There is only one access onto the field, not two as stated in the application. The road is narrow at this point. Presumably fairly large vehicles will be needed for transporting horses, hay and feed.  
- **USE** - The application is said to be for private use, yet there are five horses which seems a lot?  
- **WATER SUPPLY** - There is no provision for water but five horses are to be there? Water is needed for the horses and for cleaning out the stables.  
- **WASTE** - What are the facilities for the disposal of waste from the site?  
- **CARE OF LAND** - The hedge has not been properly cared for since the land was bought at auction. The applicant now makes a virtue of the height of the hedge to provide screening.  
- **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS** - I am also concerned that the resident of No 38 Booths Lane, which is next door, was not notified of the proposal.  
- Although it is not a planning objection, we believe that the field was sold at auction for a value twice that of the estimated agricultural value which makes us suspicious about future plans for the site.  

Although amended plans are an improvement, original comments still stand. |
| Key policy references | GRN1, GRN3, DCS1        |

**Appendix 6 – summary/appraisal of main points of comments of barrister engaged by local residents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report section</th>
<th>Main points (summary)</th>
<th>Comments/appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Introductory matters | Summarises main features of application, including:  
- concern that discussions with Council officers not | Being pre-application discussions, these are necessarily confidential & not within the public domain. |
<p>| Discussion | • Whilst the proposed development is restricted to operational development to create the stables, the application is seeking to create significant new infrastructure to facilitate equestrian use of the field, &amp; change from agricultural use. | • Post-submission access alterations follow Highways’ advice/requirements. |
| Discussion | • Works being proposed to hedge, incl. widening of access &amp; creation of visibility splays, yet no appraisal of the ecological or landscape implications of the change. | • Whilst inevitable loss of a small portion of hedge at the access point itself, because of the curve in the lane, the hedge itself would not require significant cutting back – much of the visibility splay bisects the carriageway. (Indeed, a number of objectors have cited the hedge as being overgrown &amp; in need of maintenance &amp; |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>• A long access road is proposed thereby sterilising a portion of present agricultural land, yet no meaningful appraisal of implications.</th>
<th>• The roadside hedge would provide an effective screen to the access road, as well as the stables themselves, from Booths Lane.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>• Applicant lives some distance from site, with no explanation to identify who horses would be used by – insufficient infrastructure proposed to facilitate livery.</td>
<td>• As planning permission runs with the land rather than a particular applicant, personal circumstances should not be afforded undue weight. • Commercial livery is not being proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>• Lack of apparent effort to minimise impact on visual amenities of the Green Belt, e.g. by a landscaping scheme</td>
<td>• By siting the stable at the same end of the field as the access, impact of the track to it minimised. • Additional landscaping requirement not considered necessary, given that hedge to Booths Lane would perform a screening function – suggested condition to require its retention at minimum height of 1.8m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>• Hardstanding appears to be proposed within root protection areas of trees / hedgerows</td>
<td>• WBC Arboriculturalist happy with proposals – subject to condition to require temporary protective fencing &amp; informative re. surfacing materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>• Drainage &amp; access to utilities (particularly water) not addressed</td>
<td>• Not in themselves reasons to warrant refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>• Lack of identity of stables’ users – the effects of ‘horsiculture’ on the character / appearance of countryside / green belt is a well recognised concern by the planning inspectorate – with the fear which underpins many such decisions are that if consent is granted for a limited form of development that it then opens the door / site for a more intensive use.</td>
<td>• Planning permission runs with the land rather than a particular applicant, &amp; personal circumstances should not be afforded undue weight. • Each application needs to be considered on its own merits, in the context of the relevant planning policies &amp; site-specific considerations – not appropriate to resist on grounds of potential precedent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cite approach of South Staffordshire Council, which has a policy which states that anything in excess of 4 units &amp; a maximum building size of 3.6m x 14.4m x 3.5m high will be regarded as inappropriate, &amp; require that the buildings should not be stone/concrete &amp; potentially removable if/when use ceases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inappropriate to attempt to apply a South Staffordshire policy approach in Warrington, where the UDP does not include such a policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In any case, South Staffordshire’s Planning Team Leader has advised that the policy in question has no status in planning terms, not having not been adopted, &amp; is not referred to when considering planning applications; adding that, in his view, the Booths Lane proposals would be ‘small scale’ &amp; therefore, appropriate development in the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The former PPG2 referred to ‘small scale’, which British Horse Society defines as around 70m² – these proposals comply with this, having a floor area of 63.4m² measured internally / 74.5m² measured externally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Timber stables are proposed – the previously proposed part blockwork storage building has been omitted from application on amended plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Condition included to require removal when no longer required for equestrian use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outdoor sport/recreation only appropriate if: |
| (i) genuinely required; |
| (ii) ‘essential’, for such uses; & |
| (iii) it preserves the openness of the Green Belt. |

| In this case, substantial reasons to be circumspect as to the genuineness of the proposed use. |

<p>| The structure proposed is appropriate in terms of its design &amp; construction for its intended use. |
| The “substantial reasons to be circumspect” appear to revolve around suspicions in respect of the applicant – as noted above not appropriate to afford undue weight to personal circumstances, given that planning permission runs with the land. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the information thus far provided there is no evidence that could satisfy a rational local planning authority that the proposed use was ‘genuine’.</td>
<td>Taking the 3rd point to its logical conclusion, any building the Green Belt would not preserve openness – however the principle of a development to facilitate bona fide private recreational uses would be appropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The permanent nature of the building, the radical change in the proposals – an ‘essential’ barn being promoted and then inexplicably dropped, and the size of the stables (linked to the carrying capacity of the land rather than the need of a prospective horserider) can only lead to the conclusion that there is no basis upon which the LPA can properly conclude that these facilities are ‘essential’ or appropriate.</td>
<td>Barn element omitted following advice to agent that this element was not considered appropriate, given British Horse Society standards cited above. The stables are of an appropriate size/scale in terms of the British Horse Society standards – not unreasonable to link to the carrying capacity of the field (anything in excess would be a different matter).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little / no effort to minimise the effect upon the openness of the Green Belt, both in terms of siting design and landscaping, &amp; in terms of incongruous access alterations.</td>
<td>More significant access improvements than initially proposed, added at request of Highways. Siting at Booths Lane at end of field minimises length of access track within site, as well as ensuring screening by existing adjoining roadside hedge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unjustified when in policy terms it requires the clearest possible justification, and essential reports simply have not been provided. Approval of application in its current form would render it highly vulnerable to challenge by judicial review. If the application remains in its current form then my strong advice is that it could not be lawfully approved.</td>
<td>Inappropriate to focus on individual circumstances of this particular applicant when any planning permission would run with the land, regardless of any future change in ownership etc. Notwithstanding barrister’s views, proposals considered to accord with relevant planning policy – see appraisal in main body of report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 – External Consultants’ report:

