To: Members of the Development Management Committee

Councillors: Chair – T McCarthy
Deputy Chair – J Richards
P Carey, F Rashid, L Morgan, L Murphy,
B Barr, J Wheeler, S Woodyatt, D Keane
S Wright and A Heaver

18 August 2015

Development Management Committee

Wednesday, 26 August 2015 at 6.30pm

Council Chamber, Town Hall, Sankey Street, Warrington, WA1 1UH

Agenda prepared by Julie Pickles, Democratic and Member Services Officer – Telephone: (01925) 443212 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.

2. Code of Conduct - Declarations of Interest
   Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests)
   Regulations 2012

   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.
3. **Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 5 August 2015 as a correct record.

4. **Planning Applications (Main Plans List)**

Report of the Executive Director Economic Regeneration, Growth and Environment

4. **Planning Appeal Decisions for Period 4 July to 13 August 2015**


5.1 Grappenhall Lodge (Enforcement), Cartridge Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 4SQ

5.2 Oakview Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 3HT

5.3 Oakview, Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 3HT

5.4 Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 3HT

5.5 Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 3HT

**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.

Nil

*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

5 August 2015

Present:  Councillor T McCarthy (Chairman)
           Councillors B Barr, P Carey, A Heaver, L Morgan, L Murphy, S Parish (Substituting for D Keane) F Rashid, J Richards, J Wheeler, S Woodyatt

DM18  Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Keane (S Parish Substituting) and S Wright.

DM19  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>B Barr</td>
<td>DM27</td>
<td>Councillor Barr was the ward member for the area.</td>
<td>Councillor Barr had no involvement in the application and would remain in the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Heaver</td>
<td>DM24</td>
<td>Councillor Heaver was a member of Penketh Parish Council.</td>
<td>Councillor Heaver had no involvement in the application and would remain in the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T McCarthy</td>
<td>DM25</td>
<td>Councillor McCarthy was the ward member for the area.</td>
<td>Councillor McCarthy had no involvement in the application and would remain in the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Rashid</td>
<td>DM22</td>
<td>Councillor Rashid was the ward member for the area.</td>
<td>Councillor Rashid would step down for the item and would speak as the ward member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Wheeler</td>
<td>DM23</td>
<td>Councillor Wheeler was the ward member for the area.</td>
<td>Councillor Wheeler had no involvement with the application and would remain in the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Woodyatt</td>
<td>DM27</td>
<td>Councillor Woodyatt was the ward member for the area and Chair of Lymm Parish Council who had requested the site visit for the application.</td>
<td>Councillor Woodyatt had no involvement with the application, had not predetermined it and would remain in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DM20 Minutes

Resolved,

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DM21 Planning Applications

Resolved,

That Pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) the applications for permission to develop land be considered and dealt with in the manner agreed.

DM22 2015/25913 – Great Sankey Leisure Centre, Barrow Hall Lane, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 3AA

The Chair requested that the above item be taken first due to the nature of the application. The Executive Director of Economic Regeneration, Growth and Environment submitted the above application with a recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

Councillor Rashid left the meeting and addressed the committee as the ward member for the area, speaking in favour of the application. Further representations were heard in support of the application.

Members considered the information set out in the update report.

Resolved,

That the application 2015/25913 be approved subject to conditions in accordance with the recommendations.

DM23 2015/25675 – HMYOI Thorn Cross, Arley Road, Appleton, Warrington, WA4 4RL

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

The committee received representation in support of the application.

Members considered the information set out in the update report.

Resolved,
That the application 2015/25675 be approved subject to amendment to condition 9 to refer to long wheel base transit type vehicles aside from this, members expressed their requirement for a traffic speed survey to be conducted in the vicinity of this site and for a wider review of traffic speeds and restrictions in Appleton Thorn.

DM24 2015/25661 – Friends Lane Stables, Friends Lane, Warrington, WA5 3LE

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

The committee received representations in support of the application.

Members considered the information set out in the update report.

Resolved,

That the application 2015/25661 be approved subject to additional and amended conditions as set out in the written update report.

DM25 2015/25807 – 44 Hertford Close, Woolston, Warrington, WA1 4EZ

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

Resolved,

That the application 2015/25807 be approved subject to conditions in accordance with the recommendations.

DM26 2015/25898 – 101 Walton Road, Warrington, WA4 6NR

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

The committee received representations in support and against the application.

Members considered the information set out in the update report.

Resolved,

That the application 2015/25898 be deferred to a future meeting to allow for a site visit to take place on Friday 21 August.

DM27 2015/25943 – 44 Eagle Brow, Lymm, Warrington, WA13 0LZ
The Executive Director of Economic Regeneration, Growth and Environment submitted the above application with a recommendation of approval subject to conditions.

The committee received representations in support of the application.

Members considered the information set out in the update report.

Resolved,

That the application 2015/25943 be approved subject to conditions in accordance with the recommendations.

DM28 2015/26061 – New Horizons School, Fallowfield Grove, Poulton-With-Fearnhead, Warrington, WA2 0QQ

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

Resolved,

That the application 2015/26061 be approved subject to amended conditions as set out in the update report.

DM29 Planning application and appeal performance for 2015/16 – Quarter 1

Members were presented with a report of the Executive Director of Economic Regeneration, Growth and Environment that set out the planning application and appeal performance for the period from April to June 2015.

The committee noted that for the quarter 31% of appeals were allowed. This was against a target of 25% and compared to 33% in quarter 1 of the previous year. Members were also informed that despite a reduction in staffing levels, the service had maintained good levels of performance in terms of dealing with applications within satisfactory timescales.

Resolved,

That the report be noted.

Signed………………………

Dated ………………………
TITLE OF REPORT: Appeal decisions for period between 4th July & 13th August 2015.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To advise members of the planning appeal decisions at:

- Oakview – appeal dismissed
- Grappenhall Lodge – appeal dismissed / appeal allowed
- Yew Tree Farm – appeal dismissed

2. REPORT BODY

Oakview

2.1 The above appeal which sought to vary condition no. 4 on application 2007/10875 has been dismissed and the appellants costs application refused.

2.2 Condition no. 4 concerns itself with permitted development restrictions. The specific part of the condition which the applicant sought to remove would enable the construction of outbuildings. This restriction was imposed when consent was granted for the re-development of the former agricultural workers bungalow into a dwelling, which has subsequently been extended. A number of outbuildings were demolished as part of the reasoned justification for allowing the 2007 consent.

2.3 The Inspector agreed with our view that policies CC1 and CC2 would be conflicted by the proposed variation. Furthermore the Inspector agreed with the approach taken in arriving at a planning judgement on the 2007 application regarding the material enlargement of the dwelling and removal of multiple outbuildings. The NPPF states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The circumstances of the site have not changed in this regard. However, the introduction of buildings where none existed previously would reduce the undeveloped space around the house and there is a realistic prospect that the openness of the Green Belt would be harmed. The Inspector therefore considered that in this case an element of restriction is justified, reasonable and
necessary to prevent the aims and objectives of Green Belt policy as set out in the NPPF and Policies CC1 and CC2 of the LPCS being undermined.

2.4 Emery drew the Inspectors attention to an appeal decision from elsewhere in the UK. The Inspector didn’t place any weight behind this, because it was in a different LPA and the decision was reached on the basis of different policies and site circumstances. Useful point, given we are increasingly being asked by applicants to consider fall back positions and other decisions taken elsewhere in arriving at our own judgements.

Grappenhall Lodge

2.6 We have received the decision for the enforcement inquiry at Grappenhall Lodge. The decisions have taken some time to come forward. Appeal A (grounds (a), (e), (f) and (g)) relates to Mr T Smith, Appeal B (grounds (e), (f) and (g)) to Mrs M Smith. Both appeals relate to the same enforcement notice.

2.7 A split decision has effectively been issued, amending the notice issued to reflect a number of grounds succeeding, but retaining the substantive merits of the notice issued by the Council.

2.8 The appeal was initially recovered by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, however following the judgement of Moore and Coates the appeal was de-recovered and accordingly determined by the appointed Inspector.

2.9 It was agreed by both parties that the appeal site is also used for the stabling and keeping of horses and thus was in a mixed use when the notice was issued. It was agreed that the notice could be corrected without causing any prejudice to the parties as there is no requirement or intention to require that use to cease.

2.10 A separate appeal decision was issued on 25th July 2014 (prior to the enforcement inquiry) which granted temporary consent until 25th July 2016 for 3 no. pitches on the site. Occupation of these pitches is constrained to particular individuals based on their individual circumstances. The remaining persons on site do not benefit from planning permission to be on the site. At the enforcement inquiry the appellants amended their ground (a) case removing an ambition to seek permission for the remaining 2 no. pitches and instead focussed on an additional area of hardstanding and the siting of the 3 no. pitches previously granted temporary consent. (The 25th July appeal decision was unclear on the precise siting of caravans within them.)

2.11 Due to the earlier appeal decision the Ground (a) appeal was bound to succeed either in whole or in part. The issue with the 2014 appeal decision is there was insufficient room to substitute two of the touring caravans with two static caravans as required by condition 6 of that decision and also comply with licensing requirements to maintain a distance of 6m between caravans. The Inspector concluded that ‘a carefully designed layout for the three permitted pitches that incorporates the retrospective area, whilst retaining a central space for turning and manoeuvring, would not have any greater visual impact, and indeed potentially less than the parking and storage of commercial vehicles and trailers in this area.’ Plan 3 shows the layout. Condition no. 6 controls the location of buildings, caravans and vehicles.
Ground (e) was withdrawn at the inquiry.

Ground (f) was only pursued in relation to the hardstanding to be removed by virtue of the enforcement notice in order to restore the land to its condition prior to the breach taking place. On this matter the Inspector concluded that the notices requirement to remove hardstanding already in existence prior to the breach taking place would be excessive and ignore the historic position of hardstanding outside the two pitches relating to app ref: 2007/12024 and not identified on Plan 2. Furthermore it was deemed that the notice didn’t recognise hardstanding present in connection with the former house.

Ground (g) was pursued on the basis of a short 56 day compliance period. This applied to the Knight and Winter families. Whilst both families could leave quite quickly, the 56 day period allows for very little opportunity to find an alternative available site. We were not in a position to suggest alternative sites. The Inspector also noted the position regarding Two Acres in that the consent has now lapsed/refused and these families can be regarded as in immediate need of lawful accommodation. The Inspector remarked that the Council has made little progress in identify sites. Previously this has been earmarked for completion by October 2011. At inquiry, the Inspector was informed this would be Spring 2015, but this has changed to fall in line with the Secondary Plan Alteration and unlikely to be completed until September 2017. ‘As the Secretary of State acknowledged in his recent appeal decision it is likely that sites in Warrington may need to be identified that are currently in the Green Belt.’

Although the updated GTAA highlights a lower pitch requirement of 35 no. pitches up to 2027, the Inspector commented that ‘the position in relation to the need for additional pitches has not materially changed. There remains an existing shortfall of pitches.’

‘Unlike a member of the settled population becoming homeless, temporary measures such as bed and breakfast accommodation would not facilitate the gypsy way of life and are not suitable alternatives. To my mind, given the lack of alternative authorised provision, 56 days is far too short to expect the families to find available alternative pitches. I recognise that the families were aware when they occupied the site that it did not benefit from planning permission. However, neither family had occupied an authorised site prior to using the appeal site as a settled base and so did not put themselves in a worse position. A period of 12 months would be reasonable period of time, consistent with other appeal decisions where no alternatives sites have been identified. It is not necessary to demonstrate very special circumstances in relation to a ground (g) appeal.’ This was viewed as a proportionate response in the best interests of children residing on site. Therefore the Knight and Winter families have until 10th August 2016.