| Introduction | • Following receipt of representations made by Mr Paul Tucker QC, on behalf of local residents, Urban Vision have been instructed to consider the content of this representation and to undertake the following: -  
| | o a thorough analysis/appraisal of all the attachments and other submitted information by the applicant;  
| | o a site visit  
| | o an assessment of the scheme against the development plan for Warrington  
| | o review of material considerations and consideration of matters of weighting to be given to them  
| | o production of a written draft report with our findings  
| | o discussion of same with you and other relevant colleagues  
| | o submission of final report to you to assist in your own decision making process. |

| Policy background | • Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that if regard is to be had to the development plan in any determination that determination shall be in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 38(5) of Act requires that where policies in the development plan conflict, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the last document to be adopted.  
| | • The development plan for Warrington comprises the saved policies of the Warrington UDP (Adopted January 2006) and the North West Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 (Adopted 30th September 2008). The policy framework which is pertinent to consideration of the issues raised by Mr Paul Tucker QC in his correspondence dated 18th June 2012 are as follows: -  
| | o National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)  
| | o Chapter 9 – Protecting Green Belt land  
| | o North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2012  
| | o Policy RDF4 – Green Belts  
| | o Warrington Unitary Development Plan (saved polices 23 January 2009)  
| | o Policy GRN1 - The Green Belt  
| | o Policy GRN3 - Development Proposals in the Countryside  
| | o Policy GRN9 - Outdoor activities in the Countryside |

| Opinion | • The application site was visited on the 13th August 2012 and a thorough analysis of the case file and submitted attachments has been carried out. The comments provided below are based upon an assessment of the development plan and all other relevant material considerations. |
• **Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policy GRN1 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** indicates that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is considered inappropriate development, except where this is for; inter alia: “the provision of facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.”

• **It is common ground, between the applicant and the Council that the proposed development constitutes facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, and as such the proposed development would constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt so long as the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land therein.**

• **Paragraph 2.7 of Mr Tucker’s submission however states that development of outdoor sport and recreation activities are only considered appropriate development in the Green Belt if the proposed development satisfies the following three criteria; that is: -**
  
  (i) It is genuinely required for outdoor sport and recreation;
  
  (ii) It is essential for such uses in the words of policy GRN1 the UDP⁴; and
  
  (iii) It preserves the openness of the Green Belt

• Taking each consideration in turn; in respect of **criterion (i)** the need to demonstrate that the proposed development is ‘genuinely required’ clearly relates to paragraph 3.5 of Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts. PPG2 has since been replaced by NPPF and there is no longer an explicit policy requirement through NPPF, to give this consideration.

• **UDP policy GRN1 makes no reference to the acceptability of a proposal being dependent upon it being genuinely required. However, determining whether the facilities are ‘appropriate’ implies that they should be genuinely required.**

• **It is noted that amendments have been sought to the amount of operational development and the design/materials used. With those changes and given the reasons set out below, it is our opinion that the facilities are genuinely required.**

• **In respect of criterion (ii), following the publication of NPPF there has been a subtle shift in policy with regards to appropriate development in the Green Belt. UDP policy GRN1 states that the erection of new buildings within the**
Green Belt will be inappropriate unless the building is for, inter alia:-
- **Essential facilities** for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the green belt, and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.”

- NPPF, however indicates that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate, except where this is for, inter alia;
  - **Provision of appropriate facilities** for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.”

- It is therefore clear that there is a policy conflict between NPPF and the UDP, in that development of recreational and outdoor facilities must now be **appropriate** rather than **essential**.

- Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 indicates that development proposals should be considered in accordance with the development plan. NPPF paragraph 215 however indicates that if the development plan was prepared prior to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, “due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight may be given).”

- UDP policy was prepared with regard to PPG2 and as such reflects paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 of this document. It is my view however that a policy conflict exists and as such NPPF should be given greater weight in consideration of this aspect of the application. It is my view therefore that the Council must be satisfied that the development of recreational and outdoor facilities must be **appropriate** rather than **essential**.

- There is no case law available at this stage to define what is considered to constitute appropriate facilities, however it should be noted if referring back to PPG2 where the applicant had to demonstrate that development was **essential**, paragraph 3.5 specifically identified possible examples as including, “small stables for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation.”

- No reference is made to the type/size of horse that will be allowed to graze and be stabled on the site. It is however noted that in accordance with advice obtained from the British Horse Society, National Farmers Union and the Countryside Agency that the field is of sufficient size to allow 5 horses to graze on the land.
• It is our opinion that the stables should be as small as possible to ensure that they are appropriate in Green Belt policy terms. I understand that a standard stable should have an approximate floor area of 3.7 metres by 3.7 metres, although larger horses may need stables up to 3.7 metres by 4.3 metres. It may therefore be prudent to request confirmation from the applicant that the size of stable is appropriate to the type/size of horse which would be stabled at the site.

• Notwithstanding the above, the proposed stable block would provide accommodation for up to 5 horses and one of the stables could also be used as a tack room. The stable block does not include any floorspace which is not directly associated with the proposed use; for example a kitchen or washroom, and as such the scale of development is considered appropriate to the intended use and as such would constitute appropriate facilities.

• We understand from the planning file that the access road, in terms of its width, visibility splays and swept paths are sufficient to accommodate safe access and egress of a vehicle and horse box. It is our view that the transportation of horses to and from the site, would constitute an appropriate form of activity associated with the recreational uses of a horse.

• In light of the above considerations, we are satisfied that the Council are in a position to support the type and scale of proposed development, in this Green Belt location which is considered to be appropriate for this form of outdoor recreation use.

• In respect of criterion (iii) the proposed L-Shaped development is located to the south west corner of the site. The southern and western boundaries of the site are defined by a 2 metre (approx.) hedge and a number of trees. The stables would be positioned so as that they are well screened by the existing trees and hedges whilst avoiding a prominent position on the site. The stable blocks would utilise a timber frame and would be clad in shiplap timber boarding, whilst the roof would be finished in black Onduline. The proposed materials are considered appropriate for this semi rural setting and would ensure that the impact on the landscape and openness of the Green Belt is minimised.