The 3 no. families benefitting from earlier appeal decision consent have until 26th July 2016. Thereafter the site needs to be reverted back to the 2007 approval for 2 no. pitches. Until 10th August 2017. A further 56 days thereafter enables the removal of hardcore, road planing’s, utility buildings, sheds, vehicles, all domestic paraphernalia and septic tank. The notice was amended to capture the removal of domestic paraphernalia rather than ‘associated development to facilitate such use’ the change is more precise. A further change was made to remedy the presence of a septic tank rather than cess pool.
2.18 The Inspector disagreed with the appellants that a separate storage use was taking place within part of the building used for stabling. The Inspector noted the appellant had inherited them from the previous owner and had not simply removed or disposed of them. They are not stored for any active purpose. The Inspector also considered there was no material change in character of the land if the appellant or one of the other occupiers were keeping vehicles on site to restore as a hobby. An incidental use was the view arrived at.

Yew Tree Farm

2.19 This appeal has been dismissed and the appellants claim for costs refused. The case like Oakview hinged on whether a permitted development condition had correctly been applied with regards to the six tests on a previous consent. In this case it dated back to 2004. The applicant was seeking to release the outbuilding element of the condition. The main issue in this case is whether the condition in dispute is reasonable and necessary having regard to national and local policy on protecting the Green Belt.

2.20 The Inspector noted the open and undulating topography interspersed with pockets of woodland, low hedgerows delineating field boundaries and open vistas characterise the wider landscape in the vicinity. The house and barns together with the adjoining property ‘Oakview’ form an isolated pocket of development in open countryside and are visible from long distances along Broad Lane to the north-west and south-east. To the rear of the house, the side boundaries are delineated by hedges and shrubs. The southern boundary is open from the corner of the detached timber garage to the east boundary.

2.21 Although a green belt location in itself is not an exceptional circumstance meaning the removal of permitted development rights for ancillary buildings would comply with the provisions of the Framework and the PPG. However, when consent was granted in 2004 the farmhouse was extended and the effect of the proposal on the curtilage as a whole was assessed against green belt policy and former UDP policies which aimed to protect open countryside and the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt.

2.22 Our view in determining the application subject of appeal was that releasing pd rights for outbuildings would conflict with national and local policy relating to protecting the Green Belt. The appellant took a different view and considered the condition to be unreasonable and unnecessary given that the 2004 proposals were not considered to be inappropriate development and it places unreasonable restriction on the occupier of the house. But in granting permission in 2004 existing farm structures and amendments were made to remove a detached garage in the rear garden of the house to ensure openness would not be harmed.

2.23 Given the plot size an outbuilding could potentially be erected of a considerable size that would reduce openness and be open to view from long distances on Broad Lane. So it is reasonable and necessary to prevent the aims and objectives of Green Belt policy as set out in the Framework and Policy CS5 of the LPCS being undermined to retain the condition. The appellant could apply for an outbuilding in any respect.
2.24 In terms of the costs decision, it was straightforward given the Inspectors view on the appeal itself. The appellants had not proven unreasonable behaviour in refusing planning permission.

2.25 As a consequence of submitting the application, it is possible that the applicants have extended their garden curtilage and erected a garage without the benefit of planning consent. This is now subject to a separate enforcement investigation.

3. CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT
   3.1 Not confidential or exempt.

4. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS
   4.1 None.

5. RISK ASSESSMENT
   5.1 No risks identified.

6. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY/EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT
   6.1 Not required.

7. CONSULTATION
   7.1 Not required.

8. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION
   8.1 To inform Members of the outcome of the appeal decisions.

9. RECOMMENDATION
   9.1 That members note the appeal decisions.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS
    10.1 None

Contacts for Background Papers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew McGlone</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amcglone@warrington.gov.uk">amcglone@warrington.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>01925 442845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appel Decision

Inquiry held on 1 July 2014
Site visit made on 1 July 2014

by C Sherratt DipURP MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/C/13/2197257 & 2197258
Grappenhall Lodge, Cartridge Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington WA4 4SQ

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeals are made by Mr T Smith (Appeal A) and Mrs M Smith (Appeal B) against an enforcement notice issued by Warrington Borough Council.
- The Council's reference is ENF/12/03744.
- The notice was issued on 9 April 2013.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is “without planning permission, continued using the land for residential purposes by siting of residential caravans and associated development to facilitate such use”.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
  5.1 Remove from the land and not return
     (i) all touring and static caravans from the site;
     (ii) the temporary utility building and sheds on the site which are being used in association with any use not permitted under permission 2007/12024 and which do not comply with the terms of permission 2007/12024;
     (iii) all the imported hardcore and road planings;
     (iv) all vehicles associated with any use or unauthorised change of use which do not comply with the terms of permission 2007/12024;
     other than from two pitches comprising no more than 2 static caravans and two touring caravans each and 2 utility blocks, in the positions approved under planning permission 2007/12024 as shown marked in blue on the “Proposed site layout plan” relating to permission 2007/12024 dated 14 December 2007 (attached to this notice and marked “Plan 2”).
  5.2 Re-position both the touring and static caravans and utility blocks onto the positions approved under planning permission 2007/12024, as shown on Plan 2 and to site no more than two touring and two static caravans on the site as allowed by permission 2007/12024.
  5.3 Ensure that the two pitches, as shown on Plan 2, and permitted under permission 2007/12024, are only occupied by Mr Tom Smith & Mrs Alice Smith (and their resident dependants) and by Mr Jim Vary & Helen Varey (and their resident dependants).
  5.4 Remove from the land and not return
     (i) all touring and static caravans from the site including those permitted under permission 2007/12024 and as shown marked in blue on Plan 2
     (ii) all the imported hardcore and road planings, including those permitted under permission 2007/12024 and as shown marked in blue on Plan 2
     (iii) all the temporary utility building and sheds on the site including those permitted under permission 2007/12024 and as shown marked in blue on Plan 2
(iv) any and all cess pools located on the site including those permitted under permission 2007/12024 and as shown marked in blue on Plan 2
(v) all vehicles associated with any previous unauthorised use or change of use
(vi) all vehicles associated with the use permitted under permission 2007/12024.

- The period for compliance with the requirements under 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 is 56 days.
- The period for compliance with the requirements under 5.4 (i) is 2 years.
- The period for compliance with the requirements under 5.4 (ii)-(vi) is 2 years and 56 days.
- Appeal A is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (e), (f) and (g) of the 1990 Act.
- Appeal B is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (e), (f) and (g) of the 1990 Act.

**Decision**

1. The enforcement notice is corrected by:

   At section 3 (the description of the matters which appear to constitute the breach of planning control) delete the words "continued" and "and associated development to facilitate such use"; replace "using" with the words "the mixed use of" and add the words "and the keeping and stabling of horses".

2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the land edged black on Plan 3 annexed to this decision and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the mixed use of the site for residential purposes by siting of residential caravans and the keeping and stabling of horses subject to the schedule of conditions attached to this decision.

3. The enforcement notice is varied by:

   5.1 (iii) the addition of the words ‘identified on Plan CD3’.
   5.3 substitute ‘Alice’ for ‘Michelle’ and ‘Jim Varey and Helen Varey’ for ‘Earnest and Alice Varey’;
   5.4 insert “Cease the residential use and” before the word “Remove”.
   5.4 (ii) substitute Plan 2 for CD4.
   5.4 (iv) insert the words “or septic tank(s)” after “cess pools”;
   Add requirement 5.4 (vii) ‘all associated residential paraphernalia’.
   The substitution of 56 days for 12 months as the period for compliance in respect of requirements 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

4. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld as corrected and varied insofar as it relates to the land outside the area edged black on Plan 3 annexed to this decision, and planning permission is refused in respect of for the mixed use of the site for residential purposes by siting of residential caravans and the keeping and stabling of horses, on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.
Background Matters

5. The appeal was recovered by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 13 May 2013 as the appeals involve proposals for significant development in the Green Belt. Following the High Court Judgement relating to Redhill Aerodrome Ltd v SSCLG, Tandridge DC, Reigate and Banstead BC [2014] EWHC 2476 (Admin), the parties were given the opportunity to comment. However, on 9 October 2014 the CoA reversed the High Court Judgement and so this decision does not take the original Redhill Judgement into account.

6. Following the judgement of Moore and Coates the appeal was de-recovered. Accordingly the appeal is to be determined by an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. The main parties have been asked if there have been any material changes in circumstances that may be relevant to the appeal, and I have had regard to those responses.

7. The Secretary of State determined an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, for 5 gypsy and traveller pitches and 1 transit pitch on this site on 25 July 2014 (‘the 2014 appeal decision’). The decision was issued a matter of days before this Inquiry was held, and so is not reflected in any of the documentation submitted prior to the Inquiry.

8. In his 2014 appeal decision, the Secretary of State granted planning permission for three of the five pitches sought for a temporary period of two years only, expiring on 25 July 2016. Occupation of those pitches is made personal to Tom and Michelle Smith (the appellants), Charles and Tammy Howard and Peter and Lucy White. In light of the Secretary of State’s decision, the areas of dispute between the parties and discussed at the Inquiry were narrowed considerably.

9. The appeal made under ground (a) is now confined to seeking planning permission for three pitches only entirely consistent with the recent decision but enabling an additional area of the hardstanding (that can remain in any event) to be used for the stationing of the caravans. Due to the delays in the determination of this appeal the period for compliance with the notice, for the three families to which the temporary permission relates, is now slightly longer than the duration of the temporary permission granted in 2014 in any event.

10. It is accepted by the appellant that all those with an interest in the land were aware of the enforcement notice and so the appeal made under ground (e) is withdrawn.

11. Ground (f) is only pleaded in relation to the extent of hardstanding to be removed by virtue of the enforcement notice in order to restore the land to its condition prior to the breach taking place.

12. The remaining two pitches are occupied by Mr and Mrs Knight and Walter (Dougie) and Stacey Winter. As planning permission was not forthcoming for the continued occupation of the site for these two families, they will need to comply with the enforcement notice upon it taking effect. The appeal made on ground (g) is only therefore directed at these two families that would be

---

required to leave the site within 56 days. An alternative period of 12 months is sought.

The Notice

13. It is important to get the allegation right (subject to there being no injustice), even if quashing the notice, so that the breach is correct against which to assess the appeal, especially in relation to ground (a), as the terms of any permission are derived from the description set out in the allegation. The effect of s173(11) is that any unauthorised elements specified in the allegation but not covered by the requirements obtain a deemed planning permission if the notice is corrected.

14. The site has benefited from a temporary permission in the past which was granted on appeal in October 2008. This expired in October 2011. This permission is referred to in the requirements of the notice. Notwithstanding this temporary permission, it is not necessary to refer to the ‘continued’ use of the site in the allegation as the residential use of the site is unauthorised irrespective of any previous permission that has expired. This can be corrected without causing injustice.

15. It was agreed by the main parties that the appeal site is also used for the stabling and keeping of horses and thus was in a mixed use when the notice was issued. This should be reflected in the description of the breach of planning control. It was agreed that this could be corrected without causing any prejudice to the parties as there is no requirement or intention to require that use to cease.

16. The appellants suggest that there is a separate storage use within part of the building used for stabling that should also be referred to in the allegation to reflect the use of the site at the time the notice was issued. This is not accepted by the Council. During my site visit I observed the items referred to by the appellant in part of the building on the site. The appellant accepts that the materials and various items were simply left by the previous owner and have remained on the site. It seems to me that Mr Smith has simply not removed or disposed of them. They are not actively stored for any purpose – simply a waste product of the demolished building. Indeed they remained on the site when the Inspector found that there was a ‘nil use’ in the 2008 appeal.

17. In addition to these ‘waste’ materials, I saw the two vehicles parked on the site in need of restoration. The appellant allows his brother to keep these vehicles here. There is no material change in character of the land than if the appellant or one of the other site occupiers were keeping vehicles on the site to restore as a hobby. In my view this would not constitute a material change of use of land – it would simply be incidental to the residential use of the land. Domestic items such as the sewing machine are commonly associated with and incidental to the residential use of land. Overall, it is considered that there is no separate storage use taking place on the site. There is no need for the description of the alleged breach of planning control to refer to a storage use.

18. It was agreed by the main parties that the reference in the description of the alleged breach to ‘associated development to facilitate such use’ is not precise and could lead to uncertainty about whether it refers to anything more that is referred to in the requirements of the notice. The Council confirmed it is intended to refer to domestic paraphernalia. Accordingly, it was considered the
notice would be clearer and more precise if the requirements of the notice expressly required all domestic paraphernalia to be removed and the reference in the allegation to ‘associated development’ be deleted. No injustice would be caused by this correction for clarification.

19. The 2008 appeal decision, referred to in the requirements of the notice, was a temporary permission for two pitches with occupation restricted to Tom Smith and Michelle Smith (the appellants) and Mr Earnest Varey and Mrs Alice Varey together with their resident dependants. However the notice refers to occupation by Tom and Alice Smith which is incorrect. Tom Smith is married to Michelle Smith. It was agreed that this could be corrected without causing injustice.

20. The second family named in the requirements of the notice is Jim Varey and Helen Varey. They have lived on the site in the past but left after they were offered a pitch on a socially rented site\(^2\). Earnest and Alice Varey were named occupiers on the 2008 appeal decision but only occupied the site for two years and were no longer in occupation when the notice was issued. Nevertheless the notice should be corrected to be consistent with the 2008 appeal decision referred to in the requirements of the notice.

21. The requirements of the notice refer to the removal of a cess pool. It is understood that it is a septic tank that has been installed. The notice can be corrected in this regard without causing injustice. The requirements of the notice do not specifically require the residential use of the land to cease. It was agreed by the main parties that it would be prudent to do so and no injustice would be caused as it is clear that this is the intention of the notice.

**Planning Policy**

22. The Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) has been adopted. This is a recent change in circumstance to those applicable during the determination of the recent 2014 appeal decision. Of particular relevance to this appeal is Policy SN3 which is specific to the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople. It confirms that provision will be made between 2007 and 2027 for a minimum of 56 additional permanent pitches for gypsies and travellers and 5 transit pitches. The Policy text confirms that the allocation process will seek to resolve the long term future of those sites within the borough which currently only benefit from temporary planning consent.

23. At the time of the inquiry, provision was to be made through the allocation of land through a separate Local Plan document. Since the close of the inquiry part of the LPCS has been quashed. Whilst this has no direct implications for Policy SN3, the Council has reviewed the Local Development Scheme to reflect the need to address a new housing target as a matter of urgency through a Primary Plan Alteration with a subsequent Secondary Plan Alteration will be prepared covering policies relating to minerals and waste and gypsy and traveller accommodation provision. The current LDS suggests submission of this document to the Secretary of State in March 2017 with adoption in September 2017.

24. The Two Acres site at Higher Walton is a large private site in the Green Belt which benefited from a 10 year temporary permission for 16 pitches (22

\(^2\) CD1 – IR27
caravans) which expired in December 2014. Caravan counts have demonstrated that there are well in excess of the permitted number of caravans on this site. Since the close of the Inquiry the Council has refused an application at the Two Acres site for the removal of condition 1 (time period of permission), condition 2 (occupation restriction) and condition 6 (size of additional caravans) of the 10 year temporary permission.

25. An updated Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) was jointly commissioned in May 2013 by Warrington Borough Council and neighbouring authorities. The updated GTAA will, it is explained, directly inform the subsequent Local Plan. The GTAA has recently been published. This is another recent change in circumstance to those applicable to the 2014 appeal decision. It identifies a lower requirement than the LPCS for 35 pitches to 2027.

26. Irrespective of which figure is to be accepted and justified for the basis of the Site Allocations Local Plan, the position in relation to the need for additional pitches has not materially changed. There remains an existing shortfall of pitches.

The Site and Surroundings

27. The appeal site is situated in the Green Belt. It was once occupied by the residential property ‘Grappenhall Lodge’ which was demolished sometime in the 1970s. The brick outbuildings associated with the hall (also referred to as incorporating the former cottage) remain together with the gated access, original access drive, hardstanding, part of the old walled gardens and landscaping. The site is well contained by existing vegetation around the site perimeter.

28. The surrounding land to the north, west and east predominantly consists of open agricultural land. To the south of the site is Grappenhall Lane and part of Barley Castle Industrial Estate (also referred to as Appleton Thorn Industrial / Trading estate). The nearest dwellings are to the North West at Reddish Hall Farm on the north side of Cartridge Lane and those at the junction of Cartridge Lane and Broad Lane.

The hardstanding

29. The areas of hardstanding are identified on a Site Layout Plan\(^3\). The hatched area annotated as ‘existing’ incorporates the area of hardstanding originally associated with Grappenhall Lodge. It was agreed by the main parties that the area of hardstanding to the east of the outbuilding, also hatched, existed prior to the appellant purchasing and occupying the site. Condition 6 of the 2014 appeal permission restricts the stationing of caravans to this hatched area and marked as ‘existing’ on the ‘Site Layout Plan – proposed’.

30. The Secretary of State explains in his 2014 appeal decision at paragraph 22 that in order to limit the extent of the harm caused by this permission and given his decision to restrict the consent to 3 families, the hardstanding on the site should not be extended as proposed on the site layout plan – proposed (scale 1:500). The hatched area annotated ‘proposed’ was an additional area of hardstanding proposed as part of the recent 2014 appeal development. It was agreed by the main parties that this is the ‘proposed’ area referred to by

\(^3\) Plan appended to Document TS1
the Secretary of State on the site layout plan, a view with which I concur.
Requirement 5.1 (iii) to remove this 4 m strip of hardstanding in 56 days is therefore consistent with the 2014 appeal decision.

31. The non-hatched area marked ‘retrospective’ on the Site Layout Plan was included in the 2008 appeal site (for two pitches) and has remained since. The main parties agree that the 2014 appeal decision permits the area of hardstanding identified as ‘retrospective’ to remain for the duration of the temporary permission by virtue of condition 4 that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with various plans including the site layout plan. The notice requires its removal within 56 days of the caravans being removed i.e. 2 years and 56 days from the notice taking effect.

Reasons

Ground (a)

32. This ground of appeal is narrowed considerably as a result of the Secretary of State’s recent 2014 appeal decision in relation to the s78 appeal against the refusal of planning permission. Consequently, permission is now sought for only 3 pitches to be consistent with the 2014 appeal permission. The only difference relates to the area permitted for the siting of those three pitches and the stationing of caravans within them.

33. Section 177(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) enables the Secretary of State to grant planning permission in respect of those matters stated in the enforcement notice as constituting a breach of planning control, whether in relation to the whole or any part of those matters or in relation to the whole or any part of the land to which the notice relates.

34. The Secretary of State has granted planning permission for a temporary period of two years for the residential use of the site restricted to three pitches only. Two pitches together with a transit pitch remain unauthorised. No material change in circumstances that would impinge on the Secretary of State’s reasoning, are advanced by the parties. It follows therefore that the appeal made under ground (a) and the deemed application for ‘the mixed use of the site for residential purposes by siting of residential caravans and the keeping and stabling of horses’ is bound to succeed either in whole or in part.

35. The Site Layout Plan demonstrates that 7 touring caravans together with the various utility buildings can be accommodated within the hatched area to the west of the building which also incorporates part of the yard area for turning and manoeuvring within the site. However there appears to be insufficient room to substitute two of the touring caravans with two static caravans, as permitted by condition 6 of the 2014 appeal permission, on the area hatched and denoted as ‘existing’ to the west of the existing building that would also comply with the licensing requirements to maintain a distance of 6m between caravans.

36. The hatched area includes land to the east of the building where no caravans are currently stationed. Instead, this area is used for the parking of the commercial vehicles and trailers used for business purposes by the site occupiers and the other equipment. I heard there is also a well on this part of the site. There are currently no utility buildings in this area.
37. The appellant agreed, during cross-examination, that if he were to move the various commercial vehicles and trailers currently parked to the east of the building then he could physically accommodate some caravans in this area. However, it would then be necessary to move the vehicles, trailers and some other equipment to the west of the building as a consequence. This would be likely to compromise turning and manoeuvring within the site as the hatched area would be fully utilised by vehicles, caravans, utility buildings and other equipment displaced from the area to the west.

38. From my observations on site a carefully designed layout for the three permitted pitches that incorporates the retrospective area, whilst retaining a central space for turning and manoeuvring, would not have any greater visual impact, and indeed potentially less than the parking and storage of commercial vehicles and trailers in this area. These vehicles that include trailers, a roller, fork lift truck and digger are currently well screened by the surrounding vegetation and in many cases the trailers are stored between the trees.

39. The ground (a) appeal succeeds in relation to that part of the land identified as existing and retrospective on the Site Layout Plan (scale 1:500)\(^4\), to be consistent with the 2014 appeal decision in all respects with the exception that the permitted caravans can be stationed on the wider area identified. This area is reproduced as Plan 3 for ease of reference. The notice shall be upheld, relying on section 180 to mitigate the effect of the notice so far as it is inconsistent with the 2014 appeal permission. This would require a distinction to be made between the area identified on Plan 1 attached to the notice and the part of land within it where the appeal succeeds (Plan 3).

40. It was agreed at the inquiry that any permission should be subject to the same conditions imposed on the section 78 appeal with the exception of condition 6. It is considered that condition 6 should state "All buildings, caravans and other vehicles shall be located on the area of hardstanding shown hatched and marked as 'existing' and the un-hatched area marked 'retrospective' on the Site Layout Plan – proposed and dated 17.07.2012 (scale 1:500), hereby approved and no vehicles shall exceed 3.5 tonnes in weight". In addition, a site layout plan should be agreed to ensure that the caravans are stationed to minimise visual harm and retain a satisfactory amount of turning and manoeuvring space within the site.

Ground (f) – that the requirements of the notice are excessive.

41. This ground is pleaded on the basis that the extent of hardstanding to be removed is excessive. A notice can only require the restoration of the site to its condition before the breach took place. Any requirements to remove areas of hardstanding already in existence prior to the breach taking place would therefore be excessive. Requirement 5.1(iii) fails to acknowledge that there was some historic hardstanding within the site that is outside the area of the two pitches relating to planning permission reference 2007/12024 and not identified on Plan 2 that accompanies the Notice. Similarly, requirement 5.4(ii) fails to recognise that some of the hardstanding within the area of the two pitches was already in situ in connection with the former house on the site.

42. A plan has been agreed by the main parties to identify the areas concerned and the extent of hardstanding that can legitimately be referred to in the notice to

\(^4\) Plan attached to Document TS1.
restore the land to its condition prior to the breach occurring\(^5\). The requirements of the notice set out in 5.1 (iii) and 5.4 (ii) should be varied to only require the removal of those areas of hardstanding required to restore the land to its condition before the breach occurred, as set out on the agreed plan. The appeals made under ground (f) succeed to this extent.