• The access road utilises the existing access point on to Booths Lane, all be it slightly enlarged, to enable appropriate access to the stable. The loss of hedgerow is clearly minimal and would have little impact on the character of the area or the openness of the Green Belt. The road provides the access necessary to serve the stable block. The length of road is limited to that which is required to serve the stable block and allows safe
vehicular movement to, from, and within the site.
- I consider that keeping horses on the land and its associated built development (stables / access road) by virtue of its siting, scale, massing and materials would not have a detrimental impact on preserving the openness of the Green Belt, nor any other reason for including land within it (NPPF paragraph 80) and as such would not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

**Other issues**

- Paragraph 2.3 (iii) states that the applicant lives ‘some distance from the site’. We note however that the application form indicates that the applicant lives in Davyhulme, which is approximately a 20 minute drive to the site and as such consider that this to be a wholly acceptable time to travel to enjoy a recreational pursuit.
- Paragraph 2.3 (iv) relates to concerns of developing within the root protection area of existing trees. We note that the arborist raises no objections to the proposals and that appropriate conditions could be implemented to secure their on going protection.
- Paragraph 2.3 (vi) relates to drainage, however conditions could be attached to ensure that suitable means of drainage are provided as part of the scheme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>2012/20372</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>CROSFIELD FILLING STATION, CROSFIELD STREET, WARRINGTON, WA1 1UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>BEWSEY &amp; WHITECROSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development:</td>
<td>Proposed extension of time limit for implementation of 2009/14568 (Three storey office block with underground parking and associated landscaping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Mr Clear Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conditions:         | • Development to begin within 3 years  
|                     | • In accordance with approved drawings  
|                     | • Parking and cycling to be made available prior to commencement of office use  
|                     | • Materials to be submitted and agreed  
|                     | • Glazing details to be revised  
|                     | • Canopy detail to be revised  
|                     | • Landscaping scheme to be implemented in first planting season  
|                     | • External plant to be acoustically insulated  
|                     | • Details of retaining wall and or measures to address the variation in levels to be submitted and agreed  
|                     | • Land contamination investigation / remediation |

**Reason for Referral**

- This application is referred to Committee for decision as it is a major planning application.

**Description**

- Proposal is for a 3-storey office building with basement car parking and associated landscaping.
- Access to the site is via Nicholson Street to the north west corner of the site.
- Existing use of the site is a petrol filling station.
- The application is for an extension of time for the implementation of a planning permission by grant of a new permission for the development authorised by the original permission.
- This measure has been introduced in order to make it easier for developers and LPA’s to keep planning permissions alive for longer during
the economic downturn so that they can more quickly be implemented when economic conditions improve.

- The development proposed in an application for extension will by definition have been judged to be acceptable in principle at an earlier date. While these applications should be determined in accordance with s.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, LPA’s should, in making their decisions, focus their attention on development plan policies and other material considerations which may have changed significantly since the original grant of permission.

Location

- The site is 0.16ha in size located off Crosfield Street within the town centre.
- The site is outside but on the edge of the Town Hall Conservation Area and Bank Park.
- The West Annexe, a Grade I Listed Building, is sited within the curtilage of Bank Park, and adjacent this is the Town Hall, also Grade I listed.
- There are a variety of uses within the locality including housing and commercial development.

Relevant History

- Ref. 2006/08967 - Erection of 19 apartments with underground car parking and associated landscaping - Refused 02/01/07 – Housing Policy / Lack Healthcare Provision / Inadequate Parking Facilities / Design
- Ref. 2007/11812 Demolition of existing petrol station and erection of a 3 storey office block with underground parking and associated landscaping – Refused 29/04/08 – Insufficient Information / Design
- Ref. 2009/14568 Proposed erection of a 3 storey office block with underground parking and associated landscaping (revision of application 2007/11812) – Approved 2009

Main Issues and Constraints

- Economy
- Design
- Highways
- Environmental Impact

Key policy/guidance checklist

- Bank Park Area SPD 2010
- Policy DCS1 Development Control Strategy
- Policy DCS7 Landscaping in New Development
- Policy BH3 Development in the vicinity of a Listed Building
- Policy BH8 Development in Conservation Area
- Policy LUT20 Car parking
- Policy REP10 Noise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>ECONOMY</strong> Building a Strong Competitive Economy (para. 18 – 22)</th>
<th>The site remains within the designated town centre boundary and is of an appropriate scale. An important change since the granting of the previous consent is the introduction of the NPPF which sets out a strong presumption in favour of sustainable development - the current proposal involves the redevelopment of a brownfield site within a relatively central location within the urban area - there is therefore a stronger presumption in favour of granting planning permission than there was with the previous application.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DESIGN</strong> Development Control Strategy</td>
<td>A further significant change since the 2009 application is the introduction of the Bank Park Area SPD, adopted October 2010. The vision of the document is to provide a vibrant, successful part of the town centre with an increased diversity of uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH3</td>
<td>Development in the vicinity of a Listed Building</td>
<td>The current use as a petrol station continues to contribute very little as a positive element of built form, and there remains scope for the development to enhance and improve the streetscene along Crosfield Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH8</td>
<td>Development in Conservation Area</td>
<td>The site is situated close to a Conservation Area and Bank Park. The distance between the nearer of the listed buildings (the West Annex) is approximately 125m. It is not considered that the proposal affects the setting of this listed building and the petrol filling station is clearly outside the curtilage of the Town Hall. The site is more sensitive in terms of its potential impact upon views from the park itself, as well as the more immediate relationship with the adjoining buildings and the streetscene along Crosfield Street. Following much discussion with the applicant a previous scheme was amended from what was considered a bland and unimaginative design to the current proposal which adopts a triangular plan form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The triangular format gives emphasis to the corner of the new building with the apex of the triangular footprint being capable of being articulated as a distinctive element. The triangular shape also opens up the possibility of introducing an atrium, bringing natural light into the centre of the building.

The incorporation of glazing to complement the central atrium provides a more dynamic interface with Crosfield Street and the adjacent areas of land around the site. The general scale and massing of the building is consistent with existing built form along Crosfield Street and basement parking and rear vehicular access retains the continuity and integrity of the frontage and removes any pedestrian conflict.

In summary, although the scheme pre-dates the Bank Park Area SPD, it is considered that it is aligned to its key urban design principles, specifically:

- avoiding ‘any place’ development by evolving a site responsive development;
- reinforcement of the outer edges of the Park with distinctive built form;
- introduction of complementary built form in terms of scale and massing;
- promoting a mix of uses and active frontages at street level to ensure vibrancy, activity and safety;
- locating servicing accesses and areas to ensure that they do not impinge adversely on the quality of the streetscape or the visual amenity of users and passers by;
- designing out conflict between pedestrians and service vehicles;
- locating refuse bins so as to ensure that they do not impinge adversely on the quality of the streetscape or the visual amenity of users and passers by;
- locating car parking facilities so as to ensure that they do not impinge adversely on the quality of the streetscape or the visual amenity of users and passers by;
- encouragement of car parks in basements or courtyards;
- maximising natural daylight, sustainable land use and sustainable movement patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS1</th>
<th>HIGHWAYS Development Control Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use / Transportation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No additional highway issues are recognised since 2009 and the proposed scheme would not generate a significant increase in traffic levels, or have any material impact upon the highway network. The existing filling station has a higher traffic generation than the expected office trips - provision of the 27 parking spaces is considered adequate for the proposed use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS1</th>
<th>ENVIRON IMPACT Development Control Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site remains bounded by offices to the south, and a supermarket and church building to the west/south west with Bank Park to the east. Despite the differences in land levels, it is considered that a sufficient distance is retained to the buildings to the west / south west so as not to adversely affect the
use of this land (more than 50m). Nevertheless the new building will be very visible when viewed from the west / south west due to the elevated land levels. The adjacent office has windows within its north facing elevation that would be affected by the development, but not to the extent that it is considered that this should be a determinative factor.

There are residential properties to the north and north-west with a block of three storey apartments, Park Court, facing onto Crosfield Street, and two storey semi detached along Nicholson Street - there are no windows within the side elevation of Park Court and the outlook and privacy of these properties would remain largely unaffected - the proposed building would be visible from Nicholson Street, but only at an oblique angle - it is considered that this relationship would not be materially harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of Nicholson Street.

As with the previous application Environmental Heath raise no objections subject to appropriately worded conditions.

Responses to consultation

Environment Agency
No objections
No comments
Environmental Health
No objections
Conditions recommended relating to land contamination and insulation of external plant

Highways
No objections
Previous conditions reiterated

Arboricultural Officer
No objections
None

Responses to Notification
One letter of objection received:
1. Access from cul-de-sac is extremely hazardous for residents in Nicholson Street.
2. Increased traffic on road.
3. Development should have begun within the allotted three year time period.

Comment: see policy appraisal above (HIGHWAYS) – government initiative to allow extension of time and LPA’s advised to take a positive and constructive approach towards such applications

Letter received from church to the west of the site:
1. Concerns in respect of the integrity of the embankment retaining wall.
2. Possible spillage of contaminated compounds onto the adjoining church land.

Comment: conditions again recommended relating to remediation and measures to address the variation in levels with the adjacent land

Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision

- The NPPF has introduced a stronger presumption in favour of development and the principle of an office development in this location remains acceptable.
- There has been no material change in circumstances in respect of the sites relationship with adjoining land and buildings.
- There remains a relatively sensitive context - the proposal as originally submitted was considered bland and unsympathetic - the current scheme is a lot more dynamic and vibrant and better utilises the specific characteristics of the site.
- The introduction of the Bank Park SPD since the previous approval articulates a vision for the area based on sound urban sound principles – the proposal reflects several of these principles and complements regeneration objectives for the area.
• The traffic generated by the proposal would be less than its existing use as a petrol filling station, and the access and basement parking arrangements remain satisfactory.
• The amount of traffic that would use Nicholson Street is not considered to be so great that it would seriously harm the living conditions of the residents of Nicholson Street.
• The building does not have a direct interface with residential property, and although it would be conspicuous when viewed from the church and supermarket to the east by virtue of lower adjoining land levels, its visual impact is considered to be acceptable.
• Matters relating to land contamination and integrity of a retaining wall are capable of being conditioned, and addressed at a later stage.
• The proposal remains in accordance with the relevant provisions of the development plan.
## Application Number:
2012/20433

## Location:
WOOLSTON COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL, HALL ROAD, WOOLSTON, WARRINGTON, WA1 4PA

## Ward:
RIXTON AND WOOLSTON

## Development:
Proposed demolition of existing building and construction of a new single storey school.

## Applicant:
The School Governors

## Recommendation:
Approve subject to Conditions

## Conditions:
- Standard Time limit -full 3 years
- Plans Compliance
- Contaminated Land Investigation/survey/remediation
- Submit details of externally mounted plant/equipment
- Scheme for continued use of sports pitch
- Landscaping Scheme
- Investigation of ground conditions
- 10% Renewable Energy Target
- Submission of Swept path analysis
- Submission of Construction Management Plan
- Submission of School Travel Plan

### Reason for Referral
The application made by the Council. Cllr Brinksman has requested referral and for Members to make a site visit.

### Description

- Full application for the demolition of the existing two form entry school building and construction of a new single storey one form entry school building
- Proposals include a hard play area, a Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and an under 12 grass pitch
- Existing school provides for 256 pupils. The proposed school would provide 210 pupil places with 25 full time and 5 part time staff
- Some community use after school hours and weekends is proposed
- The proposed building is to be re-sited to the south-west of the site – with parking to the north-east and play areas to the north and middle section of the site
- 24 staff car park bays would be provided, 3 spaces for visitors and 2 disabled bays
- Existing main entrance on Hall Road to be closed off and replaced with pedestrian entrance, existing car park access to Barnfield Road to remain and the proposed main entrance and service yard entrance would use existing access to the western elevation on Barnfield Road
- There would be no on-site “drop-off/pick-up” provision for the school – however this is not currently provided for the existing school
- Proposed and existing delivery times are between 7-730am and recycling collection at 8am; The applicant confirms that a restriction of delivery times will be agreed with the school to avoid am/pm school runs
- Paths within the site would be well segregated from vehicle routes; there are no proposed changes to existing bus stop provision or to services
- The existing car parking area to the north-east of the site is to be retained and extended
- Existing access of Barnfield Road to be widened and pedestrian access off Hall Road to be relocated to reflect new building location
- 51 trees would be removed and 60 trees to be re-planted
- The applicant has conducted pre-application consultation with local residents on the site boundary – which has resulted in alterations to design/layout

Location

- The 0.247 ha site houses the existing primary school
- The site is bounded by residential properties in all directions with fairly continuous boundary planting
- Main vehicular access would be via Barnfield Road; nearest bus stops are located off Hillock Lane and Manchester Road
- The site is designated as Urban Green Space and Playing Fields in the adopted UDP
Plan below shows the location of the existing building in relation to plot boundaries
Relevant History

- Various applications for works to existing school buildings, temporary and mobile classrooms have been submitted since 1977.

Main Issues and Constraints

Principle
Details of design, layout etc
Highways/Transportation matters
Impact on living conditions
Land quality
Playing fields/Green Space
Drainage
Nature conservation
Important Landscape Features
**Key policy/guidance checklist**

**National Policy/Guidance**
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Local Policy/Guidance**
*Warrington Borough Council Unitary Development Plan unless otherwise stated.*

**Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

| DC51; LUT1; LUT2; GRN2; GRN11; SOC1; | **Principle** | The principle of a replacement for the existing school building on site is considered acceptable.

The existing facilities at Woolston Primary School are acknowledged to be inadequate, the buildings of poor quality with ad hoc additions; of outdated design; and does not meet the requirements of a modern school.

The provision of enhanced and upgraded schools, using sustainable design and taking on board guidance associated with green space and playing areas is well supported by the planning policy framework.

The west facing orientation of the new school was chosen as it would allow the existing school to be remain occupied during construction and subsequently demolished once the new school was finished.

---

| DC51; DC57; GRN2; GRN22; REP16; | **Details of design, layout, landscaping etc** | The aim of the new building is to provide “street presence” to both Hall Road and Barnfield Road through the proposed modern design – whilst aiming to respect the adjoining surrounding residential area.

The proposed modern design would tend to be more prominent than both the existing building - given that it replaces an outdated 1950’s flat roofed structure. – in a locality typified by red brick housing dating from the 1930/60’s. However the proposed building has been designed with the intention of creating a new focal point, whilst also trying to harmonise with the setting - for example by the use brick. The use of a green powder coated aluminium standing seam roof is an attempt to compliment the green field setting of the site. The proposal also seeks to increase the functional requirement of the building given the amended layout and increased use of natural light.