Ground (g) – that the period for compliance is too short.

43. This ground of appeal concerns whether the period for compliance of 56 days is too short. This is a different consideration to that previously determined by the Secretary of State in respect of whether or not a temporary permission is appropriate. Compliance with the notice will result in both the Knight and Winters families losing their settled base which must be regarded as their home. Whilst it was generally accepted that the family can physically hitch up their caravans and leave the site quite quickly, the short period allows very little opportunity to find an alternative available site.

44. The Council were not able to suggest any alternative sites that would be available to these families. The Council appear to have been tolerating the additional caravans on the Two Acres, Higher Walton Site, in breach of the terms of the planning permission, that is also in the Green Belt and adjacent to a conservation area. The temporary planning permission for the authorised pitches and 22 caravans has, since the close of the enquiry, now expired and the entire site is unauthorised. An application seeking to regularise the position on site has also been refused. These families can now be regarded as in immediate need of lawful accommodation.

45. In 2008, the Inspector was informed that the Council expected to be in a position to identify additional sites by October 2011. The Council has not done so and has made little progress in terms of site provision since. The Council informed the Inquiry that it is unlikely to be able to suggest any alternative sites until the Site Allocations Local Plan is produced or at least at an advanced stage. I was informed this would be by Spring of this year. However, it is now the Council’s intention, as set out in the LDS 2015, to progress a Primary Plan Alteration as a matter of urgency to establish a new housing target. A subsequent Secondary Plan Alteration will be undertaken to provide additional policies and allocations in relation to both minerals and waste and gypsy and traveller site provision. The timetable for submission to the Secretary of State is March 2017 with adoption estimated in September 2017. As the Secretary of State acknowledged in his recent appeal decision it is likely that sites in Warrington may need to be identified that are currently in the Green Belt.

46. Unlike a member of the settled population becoming homeless, temporary measures such as bed and breakfast accommodation would not facilitate the gypsy way of life and are not suitable alternatives. To my mind, given the lack of alternative authorised provision, 56 days is far too short to expect the families to find available alternative pitches. I recognise that the families were aware when they occupied the site that it did not benefit from planning permission. However, neither family had occupied an authorised site prior to using the appeal site as a settled base and so did not put themselves in a worse position.

\(^5\) CD3 & CD4 – Agreed Plan.
47. A period of 12 months would be reasonable period of time, consistent with other appeal decisions where no alternatives sites have been identified. It is not necessary to demonstrate very special circumstances in relation to a ground (g) appeal. However, exceptional circumstances should be demonstrated to justify a compliance period of 12 months or more. In this case, the lack of any alternative provision for these families would justify a period of 12 months which is a reasonable period of time for these two families to find alternative provision rather than the likely outcome of the families resorting to living on the road-side or occupying another unauthorised site.

48. Notwithstanding that the notice extends the period for compliance to two years for some, any longer than 12 months would be commensurate with a temporary permission which the Secretary of State did not find acceptable in the 2014 appeal decision. This would be a proportionate response and in the best interests of the children on the site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the temporary planning permission would expire earlier, in July 2016, the appellant is entitled to assume success of the appeal and so 12 months remains a reasonable period from the receipt of this decision. The appeals made under ground (g) succeed to this extent.

**Overall Conclusions**

49. I conclude that Appeal A, on ground (a) should succeed in part only and that conditional planning permission should be granted on that part of the land identified on Plan 3 but otherwise that the appeal should be dismissed, and planning permission refused on the remaining part of the land.

50. I conclude that the requirements are excessive in relation to the amount of hardstanding to be removed and a reasonable period for compliance that relate to requirements 5.1 – 5.3 would be 12 months, and the enforcement notice should be varied accordingly, prior to it being upheld. Both appeals made under grounds (f) and (g) should succeed to that extent.

51. The notice should be upheld with corrections and variations. Reliance should be placed on section 180 to mitigate the effect of the notice so far as it is inconsistent with the permission.

_Claire Sherratt_

Inspector
The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the land edged black on this plan.
Plan 1: Area of hardstanding extended following the grant of permission 2007/120124 and not permitted by the previous appeal decision and to be removed to comply with 5.1 (iii)
Land Registry
Official copy of
title plan

Title number CH553166
Ordnance Survey map reference SJ6484NE
Scale 1:1250 enlarged from 1:2500
Administrative area Warrington

Plan 2. Extent of hard standing to be removed to comply with requirement 5.4 (b) is all hard core not associated with Grappenhall Lodge.
Annex - Schedule of Conditions

1. The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

2. The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Tom Smith and his wife Michelle Smith; Charles Howard & Tammy Howard; and Peter White & Lucy White (nee Howard) together with their resident dependants, and shall be for a limited period expiring on 25 July 2016, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.

3. When the premises cease to be occupied by those named in condition 2 above, or at the end of the period specified, whichever shall first occur, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use shall be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (scale 1:1250); Site Layout Plan (scale 1:500); Details of small utility blocks installed on plots 4 & 5; Illustrative details for proposed utility blocks T1, R1-4; Site Layout Plan to show areas of hardstanding, dated 17 July 2012.

5. On the three residential pitches hereby approved no more than 2 caravans as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 (as amended) shall be stationed at any time, with the exception of one pitch, defined as plot 3 on the approved layout plan, upon which no more than 3 caravans shall be stationed at any time. Of the caravans hereby approved no more than a total of two caravans shall be a static caravan.

6. All buildings, caravans and other vehicles shall be located on the area of hardstanding contained within the area edged in black on Plan 3 attached to this decision. No vehicles shall exceed 3.5 tonnes in weight.

7. No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.

8. The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed within 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:
   (i) within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for:
       (a) the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site;
(b) proposed and existing external lighting on the boundary of and within the site;
(c) details of measures to retain existing trees and landscaping;
(d) details of hard surfacing materials;
(e) details of the layout of the site including the identification of three plots, the siting of caravans, utility blocks and turning facilities (notwithstanding condition 4 above);
(f) the restoration of the site to its condition before the development took place, or as otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority at the end of the period for which planning permission is granted for the use, or the site is occupied by those permitted to do so, as appropriate, (hereafter referred to as the site development scheme) shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the said scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation.

(ii) within 11 months of the date of this decision the site development scheme shall have been approved by the local planning authority or, if the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme, or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
(iii) if an appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted site development scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
(iv) the approved scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.
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Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2015

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTP

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/15/3007983

Oakview, Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, Cheshire WA4 3HT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mr Steven Tilston against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2014/24520, dated 17 September 2014, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2014.
- The application sought planning permission for ‘variation of condition - proposed variation of condition 4 (permitted development rights – no garages or outbuildings) following planning approval 2007/10875.
- The condition in dispute is No 4 which states that: Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification): (i) no external alterations shall be carried out to the dwelling (s) (ii) no extensions shall be carried out to the dwelling (s) (iii) no garages or outbuildings shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling (s) (iv) no windows or dormer windows shall be added to the dwelling (s) other than those expressly authorised by this permission, unless planning permission for such development has been granted by the Local Planning Authority’.
- The reason given for the condition is: To protect the residential and visual amenities of the area, privacy and to accord with Policies DCS1, GRN2, DCS9 and HOU7 of the adopted Warrington Unitary Development Plan.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Steven Tilston against Warrington Borough Council. That application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. In the interests of clarity, I have taken the description of the development from the Council’s decision notice.

4. Although the description in the planning application referred to the proposal as a ‘variation’ of condition 4 of planning permission 2007/10875 (‘the 2007 permission’) it is clear from the application details that what is being sought is
the removal of section (iii) from the condition in its entirety to enable outbuildings to be constructed within the curtilage of the dwelling. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

5. The reason given for condition 4 of the 2007 permission refers to policies in the former Warrington Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which has now been replaced by the Warrington Local Plan Core Strategy (July 2014) (LPCS). Due to the outcome of a recent High Court challenge, parts of the LPCS relating to housing have been quashed. However, Policies CC1 and CC2 which are relevant to the determination of this appeal are unaffected.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this case is whether the condition in dispute is reasonable and necessary having regard to national and local policy on protecting the Green Belt.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is located in open countryside to the south of a former farm complex at Yew Tree Farm. It is approached via a long single track access road off Broad Lane. The open and undulating topography interspersed with pockets of woodland and low hedgerows delineating field boundaries characterise the open countryside in the vicinity. The site is visible in the wider landscape and long distance views when approaching along Broad Lane from both the north and south.

8. The appeal property is a detached, brick built modern dwelling which was granted planning permission in 2007 as a replacement for an agricultural workers bungalow. A two storey side extension with basement was granted permission in 2012 with amendments in 2014. The curtilage as outlined in the application plans is delineated by low hedges to the access road frontage and north boundary and a 1.8 metre panel fence and shrubs on the common boundary with the adjacent barn conversions. To the west, the boundary is open but is defined by the transition from the outdoor area around the house to the grassed area beyond.

9. The 2007 application was assessed in relation to the UDP and Planning Policy Guidance 2 (PPG 2) ‘Green Belts‘ which has now been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). PPG 2 set out the considerations against which proposals for replacement dwellings were assessed to determine whether they were inappropriate development. The reason given for restricting permitted development rights under Class E in condition 4 of the 2007 permission refers to general development policies in the UDP that sought to protect open countryside. These policies cross referred to a number of other policies which have not been supplied.

10. In refusing the appeal scheme, the Council refers to Policy CC1 of the LPCS which sets out the approach to settlements in the Green Belt. Policy CC2 is also referred to in the reasons for refusal and states that development in the countryside which accords with Green Belt policies at a national level will be supported subject to a number of criteria. These include that the siting and design of development relates satisfactorily to its rural setting in terms of its scale, layout and use of materials and respects local landscape character in terms of immediate impact or from distant views. This is consistent with the
Framework which sets out the approach to protecting Green Belts, including that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

11. The appellant’s case refers in part to judgements that were made in assessing the 2007 application. In summary it is argued that no justification has been given for the Council’s conclusion in determining the application for the replacement dwelling that it was ‘materially larger’, than the existing bungalow and therefore inappropriate development under the terms of PPG2. It is argued that the Council should have concluded that the replacement dwelling was not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and on that basis there would have been no grounds to remove Class E permitted development rights. Reference is made to other appeal decisions in which it is acknowledged that the fact that an appeal site lies within the Green Belt is not, in itself an exceptional circumstance meaning that the removal of permitted development rights for outbuildings were unreasonably withheld in this case.

12. The appellant considers that the condition did not meet the tests set out in Circular 11/95 at the time planning permission was granted. These have been replaced by the six tests for planning conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The appellant argues that the condition is unreasonable and was unnecessary to make the development acceptable. In particular, the PGG states that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use will rarely pass the test of necessity and should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

13. In determining the 2007 application, the Council concluded that the replacement dwelling was considered to be inappropriate development since it was ‘materially larger’ than the existing bungalow. However, in weighing up the proposal, it was concluded that the scheme would not result in a harmful material increase that would adversely affect the visual amenity of the Green Belt, subject to restricting permitted development rights for extensions to the house. In addition, the removal of existing outbuildings and other visual improvements weighed in favour of the proposal.

14. Whilst acknowledging that the proposal amounted to inappropriate development, the Council applied a planning judgement based on the specific circumstances of the site. The removal of permitted development rights was considered justified to ensure that control was exercised over future additional buildings within the curtilage of the dwelling so that the visual benefits associated with the removal of existing structures would be maintained.

15. The Framework states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The circumstances of the site have not changed in this regard. Notwithstanding the recent addition of a two storey side extension, the site retains an open character due to the views from long distances and low hedgerows on the site boundaries. The curtilage to the rear and side of the house is open to views from Broad Lane. I appreciate that a landscaping scheme approved in connection with planning permission 2012/20105 would introduce more planting on the site boundaries. However, the introduction of buildings where none existed previously would reduce the undeveloped space around the house and there is a realistic prospect that the openness of the Green Belt would be harmed. I therefore consider that in this case an element of restriction is justified, reasonable and necessary to prevent
the aims and objectives of Green Belt policy as set out in the Framework and Policies CC1 and CC2 of the LPCS being undermined.

16. The location of the site in the Green Belt was weighed in the planning balance in granting permission to replace the existing bungalow with a larger dwelling and effectively created a new planning chapter in the site’s history. I therefore attach little weight to the fact that permitted development rights under Class E previously existed at the property. Condition 4 of the planning permission still enables the appellant to apply for planning permission for any development proposals prevented by the terms of the condition. This would enable the effect of additional outbuildings on the openness of the Green Belt to be fully assessed.

17. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision\(^1\) where a condition removing permitted development rights was varied to reinstate Class E rights. However, this was in a different local planning authority and was appraised in relation to the planning policies for the area and the circumstances of the site. I have come to my decision based on the circumstances of the appeal site and the evidence before me and conclude that the policies in the LPCS that relate to the protection of the Green Belt support the retention of the part of condition 4 that is in dispute.

18. I conclude in relation to the main issue in this case that the particular circumstances of the case are exceptional and that the condition in dispute is justified, necessary and reasonably imposed in the light of the advice and guidance in the PPG and the Framework. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

\textit{Sarah Housden}

INSPECTOR

---

\(^1\) Appeal decision APP/V1505/A/12/2185169; Retention of a garden shed without complying with a condition attached to planning permission ref BAS1441/92; allowed on 8 February 2013.
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2015

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 August 2015

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/15/3007983
Oakview, Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, Cheshire
WA4 3HT

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
- The application is made by Mr Steven Tilston for a full award of costs against Warrington Borough Council.
- The appeal was made against the refusal of planning permission for 'variation of condition - proposed variation of condition 4 (permitted development rights – no garages or outbuildings) following planning approval 2007/10875.

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and this has directly caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.

3. The appellant considers that the removal of permitted development rights under Class E as part of condition 4 of planning permission 2007/10875 does not meet the six tests for planning conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In particular, it is considered that the condition is unreasonable and was unnecessary to make the development acceptable. It is argued that the removal of permitted development rights in this case is not justified as an exceptional circumstance as outlined in the PPG which states that 'conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use will rarely pass the test of necessity and should only be used in an exceptional circumstance'.

4. However, I have found that the part of the condition that relates to the withdrawal of permitted development rights under Class E was justified, necessary and reasonably imposed in the light of the advice contained the Framework and the PPG and I have concluded that the circumstances of the case are exceptional. The condition seeks to maintain the openness of the Green Belt as sought by the Framework and Policies CCS1 and CCS2 of the Warrington Core Strategy Local Plan.
5. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG has not been demonstrated.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2015

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/15/3009709
Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington WA4 3HT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the conversion of two barns into dwellings and extensions and alterations to the farmhouse without compliance with condition No 9 of planning permission reference 2003/01495 dated 4 March 2004.
- The appeal is made by Mr Michael Taitt against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2015/25074, dated 8 January 2015, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2015.
- The application sought planning permission for ‘variation of condition – application for variation of condition 9 following previously approved application 2003/01495 (proposed conversion of two barns into dwellings and extensions and alterations to the farmhouse)’.
- The condition in dispute is No 9 which states that: ‘Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Development) Order 1995 or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order with or without modification: No chimney/flues shall be added to any part of the barn conversion hereby approved; No extensions, windows, external doors, dormer windows or roof lights shall be added to any part of the barn conversion hereby approved; No rendering, painting or other surface treatment shall be applied to the external brickwork of the barn conversion hereby approved; No garages, sheds, greenhouses or outbuildings shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwellings (existing or proposed); No additional vehicle hardstanding shall be provided within the curtilage of the new dwelling units created within the existing barn; No gates, walls, fences or other structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the new dwelling units created within the existing barn; No satellite dishes shall be erected on any roof plane of the barn conversion’.
- The reason given for the condition is: ‘To protect the character of the development hereby approved, having regard to policies GRN4, GRN5, and GRN8 of the emerging draft Warrington Unitary Development Plan’.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Michael Taitt against Warrington Borough Council. That application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. In the interests of clarity, I have taken the description of the development from the grounds of appeal. Condition 9 covers a number of items but it is clear
from the evidence that the only part the appellant wishes to vary relates to the
removal of permitted development rights for ancillary buildings. The variation
proposed is ‘no garages, sheds, greenhouses or outbuildings shall be erected
within the curtilage of the approved converted barns’ so that there would be no
restriction of permitted development rights for the erection of ancillary
buildings within the curtilage of the house. I have therefore focused on this
part of the condition and determined the appeal on that basis.

4. The red line plan accompanying the appeal scheme includes the curtilages
of the two converted barns which are now in separate ownerships from the house.
A shared access separates the house and the converted barns and the red line
plan does not confirm the precise area within the area of the shared access to
which the variation of condition would apply. However, as the erection of
outbuildings would be impractical in this location in any case, I have considered
the effects of the appeal scheme on the area within the red line that is
immediately around the house and is enclosed with hedges and shrubs.

5. The reason given for condition 9 of planning permission 2003/01495 (granted
in 2004 and hereafter referred to as the ‘2004 permission’) refers to policies in
the former Warrington Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The current
development plan is the Warrington Local Plan Core Strategy (July 2014)
(LPCS). Due to the outcome of a recent High Court challenge, parts of the
LPCS relating to housing have been quashed. However, Policies CS5 and QE7
which are relevant to the determination of this appeal are unaffected.

6. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995
has now been replaced by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted
Development) (England) Order 2015 and in coming to my decision I have had
good to the provisions of the 2015 Order in so far as they are relevant to the
main issue in this case.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in this case is whether the condition in dispute is reasonable
and necessary having regard to national and local policy on protecting the
Green Belt.

Reasons

8. The appeal site comprises a former farmhouse and two barn conversions
located in open countryside to the south of Grappenhall. It is approached via a
long single track access road off Broad Lane. The open and undulating

9. The house and barns together with the adjoining property ‘Oakview’ form an
isolated pocket of development in open countryside and are visible from long
distances along Broad Lane to the north-west and south-east. To the rear of
the house, the side boundaries are delineated by hedges and shrubs. The
southern boundary is open from the corner of the detached timber garage to
the east boundary.

10. The 2004 permission included a two storey extension to the main house and in
2008 a further permission was granted for a two storey side and single storey
extension to the rear. The 2003 application was assessed in relation to policies
in the emerging draft Warrington Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG 2) 'Green Belts' which has now been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). PPG2 set out national policies in relation to new development in the Green Belt.

11. The reason given for restricting permitted development rights under Class E in condition 9 of the 2004 permission refers to Policies GRN4, GRN5 and GRN8 of the UDP. I have not been supplied with a copy of these policies but the officer report indicates that they set out the approach to protecting open countryside and the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt.

12. In refusing the variation of condition 9, the Council refers to Policy CS5 of the LPCS which sets out the approach to development proposals in the Green Belt and cross refers to national policy. Policy QE7 also referred to seeks to maintain and respect landscape character and the distinctiveness of the countryside. The Council considers that the exercise of permitted development rights for ancillary buildings following the implementation of permission 2003/01495 would conflict with national and local policy relating to protecting the Green Belt.

13. The appellant has referred to the guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which states that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use will rarely pass the test of necessity and should only be used in exceptional circumstances. It is considered that the condition did not meet the tests for conditions set out in Circular 11/95 which applied when planning permission was granted and does not meet the six tests for conditions set out in the Framework and the PPG. It is argued that there was no justification for restricting rights under Class E for the erection of ancillary buildings within the curtilage of the house which benefitted from these rights at the time planning permission was granted. The appellant argues that the condition is unreasonable and unnecessary given that the 2003 proposals for the farmhouse were not considered to be inappropriate development and it places unreasonable restriction on the occupier of the house.

14. I acknowledge that the location of the site in the Green Belt is not, of itself an exceptional circumstance meaning the removal of permitted development rights for ancillary buildings would comply with the provisions of the Framework and the PPG. However, in determining the 2004 permission, the effect of the proposal on the curtilage as a whole was assessed in relation to Green Belt policy as set out in PPG 2 and the UDP policies.

15. The removal of existing farm structures was secured as part of the 2004 permission and amendments were made to remove a detached garage proposed in the rear garden of the house to ensure that the openness of the Green Belt would not be harmed. The Council sought to restrict permitted development rights under Class E to ensure that control was exercised over future additional buildings within the curtilage of the house and barns so that the visual benefits associated with the removal of existing structures could be maintained. The circumstances of the site were changed as a result of the 2004 permission. I therefore attach little weight to the fact that permitted development rights existed previously.

16. The Framework states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. The circumstances of the appeal site have not changed in this regard, notwithstanding that the house has been extended.
The house is open to views from long distances, particularly from the south east where the low hedgerows and rising ground levels to the rear of the house create an open setting.

17. Permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015 would enable up to 50% of the garden area to the rear of the house to be occupied by buildings incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, up to 4 metres high in the case of a building with a dual-pitch roof or 3 metres in any other case. Whilst this would represent an extreme uptake of permitted development rights, the introduction of any additional new buildings where none existed previously would reduce the openness of the Green Belt and would be open to views from long distances, in particular from Broad Lane.

18. Condition 9 still enables the appellant to apply for planning permission for any development proposals prevented by the terms of the condition. I consider that a degree of control to ensure that the siting and design of such development does not harm the openness of the Green Belt is justified, reasonable and necessary to prevent the aims and objectives of Green Belt policy as set out in the Framework and Policy CS5 of the LPCS being undermined.

19. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision\(^1\) where a condition removing permitted development rights was varied to reinstate Class E permitted development rights. However, this was in a different local planning authority and was appraised in relation to the planning policies for the area and the specific characteristics of the site. I have come to my decision based on the circumstances of the appeal site and the evidence before me and conclude that the policies in the LPCS that relate to the protection of the Green Belt support the retention of the part of condition 9 that is in dispute.

20. I conclude in relation to the main issue that the circumstances of the case are exceptional and that the condition in dispute is justified, necessary and reasonably imposed to prevent the aims of Green Belt policy as set out in the Framework and Policy CS5 of the LPCS being undermined. The condition also ensures that the aims of Policy QE7 of the LPCS to protect landscape character and the distinctiveness of the countryside are not undermined. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Housden
INSPECTOR

\(^1\) Appeal decision APP/V1505/A/12/2185169; Retention of a garden shed without complying with a condition attached to planning permission ref BAS1441/92; allowed on 8 February 2013.
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2015

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPl MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 August 2015

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/15/3009709
Yew Tree Farm, Broad Lane, Grappenhall, Warrington, Cheshire WA4 3HT

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
- The application is made by Mr Michael Taitt for a full award of costs against Warrington Borough Council.
- The appeal was made against the refusal of planning permission for 'variation of condition – application for variation of condition 9 following previously approved application 2003/01495’ (proposed conversion of two barns into dwellings and extensions and alterations to the farmhouse).