Plot to building ratio as existing is 11% and this would increase to a more generous 8% - the proposal would see a reduction in foot print on site.
Height of the existing building ranges from 3.5m at the lowest point and 9.1m highest point with predominantly flat roof. Height of the proposed building ranges from 3.6m at the lowest point and 10m highest point with predominantly saw tooth roof and sloping pitch roof to highest point – therefore whilst the replacement building would see ridge height increased by 0.9m the proposed “saw tooth” roof design would reduce the bulkiness of the roof - and would be more aesthetically pleasing than the existing flat roof design.

The majority of existing trees are to be retained and the north east boundary would see additional planting. Planting is to be removed to the south east and south western boundaries (51 to be removed) however new trees would be planted (60 trees to be replanted) to help define routes and enclosures and to provide extra screening to residents’ properties – replacement planting to be controlled by condition with extra planting required to the western boundary facing Barnfield Road to reduce the visual impact of the new building

Solar panels would provide 10% of the buildings energy demand – this can be secured by condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUT1; SOC1; LUT20;</th>
<th>Highways/Transportation matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing access vehicular onto Barnfield Avenue to be utilised and widening to accommodate both construction traffic and larger vehicles to accommodate deliveries – this can be controlled by condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main pedestrian entrance to be re-sited onto Barnfield Avenue with 2nd access taken from Hall Road

Existing car parking area to the north of the site to be increased from 19 spaces to 24 spaces

Pupil numbers to decrease from 256 to 210 therefore proposal is not expected to not result in additional traffic generation over and above current levels associated with the existing school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS1; GRN2; HOU7; HOU13; REP10; REP11;</th>
<th>Impact on living conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant has conducted pre-application consultation with residents living near the site boundary. Information boards were displayed in Woolston Primary School following invitations to local residents offering the opportunity to view and make comments on the proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing building is sited 32m to nearest property on Barnfield Road, 25m to properties on Hall Road, 44m to properties on Rosendale Avenue and 83m to properties on Oakdene Avenue
Proposed building to be sited 31m to nearest properties on Barnfield Avenue, 50m to properties Hall Road, 140m to properties on Rosendale Avenue and 31m to properties on Oakdene Avenue. This is considered sufficient to prevent harm to living conditions.

Classrooms face away from residential properties on Barnfield Road and instead face properties with the greatest separation distance on Rosendale Avenue. Staff offices and toilets face properties on Barnfield Road and class rooms face properties on Rosendale Avenue. Deliveries and kitchens are near the site entrance off Barnfield Avenue.

Potential environmental impacts – such as proposed external lighting, cooking odour extraction, delivery times, externally mounted equipment, construction hours/days etc are also considered acceptable, subject to condition to prevent harmful impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REP1; REP8;</th>
<th>Land quality</th>
<th>Land quality reports have been submitted. Further investigative work may be needed – and this is the subject of condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRN10; GRN11;</td>
<td>Playing fields/Urban Green Space</td>
<td>The proposal involves re-siting the existing school and demolishing the existing school building – therefore despite the loss of playfield to the south-west of the site, land would be freed up to the east of the site to make provision for new play areas – this accords with policies GRN10 &amp; GRN11- as alternative provision is to be made. Sport England have confirmed that – subject to condition – there would be no negative impact on playing field provision as the proposal would replace existing playing areas (see Sport England Comments below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP5;</td>
<td>Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage Systems</td>
<td>Advice from the Councils Asset and Flood Risk Team confirms that the submitted Drainage assessment is satisfactory (see Flood Risk Team appraisal below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN21;</td>
<td>Nature conservation</td>
<td>Pond area considered sensitive habitat area therefore condition requiring details of replacement planning is required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to consultation (Full details on file)

Planning Policy
Principle of school building already established therefore no objections to a replacement building.

Solar panels would provide 10% of the buildings energy demand which complies with the NPPF requirements however suggest condition to ensure this is provided.

Network and Development Control (Highways)
No objection, subject to following conditions – for main text see appendix 1 – below
1) Revised swept path to be submitted demonstrating that wide vehicles can enter the serve yard in a forward gear
2) Submission of a Construction Management Plan detailing temporary construction access, unloading and turning of vehicles, construction staff parking and HGV routeing
3) Submission of a revised School Travel Plan

Environmental Protection
No objection, but request following conditions/informative:
1) Full contaminated land condition – Land Quality Assessment Desk Study reveals pollutant linkages, sources of contamination and existence of a boiler/substation which requires further investigation
2) Externally mounted equipment should not increase ambient background noise levels to residential properties – to prevent harm to living conditions of neighbouring properties
3) Working hours for construction sites – to prevent harm to living conditions of neighbouring properties

Comment
Suitable conditions and informatives have been agreed.

Sport England
No negative impact on playing field provision as the proposal would replace existing playing areas therefore no objection subject to the following conditions:
1) Submission of scheme to ensure continuity of existing sports use of playfields during construction
2) Assessment of ground conditions following demolition of existing school
3) The proposed landscaping scheme should minimize adverse effect on size or quality of the playing field/multi use games area by the size, location and size of proposed trees/shrubs

Asset and Flood Risk Team
No objection however advice offered for good practice urging the applicant to consider alternatives to use of plastic crate systems.
United Utilities
No objection but the applicant advised to contact a building control body at an early stage as not all sewers are shown on statutory records

Natural Environment Officer
No objection subject to condition requiring details of replacement planting.

Tree Officer
No objections – recommends condition requiring tree protection measures to be erected prior to demolition and no excavations or increasing levels or storage in the root zones

Ward Member (Cllr Bill Brinksman)
Request referral to planning committee with consideration of attaching the following conditions:
1) Restricting delivery times to avoid schools runs in the morning and afternoon
2) Road not designed for large vehicles therefore construction access to be agreed and contractor to pay for potential damage
3) Condition controlling construction hours to prevent noise disturbance

Comments
1) Proposed and existing delivery times are between 7-7.30 a.m. with recycling collection at 8am. As a result there should be no conflict with busy periods (pick up and drop off) therefore condition controlling delivery times is not considered necessary
2) Construction Management Plan to be requested by condition which would control temporary construction access
3) Construction hours are controlled by separate legislation (see above Environmental Health appraisal)

Parish Council
No objection but request same conditions as requested above by Cllr Bill Brinksman.

Responses to Notification (Full details on file)

Neighbours
2 letters of objection – key areas of concern:
• Alternate locations of the new building on the existing site should be considered
• Curve shape exacerbates impact on properties on Barnfield Road
• New building would be sited too close to boundary fence at just 10m
• Loss of trees will make the site more prominent, particularly in winter months
• Suggestions by residents for temporary classrooms to be set up/sending pupils to nearby schools were dismissed
• Traffic congestion during delivery times/service area not wide enough therefore vehicles will be parked on the highway
• Concerned the modern design of the new building would not match the traditional red brick appearance of the locality
• Loss of house value
• Noise disturbance from use of service yard

**Appraisal**

• *Members are obliged to consider the application as proposed*
• *New building would be sited closer to properties on Barnfield Road however would still achieve a separation of 31m at the closest point which is considered sufficient to prevent harm to living conditions*
• *The new building would be sited 15m to the site boundary at the closest point, not 10m as stated. This is the same distance as the existing building - however the building has been rotated 90-degrees on site therefore is now to be viewed in full rather than from the side in relation to Barnfield Road*
• *Majority of trees to be removed to the western section of the site to accommodate the proposed building and service yard with 15 trees to be removed and 7 to be replanted. Remaining/proposed planting would provide an element of screening however condition requiring additional boundary planting considered necessary to limit visual impact to properties on Barnfield Road*
• *Proposed and existing delivery times are between 7-730am with recycling collection at 8am. As a result there should be no significant conflict with the busiest periods (pick up and drop off). Non-Planning controls are available in relation to vehicles parking on the highway which cause an obstruction*
• *The replacement building is considered appropriate to the setting in terms of scale and proportion – modern design is aimed at creating a new focal point – amended layout increases function of the school – makes use of natural light – therefore not considered to cause harm to the character/appearance of the area (see above officer appraisal)*
• *House value is not a consideration relevant to planning when determining a planning application*
• *It is considered that the proposed delivery times would not cause serious harm to living conditions*

**Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision**

Subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its potential impacts in relation to matters of principle; details of design, layout etc; highways/transportation matters; nearby living conditions; land quality; playing fields; drainage and nature conservation and is, therefore, in accordance with policies of the adopted Warrington UDP. GRN2, GRN10, GRN11, GRN21, GRN22, DCS1, DCS7, SOC1, LUT1, LUT2, LUT7
Appendix 1
Comments of Network and Development Control (Highways)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport Assessment</th>
<th>It has been confirmed by the applicant that the number of pupils attending the new school is expected to decrease from 256 to 210. Therefore the proposals should not result in additional traffic generation over and above current levels associated with the existing school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Access Arrangements</td>
<td>It is proposed that existing vehicular access onto Barnfield Road will be widened. Drawing C12020-292 Rev P1 demonstrates that an 8.6m length fire appliance is capable of entering the service yard access in a forwards direction, turning on site and leaving in a forwards direction. This is acceptable. Drawing C12020-291 Rev P1, however, demonstrates that a 9.5m length refuse vehicle cannot enter the site in a forwards direction, but would need to pull into Austral Avenue in order to reverse across the highway of Barnfield Road to enter the site. This manoeuvre is not acceptable due to the dangers that reversing such a large vehicle across the carriageway of Barnfield Road would present. In order to address the above, WBC Highways will therefore require a further widened service yard entrance to be provided, to ensure that a refuse vehicle can enter the site in a forwards direction, turn on site and leave in a forwards direction. This will need to be demonstrated by a revised swept path analysis being supplied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has also been confirmed by the applicant that it is envisaged that construction vehicles measuring up to 9.5m length are also proposed to access the site via the service yard access during the construction period. A widened access sufficient to accommodate this length of vehicle therefore needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to be demonstrated and implemented prior to the commencement of development. This should be ensured via planning condition.

Pedestrian Access Arrangements:

Two pedestrian access points are to be provided as a result of the proposals. These located off Barnfield Avenue to the east and Hall Road to the north.

Construction Management Plan

The Transport Statement submitted in support of the planning application states that:

“It is confirmed that prior to the commencement of construction of the new school the applicant will prepare and issue to the Local Authority a Construction Management Plan (CMP). This document will confirm the following:

- Details of the temporary construction access from Barnfield Road;
- Details of the location of the staff car park;
- Details of the site compound including unloading and turning area for delivery vehicles; and
- HGV route for the site from the strategic road network (M6 Junction 21).

The applicant has agreed that the issue and subsequent approval of the CMP be subject to a planning condition should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the application.”

We would therefore request that the submission and agreement of a Construction Management Plan, prior to the commencement of development, should be ensured via planning condition.

Proposed Parking Provision

It is proposed to provide 24 parking spaces (including 2 disabled spaces) to serve the proposals.

The Council’s adopted maximum parking standard for D1 Primary Schools and Secondary Schools is 1 space per 2 staff plus 1 additional space per 3 members of staff.
On the basis of the proposed school employing 30 members of staff, the proposed parking provision accords with the Council’s adopted maximum parking standards.

Proposed site plan 636/01/02 also includes provision of 8 cycle stands to serve the school. This is welcomed.

The provision and maintenance of car and cycle parking spaces to serve the development should be ensured via planning condition.

School Travel Plan

The proposed School Travel Plan has been reviewed by the Council’s Travel Plan Officer, who has confirmed that the submitted Travel Plan is out of date. A new School Travel Plan is therefore required.

The submission and agreement of a revised School Travel Plan should therefore be ensured via planning condition.

Summary and Conclusions

In view of the above, no highways objections are raised in respect of the proposals subject to attachment of the following planning conditions:

“Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, a revised swept path analysis demonstrating that a 9.5m length refuse vehicle can satisfactorily enter the service yard access on Barnfield Road in a forwards direction, turn on site and leave in a forwards direction, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed widened service yard access shall be implemented in full prior to the construction of the development, and shall be retained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.”

“Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, a Construction Management Plan (including details of the temporary construction access from Barnfield Road, unloading and turning areas for delivery vehicles, construction staff
parking areas, and HGV routeing to and from the site) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Construction Management Plan shall then be implemented in full prior to the construction of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority."

“Prior to occupation/1st use of the development hereby permitted, a revised School Travel Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed School Travel Plan shall be implemented in full to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the development.”
Application Number: 2012/20462
Location: LAND OPPOSITE GRAMMAR SCHOOL ROAD, LONGBUTT LANE, LYM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0BN
Ward: LYM
Development: Outline application for proposed detached bungalow with matters of appearance, landscaping and scale reserved for later approval.
Applicant: Mr Davies and Evans Construction Ltd
Recommendation: Refuse
Reasons:
- Demonstrable harm to visual amenities of Green Belt
- Adverse impact on matters of nature conservation interest

Reasons for Referral

- Objections have been raised by Lym Parish Council, Councillor Mrs Woodyatt and a number of residents (see responses below).

Description

- Proposal follows an appeal dismissal in 2011 for the erection of 3 affordable dwellings on this site (see history below).
- Current application has been made in Outline for the construction of a detached bungalow including access and layout details (appearance, landscaping and scale have been reserved (i.e. not included within this application)).
- The proposed layout includes a bungalow (footprint 12.7 x 10m, annotated eaves height 2.45m, ridge height 4.8m), 6m wide vehicle access from Longbut Lane, 2no. off-street parking spaces & turning area.
- The application also incorporates widening of the carriageway to 4.8m and provision of a 2m wide footpath with new front boundary hedgerow (to be maintained at a height of 0.7m).
Location

- The site is a vacant parcel of land. The adjacent land to the north and east is situated within the Green Belt, whereas the application site is within the Village Inset.