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and this has directly caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.

3. The appellant considers that the removal of permitted development rights under Class E as part of condition 9 of planning permission 2003/01495 does not meet the six tests for planning conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the PPG. In particular, it is considered that the condition is unreasonable and was unnecessary to make the development acceptable. It is argued that the Council should have concluded in determining the 2003 application that the development did not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and on this basis there would have been no grounds to remove the permitted development rights that previously existed at the property. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify the use of the condition in relation to the house and in refusing permission to vary the condition, it is argued that the Council has acted unreasonably.

4. I can find nothing in the report accompanying the 2003 application which concludes that the proposal was considered to be inappropriate development. The scheme was assessed against Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 and the policies in the emerging Warrington Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and a number of amendments were secured to ensure the proposals complied with those policies.
5. I have found that the part of the condition that relates to the withdrawal of permitted development rights under Class E is still justified, necessary and reasonably imposed in the light of the advice contained the Framework and the PPG and I have concluded that the circumstances of the case are exceptional. The condition seeks to maintain the openness of the Green Belt and protect the character of the countryside as sought by the Framework and Policies CS5 and QE7 of the Warrington Core Strategy Local Plan and the Council did not act unreasonably in refusing planning permission for the variation of the condition.

6. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG has not been demonstrated.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR
## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
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**Start 18:30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
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<th>App Location/Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | 2    | 2015/25898  | 101 Walton Road, Warrington, WA4 6NR  
Full Planning – Proposed conversion of existing Garage to create a separate dwelling, plus re-building of existing Vinery to create Garden Store/Bike Store (Resubmission of 2015/25584) | Approve        |
| 2    | 15   | 2015/26057  | Land to the side of, 2 Whitefield Road, Stockton Heath, Warrington, WA4 6LZ  
Full Planning - Application for change of use of spare land to residential curtilage (Retrospective) | Approve        |
| 3    | 25   | 2015/26216  | The Market Multi Storey Car Park, Moulders Lane, Bewsey And Whitecross, Warrington, WA1 2FA  
Advertisement consent - Application for the relocation of an existing Non Illuminated advertisement banner | Approve        |
| 4    | 34   | 2015/26108  | Grappenhall St Wilfreds C E Primary School, Church Lane, Grappenhall And Thelwall, Warrington, WA4 3EP  
Full Planning - Proposed New Canopy | Approve        |
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE DATE: 26th August 2015

ITEM 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>2015/25898</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>101, WALTON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>HATTON, STRETTON AND WALTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed Conversion of existing Garage to create a separate dwelling, plus re-building of existing Vinery to create Garden Store / Bike Store (Resubmission of 2015/25584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Registered:</td>
<td>28-May-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Mr Tony Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/16 Week Expiry Date:</td>
<td>22-Jul-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Referral to Committee

The Director of Environment and Regeneration considers it expedient for the matter to be considered by Committee following the receipt of an objection by Walton Parish Council. This application was deferred at the 5th August 2015 meeting of DMC to enable Members to visit the site. The site visit took place on 21st August

Human Rights

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from the following rights:-

Article 8 - The right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

Article 1 of Protocol 1 - The right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property.

Site and Proposals

Full permission is sought for the conversion of the existing garage to create a separate dwelling, including an extension to the rear, also the demolition of the vinery to create a garden store / bike store and a small extension to the existing single storey outrigger to create a new entrance into the converted garage.
The locally listed property is located in an established residential area - at the junction of Walton New Road and Walton Heath Road. The property is a two storey building with two and single storey outriggers at the rear. A stone structure with slate roof and garage door is connected to the outrigger and forms the northern boundary of the site. The garage is currently used for parking and storage and playroom at the first floor level. There are two protected trees in the front garden of the property. The front garden is screened by a stone boundary wall with a close boarded wooden fence on top, giving the front garden a high degree of privacy normally associated with a rear garden. Stone and brick walls form the Walton Heath Road boundary. The stone garage with its pitched roof louvre is a prominent feature in the street scene and one which positively adds to the character and appearance of the area.

Planning History

2015/25584 – Proposed Extension to attached garage and conversion of garage to dwelling. Withdrawn.

Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework

Part 12 – in relation to heritage assets

Local Plan Core Strategy

Policy QE8 – Historic Environment
Policy QE6 – Environment and Amenity Protection
Policy QE7 – Ensuring a High Quality Place
Policy CS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
Policy CS2 - Quantity and Distribution of Development.
Policy SN1 – Distribution and Nature of New Housing.

Supplementary Planning Documents

Construction and Design

Notification Responses

Parish Council

– Object to the garage conversion - we believe it to be an overdevelopment in that location. We think that a small separate residence adjoining the main building is out of character with the area.

Neighbours

– 1 letter of objection received.
Grounds of objection – given the amount of on street car parking that currently occurs it is considered that the provision for off-road parking is impractical. In addition, none of the plans show the large tree on the pavement outside the property which would prevent access to an extended parking area.

Consultation Responses

Highways

The 1 bedroom unit should be provided with 1 car parking space and 1 cycle parking space and the other unit should have 3 car parking spaces and 3 cycle parking spaces. It is recommended that both dwellings are provided with an electric vehicle charging point.
It is also required for the development to provide 1 unallocated visitor parking space. It is considered that there is adequate parking space available on street to provide the required visitor parking without resulting in any highway safety issues or any loss of residential amenity for neighbours.
The proposed arrangements show one car parking space in the existing garage for the 1 bedroom unit. Whilst this is not ideal in terms of pedestrian safety, it is appreciated that this is an existing arrangement and therefore on this basis it’s deemed acceptable. The applicant should be requested to provide a secure long stay cycle parking space within the development.

For the larger unit, there is a requirement for three car parking spaces and three cycle parking spaces. A garden store / cycle store is proposed which will provide adequate space for the cycle parking spaces required.

In terms of the car parking, there is an existing driveway access for two vehicles and this is proposed to remain unchanged. The plans show three cars parked on the site frontage, two are parked 90 degrees to the kerb which is existing. The third space is indicated as parking at 180 degrees to the kerb. It is the LHA’s view that a parking space in this arrangement would lead to increased manoeuvring across the footway and that visibility may be restricted if the vehicle crosses the footway at an oblique angle as it is not arranged to access the site at a 90 degree angle.

Therefore, whilst there is space to accommodate three cars in this arrangement, the LHA would not condone the arrangement on pedestrian safety grounds. However, it is accepted that residents may park in this arrangement even if the LHA does not support or condone the arrangement. The installation of landscaping would be the only way to remove the likelihood of this space being used.

If this space was removed from the proposals there would be a further shortfall of car parking from the standards for the site overall by one parking space. However, it is considered that there is adequate space on street in the vicinity of the site to accommodate this additional car parking space without creating residential disamenity or highway safety issues. It is felt that a refusal on highways grounds on parking grounds would not be defensible on appeal.
in this particular location due to the on street parking availability in the area.

**Trees**

Drawing 50315/7 Rev C shows the location of 3 parking spaces within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the adjacent London Plane tree. The use of the Core Landscape Products Core Drive System would be acceptable if installed in accordance with BS 5837:2012. Also protective measures need to be in place to ensure that no construction materials are stored within the RPA and that the only construction processes within the RPA are those concerning the construction of the drive.

The plan provided does not state if additional dropped kerbing is required to accommodate the driveway. The Highways specification for the construction of a dropped kerb would require an excavation depth of approximately 280mm. Considering the close proximity of the drive to the tree I would oppose the conventional construction of a dropped kerb if required.

**Environmental Protection**

No objections but would advise an informative on working hours for construction sites.

**Observations**

**Land Use Principle**

The property is located in an established residential area. The LPCS: Policy CS1 indicates that development proposals that are sustainable will be approved and that in order to be sustainable, development must accord with national and local planning policy frameworks; have regard to (amongst other things); the planned provision made for housing growth; the need to make the best use of existing transport, utility, social and environmental infrastructure; and the need to sustain and enhance the borough’s built heritage.

Policy CS2 states that 40% of new residential development will be delivered in the town’s suburbs.

Policy SN1 sets out the Council’s approach to managing the distribution and nature of new housing. It seeks to prioritise development on previously developed land (PDL) in the inner areas of the town. However, the policy does also allow for residential development in the suburbs of the town.

The proposed development would constitute development on previously developed land in an established residential suburb of the town. The property is in a sustainable location and would result in the retention, continued use and maintenance of a heritage asset for a purpose which is appropriate to its design and fabric, with minimal intervention.

**Highways**

Following concerns expressed by the Council’s tree officer the scheme has
been amended to modify the off street car parking area and avoid the need to increase the width of the access and dropped kerb. The resulting layout would necessitate the need for convoluted manoeuvres to access the car parking space parallel to the road - however, this is not significantly different to off street car parking provision on many residential properties in suburban areas. The capacity of the adjacent roads is considered to be sufficient to allow for on street visitor car parking.

Trees

The application has been amended so as to avoid the need to widen the existing drive / dropped kerb. The off-street car parking will be accessed from the existing drive, this will necessitate the provision of a car parking space parallel to the road as well as two spaces at 90 degrees to the road. This car parking layout will avoid any works in and around the tree roots.

Residential Amenity

To the west of the site is a modern detached property [30 Walton Heath Road] which was constructed circa 1990. It is an ‘L’ shaped property with a blank gable at first floor level, facing the rear of the stone garage. The property has a dormer window which is set further back from the rear of the stone garage, but which would fall within the privacy interface distance between the two properties. The relationship between the two properties would mean that neither the existing nor proposed window to window distance of 21 metres could be achieved and neither could the window to blank gable distance be achieved. In order to overcome potential privacy issues, the applicant has agreed to obscure glaze the proposed first floor window in the converted garage, to the highest privacy level and to make the windows un-openable in perpetuity. The bedroom which is served by this window would also be served by a dormer window, which would permit ventilation and outlook. It is considered that the residential amenity of the occupants of number 30 Walton Heath Road would not be compromised by the addition of a 2.2 metre extension to the stone garage.

Impact on Heritage Asset

Policy in respect of conserving and enhancing the historic environment is contained in paragraphs 126 to 141. Paragraphs 128 and 131 provide advice on determining planning applications. Paragraph 129 requires LPA’s to ‘…assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset)… They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.’
Paragraph 131 requires the LPA to take account of the following:
- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Para 135 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Whilst, paragraph 137 requires LPA’s look for new development within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance.

Policy QE8 requires that the fabric and setting of heritage assets are appropriately protected and enhanced in accordance with the principles set out in national planning policy.

The property that is the subject of this application is a locally listed building. The property has no statutory designation. The existing buildings make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the local area.

It is considered that the proposed development would not result in harm to the locally listed structures. The development will improve the appearance of the front of the building by reducing the size of the double garage door and will make best use of the existing materials of construction, by reusing those materials to create an extension to the property. The works to secure the structure of the building to allow the conversion will ensure the future use and retention of the outbuilding and would be consistent with the conservation of the building.

Due to the juxtaposition of the property with existing residential properties, it is considered to be expedient to withdraw permitted development rights for the new property.

No record was made of the site specific reasons why any particular building was originally included as a Locally Listed Heritage Asset (LLHA) – now covered by policy QE8 of the Local Plan Core Strategy for Warrington (formerly policy BE5 “Locally Important Buildings and Structures of Architectural or Historic Interest in the Warrington UDP). Status as a LLHA is felt to be justified in the case of 101 Walton Road by its obvious connection with the local area – built circa 1835; its generally unaltered physical state since then; its notable use of sandstone blockwork – combined with its visual prominence in its road side position.
A small mono and dual pitched timber and glazed structure, referred to as the vinery is located on the west side of the building. This structure is a later addition to the building and its removal would not result in detriment either to the street scene or the historic character of the building. The conversion of the garage to a residential unit would necessitate some alterations to the fabric of the building including:

- The addition of two dormer windows on the northern elevation.
- A part rendered / part stone extension to the rear.
- Reduction in the size of the garage door opening and the infilling of the panel with stone taken from the rear elevation.

A structural survey of the building has been undertaken in order to establish the structural integrity of the building and to ascertain what works would be required in order to enable the conversion. The survey has concluded that the building can accommodate the conversion subject to specified remedial works being undertaken;

- Crack repairs
- Installation of lateral restraint straps
- Purlin strengthening
- Provision of a new ground slab.

In addition to the above, it will be necessary to provide an internal structure which would tie into the existing sandstone walls. It is considered that the extension and conversion of the existing garage to one unit would be appropriate to secure the conservation of the heritage asset - and would respect the setting of this and the other locally listed buildings on the site.

**Recommendation**

Approve subject to the following conditions

**Conditions & Reasons**

1. The development hereby approved shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions and to comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:
   (a) The planning application forms, design and access statement and additional information received by Warrington Borough Council on 28/5/2015
   (b) Submitted drawing No's:
       Proposed Ground Floor Plan 50315/7 Rev A
       Plot Plan 50315/9 Rev B
       Elevational Drawing 50315/3
Elevation Plan 50315/4 RevB
Proposed Ground Floor Plan 50315/7 Rev B
Proposed First Floor Plan 50315/8 Rev A
Section Plan 50315/10
received on 28/5/2015, 17/7/2015 and 14/7/2015.

Reason: for the avoidance of doubt and to enable Warrington Borough Council to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area and to conform with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Core Strategy.

3. Prior to the occupation of the extension hereby approved, the car parking spaces identified on plan 50315/7 Rev A received on 17/7/2015 shall be implemented and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure that off-street parking is maintained for the safe, efficient and convenient movement of all highway users and to comply with Policy QE6 of the Warrington Core Strategy and Warrington SPD: Standards for Parking in new Development.

4. The window at first floor level on the western elevation of the converted stone garage shall not be glazed otherwise than with obscured glass comprising obscurity level 4 or higher. The obscure glazing shall be permanently retained as such. In addition, this window shall be constructed so as to be unopenable and shall permanently remain as such.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in order to protect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and to comply with Policy QE6 of the Warrington Core Strategy.

5. The garage hereby approved shall be kept freely available for the parking of cars, and shall not be converted or altered to form an additional room within the dwelling without the submission and grant of a planning permission for that purpose by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy QE6 of the Warrington Core Strategy

6. The building(s) hereby approved shall not be constructed until written and photographic details of the external roofing and facing materials (including manufacturer’s details) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. Materials samples shall be made available to view on site and shall NOT be deposited with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Core Strategy and the Warrington SPD: Design and Construction

7. No part of the development hereby approved shall be brought into use until cycle stands or secured covered cycle storage space has been
provided for 1 pedal cycle in accordance with details which have first been submitted to the local planning authority for approval. They shall be thereafter retained.

Reason: So that the development provides for the needs of cyclists and provides a choice of modes of transport in accordance with Policies QE6 and MP3 of the Warrington Core Strategy.

8. Prior to commencement of development hereby approved details of the rainwater goods/materials/cross sectional details of the window frames/external finishes [including details of trickle vents] and cills, at a scale of not less than 1:5 shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The windows shall be set back approximately 100mm from the front edge of the stonework/ render finish. The approved scheme shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory form of development and as inadequate details of these matters have been submitted with the application and to comply with Policy QE7 and QE8 of the Warrington Core Strategy, NPPF and Warrington SPD: Design and Construction.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification): (i) no external alterations shall be carried out to the dwelling(s) (ii) no extensions shall be carried out to the dwelling(s) (iii) no garages or outbuildings shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling(s) (iv) no vehicle standing space or hardstanding shall be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling(s) (v) no gates, walls, fences or other structures shall be erected along any boundary to the curtilage of the dwelling(s) (vi) no means of vehicular access shall be constructed to the curtilage of the dwelling(s) (vii) no windows or dormer windows shall be added to the dwelling(s) other than those expressly authorised by this permission, unless planning permission for such development has been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in order to protect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and to comply with Policy QE6 of the Warrington Core Strategy.

10. External re-pointing shall be kept to the minimum and shall be undertaken using a matching mortar to the original in composition, texture and colour. Joints shall be carefully raked out by hand to a depth of around 18mm thoroughly cleaned and prepared to receive the new mortar. The cutting out of defective mortar with power tools in NOT acceptable. The pointing shall be finished to give a neat slightly recessed joint unless firm evidence exists of the original profile which must then be replicated.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate pointing in the interests of local character and visual amenity to comply with Policy QE7 and QE8
of the Warrington Core Strategy and the NPPF

11. The boundary wall adjacent to Parking space 2 between the two units shall be no higher than 0.6m to ensure that an adequate vehicular visibility splay is provided and should be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate visibility at the site and to comply with Policy QE6 of the Warrington Core Strategy.

**Informatives**

1. The Local Planning Authority operates a pre-planning application advice service. All applicants are encouraged to engage with the Local Planning Authority at pre-planning application stage. As part of the determination of this planning application the Local Planning Authority has worked pro-actively and positively with the applicant ensuring that upon receipt all representations and consultation responses are available to view on the Council's web site. The Local Planning Authority has considered the application and where necessary considered either the imposition of planning conditions and/or sought reasonable amendments to the application in order to deliver a sustainable form of development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. In the interests of residential amenity, the applicant/agent/developer is strongly advised to adopt the following recommended construction/demolition hours for all works on site.

Works audible at or beyond the site boundary should not occur outside of Monday to Friday 08.00hrs to 18.00 hrs, Saturday 08.30hrs to 13.30hrs and at no time on Sundays or Public/Bank Holidays.

Noisy or disruptive works carried on outside of these hours are much more likely to raise objections or complaints by local residents (due to disturbance) to the redevelopment of the site which may, in turn, result in formal action being pursued by Public Protection Services to enforce the recommended hours.

For more advice and guidance on recommended construction/demolition hours or construction/demolition methods, please contact an officer from Public Protection on 01925 442589

3. In many cases your proposal will also require consent under the Building Regulations 2010, for advice and guidance on the requirements of the Building Regulations, please contact our Building Control section on 01925 442554 or email building.control@warrington.gov.uk
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DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE DATE: 26th August 2015

ITEM 2

| Application Number: | 2015/26057 |
| Location:           | Land to the side of, 2 Whitefield Road, Stockton Heath, Warrington, WA4 6LZ |
| Ward:               | Stockton Heath |
| Development         | Full Planning - Application for change of use of spare land to residential curtilage (Retrospective). |
| Date Registered:    | 22-Jun-2015 |
| Applicant:          | Mr Malley |
| 8/13/16 Week Expiry Date: | 16-Aug-2015 |

Reason for Referral

This application is the subject of an objection from Stockton Heath Parish Council.

Human Rights

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights has been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from Article 8 relating to the right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence, and Article 1 of Protocol 1, concerned with the right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property.

Site and Proposal

The proposal involves the change of use of what is described as ‘spare land’ to a residential garden.

The land is triangular in shape and situated between two residential properties, 2 Whitefield Road and 76 Walton Road, and has a frontage to Walton Road. The applicant, who is the occupier of 2 Whitefield Road, owns the site. It is understood that they have owned the land since Sept 2014.

The land extends up to a path alongside the side elevation of 76 Walton Road, which is a gable with two ground floor windows. A driveway has been laid out made constructed of grey paving flags with a post and chain barrier at its entrance to Whitefield Road.
Planning History

None

Planning Policy

Core Strategy (CS) Emerging Policy
Policy CS1 Overall Spatial Strategy – Delivering Sustainable Development
Policy QE3 Green Infrastructure
Policy QE6 Environment and Amenity Protection
Policy QE7 Ensuring a High Quality Place

Notification Responses

Stockton Heath Parish Council
The Parish Council objects to the planning application on the grounds that it restricts access to the neighbouring residences and disrupts/prevents the proper maintenance of 76 Walton Road. The installation of the chained gateway impacts on the street scene. Further the Parish Council has concerns that the hedge will grow beyond the permitted limit and could present a hazard to traffic.

Neighbours

One letter of objection received:

1. Land has been significantly altered with hedge, chained gateway and construction of a hard standing driveway. Has 'change of use' been granted?
2. As property is rented out, range of vehicles parked on driveway will vary. There is concern that large vehicles will block windows of 76 Walton Road.
3. Hedge planted alongside 76 Walton Road will block windows.
4. Above hedge will restrict access for 2-6 Whitefield Road and 66-76 Walton Road.
5. Above hedge will restrict access for maintenance work to 76 Walton Road.
6. Front hedge restricts placement of all wheelie bins for collection day. All bins are now left on pavement causing an obstruction to pedestrians.
7. 'Post and chain' at front of driveway is inadequate and an eyesore.
8. Added concern that mature tree in centre of land will be felled for further development.
Consultation Responses

Highways

No objections

Observations

Impact upon Streetscene

Policy QE3 of the Warrington Core Strategy identifies the need to protect existing green infrastructure and the functions it performs. Policy QE6 states that the Council will only support development which would not lead to an adverse impact on the environment and would not have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding area. Policy QE7 requires development to reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance the character, appearance and function of the street scene, local area and wider townscape.

The proposal is retrospective, the land having changed use to residential garden already. The land is privately owned, and is not an area of publicly accessible open space. It is not considered that the change of use has resulted in any significant harm to the streetscene. The tree on the site has been retained and remains an attractive feature. The site appears to be well maintained, and the only physical manifestation of the change of use is the laying of the concrete flags, a post and chain barrier, and the planting of a hedge, all of which do not adversely impact upon the character of Walton Road to any significant extent.

- The post and chain barrier is a light structure that is modest in appearance.
- The recently planted hedging along the boundary would be an attractive feature when mature.
- The coverage of paving flags is not excessive, and the greater area of the site remains as greenery.
- The parking of a car on the land would have some degree of impact, as all parked cars do, but the driveway is restricted to a small proportion of the site area, and a car being parked behind the building line is not within an overly obtrusive position. Some positive weight should also be given to the provision of an off street parking space which would reduce on street parking. A condition is also recommended to restrict the parking area within the site to the existing surfaced parking space to avoid increased parking and loss of greenery.

Residential Amenity

Policy QE6 of the Core Strategy identifies criteria to be considered with regard to environment and amenity protection, including the need to respect the living conditions of existing neighbouring residential occupiers.
The adjacent residential property 76 Walton Road has a gable elevation that faces across the site and includes two small ground floor windows. These windows are thus dependent upon the adjacent land for light and outlook. The proximity of the parking area within the site does impact upon these windows. This is not considered to be a determinative factor having regard to the secondary location of these windows and their reliance upon the adjacent private land for their light and outlook. The condition recommended to restrict parking would ensure that no additional parking is introduced on the site, and it is not considered that a change of use of the land has significantly impacted upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 76 Walton Road.

(Notwithstanding the outcome of this planning application, a hedge has been planted along the boundary with 76 Walton Road, which when grown will screen the parking area, but may also affect daylight and outlook).