- Abutting the northern boundary is a footpath (no. 30 Lymm).
- Abutting the eastern boundary is a watercourse.
- There is currently no footpath provision on the eastern side of this part of Longbutt Lane.

Relevant History

- Ref. 2010/16531 Outline application for three affordable dwellings (with all matters reserved for later approval) – Refused 30th July 2010 & dismissed on appeal 10th February 2011 – visual amenity of adjoining Green Belt – impact on adjoining watercourse – highway safety.

- Ref. 2009/15634 Outline application for the construction of 5 affordable dwellings (all matters reserved for later approval) – Refused 3rd March 2010 – Housing Policy – Green Belt - Higways
- Ref. 2007/10105 Proposed erection of 2 retail units and associated car parking – Refused 2nd May 2007 - Highways – Green Belt -
- Ref. 79/8825 Outline app. for the erection of one no. detached dwelling with garage – Refused 26th February 1979 – Green Belt - Highways
- Ref. 77/4162 Outline app. for the erection of a 33kv sub-station – Refused 26th February 1970

**Main Issues and Constraints**
- Housing Land Supply / Greenfield Status
- Inset Village / Green Belt
- Highways
- Residential Amenity
- Proximity of Watercourse
- Other Matters

**Key policy/guidance checklist**
- NPPF
- Policy DCS1 Development Control Strategy
- Policy GRN4 Inset Village
- Policy HOU1 Housing Land
- Policy HOU2 Housing Development – Restrictions
- Policy HOU3 Housing Development – Development Control
- Policy HOU13 Privacy and Daylight
- Policy LUT20 Parking
- Policy REP10 Noise
- Policy LUT1 Land Use / Transportation Strategy
- Policy LUT2 Transport Priorities in Development Control
- Policy LUT3 Walking
- Policy GRN21 Protection of the Nature Conservation Resource

**Policy Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOU1</th>
<th>Housing Land Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOU2</td>
<td>Housing Development – Restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN4</td>
<td>Inset Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN1</td>
<td>Green Belt Development Proposals in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN3</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to but outside the Green Belt. Paragraph 3.15 of PPG2 Green Belts, although now superseded by the NPPF, states that the visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of managing the housing supply the principle of one dwelling can be supported in this location, which is within the village inset of Lymm, provided all other relevant aspects of the Development Plan are met.
Countryside the Green Belt which, although they would not prejudice the purposes of including land in Green Belts, might be visually detrimental by reason of their siting, materials or design.

It is considered that the site has more affinity with the adjacent countryside and Green Belt, rather than the built form of the Inset Village, and it is certainly conspicuous from the Green Belt. The verdant character of the site is visually contiguous with the character of the adjacent land to the north and east, and inevitably the residential development of the site would have an adverse visual impact, both upon views into and from within the Green Belt.

This issue was endorsed in the Inspector’s report into the appeal for three dwellings under application 2010/16531 which states ‘in its present condition, and from whichever direction the land is viewed, I consider it has more physical and visual affinity with the neighbouring farmland than with the nearby housing. As a result, no matter how well designed the proposed scheme might be, I consider that the erection of 3 dwellings on this modest site would look like an encroachment into the countryside. Such development would be to the visual detriment of both the immediate locality and the wider Green Belt’.

There is minimal scope for screen planting to help minimise the visual impact due to the modest size of the site. Although the land gradient to the north/east would mitigate long distance views from those directions slightly, the proposal would nevertheless cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt.
One of the reasons why the previous application was dismissed on appeal was as follows:

- **widening of the carriageway of Longbutt Lane to an insufficient width of 4.5m which did not meet the Council’s minimum standards which require a minor residential access road to have a width of 4.8m.**

The current proposal incorporates widening of the carriageway to 4.8m and provision of a 2m wide footpath.

**A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been carried out as recommended by WBC’s transport team who have no objections subject to conditions (see below).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS1 LUT1</th>
<th>Development Control Strategy</th>
<th>Land Use / Transportation Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCS1 HOU13</th>
<th>Development Control Strategy</th>
<th>Privacy and Daylight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There are three residential properties on the opposite side of Longbutt Lane from the application site, none of which have a direct interface with the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Protection</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REP4</td>
<td>Protection of the Flood Plain</td>
<td>The Environment Agency objected to the previous scheme in relation to the proposed culverting of the adjacent watercourse increasing the risk of flooding, maintenance requirements for a watercourse, destroying wildlife habitats, damaging natural amenity and interrupting the continuity of the linear habitat of a watercourse. The current application proposes to maintain the watercourse as an open stream and states that it would be maintained by the new owner significantly reducing any likelihood of flooding &amp; maintain a potential wildlife habitat and wildlife corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GRN21 | Protection of the Nature Conservation Resource Biodiversity and Geological Conservation | The EC Habitats Directive 1992 requires the UK to maintain a system of strict protection for protected species and their habitats. The Directive only allows disturbance, or deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or resting places,  
- in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment  
and provided that there is  
- no satisfactory alternative and  
- no detriment to the maintenance of the species population at favourable conservation status in their natural range  
The UK implemented the Directive by introducing The Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994 which contain two layers of protection  
- a requirement on Local Planning Authorities to have regard to the Directive’s requirements above, and |
- a licensing system administered by Natural England.

Circular 6/2005 advises LPAs to give due weight to the presence of protected species on a development site to reflect EC requirements. “This may potentially justify a refusal of planning permission.”

This current planning application is not supported by sufficient ecological information. All planning decisions should be based on up to date information about the environmental characteristics of their areas. There are, however, no statutory or non-statutory nature conservation sites that will be effected this proposed development. It is considered necessary however to undertake a Phase 1 Habitat Survey in order for the application to be appropriately assessed. The application does not include this information, and is subsequently considered to be unacceptable from an ecological point of view.

This issue was included as a reason for refusal of application 2010/16531 but was not referred to in the Inspectors report as a reason for the subsequent appeal dismissal other than the culverting of the water course and the potential habitat harm that this could cause. The current application includes for the existing watercourse to be maintained together with a narrow strip that can be utilised as a habitat corridor. Nevertheless a Phase 1 Habitat Survey remains necessary in the Council’s view and unacceptable in the absence of one.

Responses to consultation

Environmental Health
No objections subject to comments regarding drainage and connections to services.

Highways
A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the proposals has now been conducted by the Council’s Road Safety Auditors. The audit has not identified any significant highway safety concerns and has made the following minor recommendations:

1. Tactile paving should be ensured on the crossing points between footways on the north and south side of the widened carriageway of Longbutt Lane.
This can be ensured at the detailed design (S.278) stage.

2. Where the proposed new pedestrian footway terminates at the south eastern boundary of the site, the tree line / foliage should be cut back to ensure adequate pedestrian visibility.

Consultations with the Council’s Arboricultural Officer have confirmed that the sycamore tree situated within the applicants’ site (which may obstruct pedestrian visibility if left unattended) can be removed altogether, rather than being pruned back.

Both of the above recommendations outlined in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit can therefore be ensured.

Summary and Conclusions

In view of the above, and given that the previously requested highways improvements are now proposed, no highways objections are raised in respect of the proposed development, subject to attachment of the following planning conditions:

“Prior to the commencement of development, construction details of the proposed widening of Longbutt Lane and new 2m wide footway as shown on proposed site plan Rev A received on the 24th September 2012 shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The proposed highway improvements to Longbutt Lane shall be implemented as agreed prior to first occupation of the development.”

“Prior to occupation of the development the two car parking spaces and on site turning area for vehicles shown on proposed site plan Rev A received on the 24th September 2012 shall be made available and shall be retained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.”

“Prior to occupation of the development a scheme for the relocation of street furniture in the vicinity of the site including, traffic signage, public right of way signage and pedestrian protection barriers shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme as is agreed shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development.”

In addition the following informative is offered:

In order to construct the proposed widened carriageway of Longbutt Lane, the applicant will need to enter into a S.278 agreement with the Council. To action, the applicant should contact John Drake of the Council’s Public Realm section on 01925 442668.

Comment: The previous reason for refusal has now been addressed from a highways point of view only.
Nature Conservation Officer

No ecological assessment has been provided which would be needed to be able to determine the application. The main issue is the brook and whether water voles could be present (a protected species). The national standard guidelines in terms of a stand off distance for water voles is 6m for the top of the bank to the start of any development. If a survey concludes water voles are not currently present a stand off distance of more the 1-2m would be expected as this is seen as good practice and would allow for water voles to colonise the area in the future. A reduced buffer zone could prevent this which would be seen as a detrimental impact. Liaison with the EA over an agreed stand-off distance would be necessary if water voles are not present.

The surveys cannot be conditioned as part of any permission as the information is needed to competently determine the application. Protected species are a material consideration. The lack of ecological data would, therefore, be a reason for refusal.

The applicant will need to carry out a phase 1 habitat survey of the site which should include a water vole survey of the brook. Reference to the presence of any none native species would also be expected (Japanese Knotweed or Himalayan balsam for example). The applicant should bear in mind however that Watervole surveys have seasonal risks and the optimum time for surveying is almost over.

Comment: See policy appraisal section above.

Arboricultural Officer

The site itself contains no mature tree stock, the eastern elevation however, bounded by an open ditch, has several sycamores on the opposite side of the ditch in the adjacent agricultural land.

The trees are of some visual significance and should be retained. The intended location of the bungalow and associated parking spaces are within influencing distance of the larger tree crowns.

Although on the opposite ditch side to the development, potentially the roots could be adversely affected by the excavations required to install the foundations, reducing their vigour and possibly the stability of the trees.

The proposed location of the bungalow is such that significant amounts of morning light will be reduced by the trees, increasing pressure on the owner of the trees to carry out remedial pruning on a greater frequency than could be considered acceptable for their retention in satisfactory condition.

The current submitted drawing is ambiguous with regard to the trees' locations and at this stage does not appear to mention the condition of the trees or plot their locations.
Visually, all appear to be of sound form and vigour but the amount of basal ivy and associated ground flora makes an accurate assessment of their condition difficult. It may be prudent to request further information regarding the trees condition and proximity to the proposed bungalow.

In summary, the site has several mature trees within influencing distance of some amenity that should ideally be retained in the landscape. The site is confined and concerns remain as to whether the proposed development can be accommodated without some revision to the siting of the bungalow and associated parking.

**United Utilities**  
No objection subject to standard conditions and informatives regarding contaminated land and working hours.

**Responses to Notification** (Full details on file)

**Councillor Mrs Sheila Woodyatt**  
Objection

- site totally unsuitable for development;
- a locally very sensitive site on which all previous applications have been refused by WBC and on appeal;
- any development on this site would compromise the openness of the adjacent, very precious green belt;
- Longbut Lane is a substandard highway and not suitable for additional traffic even if only domestic.

*Comment: See policy appraisal section above.*

**Lymm Parish Council**  
Objection

- site is adjacent to the Green Belt;
- development would have an adverse impact on the safe route to schools;
- the adjacent highway is substandard;
- this would be overdevelopment of the site.

*Comment: See policy appraisal section above.*

**Neighbours**  
Letters of OBJECTION received from 19 residential properties:

- Detrimental to the street scene on rural edge of Lymm bordering the Green Belt;
- Development would compromise the open aspect of the adjoining Green Belt;
• Previous reasons for refusal still apply - total unsuitability of site for residential development was confirmed by Inspector who dismissed previous appeal;
• Unnecessary addition to surplus of housing land within Borough;
• Hundreds of houses already built on Scholars Green and Seasons development resulting in more children walking along this dangerous road;
• Increased traffic in hazardous area as road is extremely narrow/ single width, wholly unsuitable for access from the site – road requires significant improvement;
• Detrimental to pedestrian safety as it is a major walking route taken by pupils to Lymm High School & Ravenbank Primary School;
• Greenfield land with appearance of Greenfield site – land is not urban in character and is visually contiguous with the Green Belt;
• Road requires significant improvement – proposed footpath not beneficial to pedestrians;
• Precedent for additional units;
• Water course would be contaminated in the event of a flood.

Comment: See policy appraisal section above

Conclusions and reasons for recommendation/decision

Whilst impacts on traffic and highway and the watercourse running along the north-eastern boundary of the site have been addressed the proposal would cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenities of the adjacent Green Belt. This impact would be compounded by the highway works proposed (widening of the carriageway) including 2m wide footpath along the front boundary of the site which would result in the site having a predominantly urban aspect. Currently the site is predominantly rural in aspect contiguous with the adjoining Green Belt.

The application does not include a Habitat Survey to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on matters of nature conservation interest. As such, the application is not in accordance with the relevant provisions of the development plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>App number</th>
<th>App Location/Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012/20175</td>
<td>LAND AT DOEFORD CLOSE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 4DL Proposed residential development comprising 26 dwellings (18 two storey detached and 8 mews type dwellings), access roads and landscape works</td>
<td>Approve subject to Sec 106 Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2012/19709</td>
<td>PROSPECT FARM, PROSPECT LANE, RIXTON-WITH-GLAZEBROOK, WARRINGTON, WA3 6EH Proposed change of use to provide a clay pigeon shooting club, clubhouse and associated parking</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2012/19993</td>
<td>LAND TO THE NORTH OF BOOThS LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON Proposed stables</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2012/20372</td>
<td>CROSFIELD FILLING STATION, CROSFIELD STREET, WARRINGOTN, WA1 1UD Proposed extension of time limit for implementation of 2009/14568 (Three storey office block with underground parking and associated landscaping)</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2012/20433</td>
<td>WOOLSTON COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL,</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HALL ROAD, WOOLSTON, WARRINGTON, WA1 4PA
Proposed demolition of existing building and construction of a new single storey school
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SITE VISITS TO TAKE PLACE ON 30TH NOV