Concerns have been expressed that the proposal would restrict access for waste bins to the rear of 76 Walton Road. The existing path alongside the side elevation of 76 Walton Road would remain as it is currently, and there would not be any obstruction to access caused by the proposal.

**Highways**

Policy QE6 states that the Council will take into consideration car parking and the effect of traffic movements to a site, including impacts on highway safety.

There is a dropped kerb which serves the properties on Walton Road. As the driveway utilises this and the existing access onto Walton Road without any known highway issues, the proposal is acceptable from a highway safety point of view.

**Recommendation**

Approve Subject to Condition

**Conditions & Reasons**

1. Condition: Parking within the site shall be restricted to the existing surfaced parking area as shown on the approved drawings, with no additional parking within the site, unless otherwise approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason: To protect the character of the streetscene. This is in accordance with the following policies of the Warrington Core Strategy: Policy QE3 Green Infrastructure; Policy QE6 Environment and Amenity Protection; Policy QE7 Ensuring a High Quality Place.
Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority operates a pre-planning application advice service. All applicants are encouraged to engage with the Local Planning Authority at pre-planning application stage. As part of the determination of this planning application the Local Planning Authority has worked pro-actively and positively with the applicant ensuring that upon receipt all representations and consultation responses are available to view on the Council’s web site. The Local Planning Authority has considered the application and where necessary considered either the imposition of planning conditions and/or sought reasonable amendments to the application in order to deliver a sustainable form of development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
Appendix 1
ITEM 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>2015/26216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>The Market Multi Storey Car Park, Moulders Lane, Bewsey And Whitecross, Warrington, WA1 2FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Bewsey and Whitecross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Advertisement consent - Application for the relocation of an existing Non Illuminated advertisement banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Registered:</td>
<td>16-Jul-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Warrington Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/16 Week Expiry Date:</td>
<td>09-Sep-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for referral

The application has been submitted by the Council’s Parking Services Team.

Site and Proposal

The multi storey car park is found in-between Academy Way, Bank Street and Moulders Lane. Opposite the site is Warrington Market, whilst DW Sports Fitness is to the east. The advert would be sited on the Bank Street elevation, but face on-coming traffic from Academy Way. A traffic light controlled junction serving Academy Way and Bank Street faces the façade. The non-illuminated advert would measure 1 metre by 5 metres and be sited 7 metres above ground level. A blue background with white text is proposed – it is the same advert currently found on this elevation, just positioned higher up. The advert in situ does not benefit from consent and is thus unauthorised.

Relevant Planning History

- Outline permission with access details granted with conditions (All other details reserved for future applications) for the demolition of existing on-site buildings / structures and the construction of a mixed use development, comprising of a new market hall, class A1 retail uses, class A2 financial and professional services uses; Class A3 restaurants and cafes; Class B1 office uses including a new council office building; class D1 non-residential uses including a library; class D2 leisure uses including
a cinema; refurbishment of the academy way multi-storey car park; new landscaping and public realm; new vehicular access roads and servicing areas, accommodation and reinstatement works to retained buildings; site remediation and other associated works. Ref: 2014/24473

- Approval granted with conditions for the erection of a multi storey car park and associated road works. Ref: 74/1045.

Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Achieving Sustainable Development

Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS)

QE6 Environment and Amenity Protection
QE7 Ensuring a High Quality Place

SPD: Warrington Design Guide

Notification Responses
No responses received.

Consultation Responses

WBC Highways - The application seeks approval to display advertisement signage at the above location. The existing banner sign is proposed to be moved higher up the building on the same elevation. As the sign is unlit and is simply being moved further up the building, there are not anticipated to be any new highways issues arising from the provision of the relocated sign.

Observations

The two main considerations in the determination of advertisement applications are visual amenity and highway safety.

Visual Appearance of the Adverts and Highway Safety

Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states “The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people”.

Local Plan Core Strategy policy QE6 will allow development providing it does not have an adverse impact on the environment or the amenity of future occupiers or the surrounding area. Emerging Core Strategy policy QE7 re-enforces this position by requiring proposals that are of local distinctiveness.
All advertisement displays must be assessed by consideration of amenity and public safety.

The advert will be a repositioned feature in the established street scene and would be viewed in conjunction with the multi storey and surrounding buildings. Large illuminated adverts populate DW Fitness whilst a variety of adverts can be found beyond the site on Academy Way.

The general appearance of the advert is acceptable – its colour replicates the colour scheme utilised for the existing advert. It will be positioned in a location which will not adversely affect pedestrian safety and it is non-illuminated, so will not distract drivers or unreasonably illuminate the environment. No objections are raised by highways.

Summary

The scheme is considered to be acceptable with regards to the aforementioned national and local policies in terms of highway safety and amenity.

Recommendation

Approve subject to conditions

Conditions & Reasons

1. This consent shall expire 5 years from the date of this notice where upon the signage shall be removed and any damage repaired unless further consent to display has been given by the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason: To accord with Regulation 14(7) of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) and for the purposes of amenity and public safety.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:

   (a) The planning application forms received by Warrington Borough Council and scanned on 20th July 2015.
   (b) Submitted drawings – site location plan, dimensions of advert and proposed location of advert scanned 20th July 2015.

   Reason: for the avoidance of doubt and to enable Warrington Borough Council to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area and to conform with Policy QE6 of the Warrington Local Plan Core Strategy.
Informatives

1. This planning permission is granted in strict accordance with the approved plans. It should be noted however that:

   (a) Any variation from the approved plans following commencement of the development, irrespective of the degree of variation, will constitute unauthorised development and may be liable to enforcement action.

   (b) You or your agent or any other person responsible for implementing this permission should inform Development Control immediately of any proposed variation from the approved plans and ask to be advised as to the best method to resolve the matter. Most proposals for variation to the approved plans will require the submission of a new planning application.

2. The Local Planning Authority operates a pre-planning application advice service. All applicants are encouraged to engage with the Local Planning Authority at pre-planning application stage. As part of the determination of this planning application the Local Planning Authority has worked pro-actively and positively with the applicant ensuring that upon receipt all representations and consultation responses are available to view on the Council's web site. The Local Planning Authority has considered the application and where necessary considered either the imposition of planning conditions and/or sought reasonable amendments to the application in order to deliver a sustainable form of development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
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DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE DATE: 26th August 2015

ITEM 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>2015/26108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Grappenhall St Wilfreds C E Primary School, Church Lane, Grappenhall And Thelwall, Warrington, WA4 3EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Grappenhall And Thelwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed New Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Registered:</td>
<td>06-Jul-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Glenda Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/16 Week Expiry Date:</td>
<td>30-Aug-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Referral to Committee

Council interest in parts of the land

Human Rights

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from the following rights:

Article 8 - The right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

Article 1 of Protocol 1 - The right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property

Site and Proposal

- Proposed single storey canopy with roller shutters to the western elevation of the secondary school building to the north of the site
- Sited in a predominantly residential area with residential properties to the east and west and canal to the north
- Nearest residential property is sited 32.5m to the west (Bridgewater Barn)
- Canopy measures 9.8m by 7.4m and 3.2m high with mono pitch roof to be finished in green steel – polyester powder coated laths
- The area to be developed currently serves as part of the tarmac play
ground
• No significant variation in land levels noted
• No significant trees in close proximity of the extensions
• Substantial side and rear boundary treatment
• The site sits within a Conservation Area, Green Belt, Green Belt Settlement, 250m Pond Buffer and is listed in the Open Space Audit

Relevant Planning History

• Various alterations and extensions between 1985-2010, however none are relevant to the current proposal

Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

In particular paragraph 74 (Promoting Healthy Communities)

Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS)

• Policy CS1 Overall Spatial Strategy – Delivering Sustainable Development
• Policy CS2 Quality and Distribution of Development
• Policy CS5 Overall Spatial Strategy – Green Belt
• Policy QE6 Green Infrastructure
• Policy QE6 Environment and Amenity Protection
• Policy QE7 Ensuring a High Quality Place
• Policy QE8 Historic Environment
• Policy SN6 Sustaining the Local Economy and Services
• Policy CC1 Inset and Green Belt Settlements

Notification Responses

1 letter of objection received regarding the following:
• Harm to the appearance of the Conservation Area
• Loss of privacy

Consultation Responses

Ward Councillors

No comments received

Grappenhall and Thelwall Parish Council

No objection
Observations

Green Belt

The National Planning Policy Framework advises that only certain forms of new development in the Green Belt are acceptable. One of the accepted criteria is the 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. Para 89 of the NPPF also sets out that the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate development provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The current proposal is an extension to existing school building and seeks to allow the building to be used for outdoor play and therefore is considered to accord with para 89 of the NPPF and therefore also policy CS5 of the Core Strategy.

The site is also washed over by green belt in a green belt settlement as set out in policy CC1 of the LPCS. Under CC1 limited new build is acceptable provided – inter alia – that it would have more affinity with existing built form – rather than the wider green belt. It is considered that the small size of the canopy – well within the grounds of the school environment – does not conflict with this policy – nor therefore with policy CS5.

Therefore the principle of development is considered acceptable.

Design/Appearance/Conservation Area

The building to be extended is the secondary building which is sited to the north of the site. The proposal itself will be sited on the main western elevation of this building. The building is intended to serve both indoor and outdoor use as it will have roller shutter walls.

The proposal would be set well back from the road by 33m to the west and 46m to the south. The proposal would not be sited further forward than the most westerly part of the building, the height would be lower than that of the building and the dimensions would be proportionate to that of the existing building. The site is also heavily screened by intervening boundary trees/planting which restricts views of the proposal from within the Conservation Area or the wider setting.

Finally the proposal would be made from steel with polyester powder coated laths which will be green in colour which is considered would better reflect the colour of the existing boundary fencing and the surrounding boundary planting.

As a result the proposed development is not considered to cause material harm to the character/appearance of the area or the Conservation Area in
which it sits.

**Residential Amenity**

The canopy would be sited 32.5m away nearest residential property to the west (23m to the boundary). These separation distances would prevent any harm to living conditions through loss of outlook, overshadowing, oppressive impact or loss of privacy.

It is not expected that the use of the extension would result in any increased noise disturbance over and above that associated with the existing school and in any case any noise would also be short lived during the opening hours of the school.

Therefore the proposal would not cause material harm to living conditions.

**Highways**

The proposal seeks to expand the existing facilities only and is not therefore considered to result in an increase in pupil numbers or staff numbers.

Therefore the proposal would not cause material harm to highway safety.

**Trees**

No significant trees within close proximity of the proposal.

Therefore the proposal would not cause harm to important landscape features.

**Playing Fields**

The tarmac area to be developed does not form part of playing field. Whilst the proposal would enclose part of the existing external tarmac playground, the retractable nature of the walls would ensure that the canopy can still be used for outdoor play in all weather. Therefore there would be no loss of playing field/play area.

As a result the proposal would not result in any loss of playing field/play area and would in fact enhance the existing play provision.

**Ecology**

The proposal sits within a 250m pond buffer, however as the proposal would sit within the confines of the existing built form, it is not considered that the proposal would pose any ecology concerns.

**Summary**

The proposal is considered to be acceptable, subject to appropriate
conditions, as it accords with Warrington Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2, CS5, QE6, CC1, QE7, QE8, SN6 & QE6 and the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 74. This is by reason of appropriate design, with no perceived detrimental impact upon the conservation area, the green belt, landscape features, ecology, surrounding neighbours, the character of the street scene, playing fields or existing off-street parking.

**Recommendation**

Approve – subject to conditions

**Conditions & Reasons**

1. The development hereby approved shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions and to comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:
   (a) The planning application forms, design and access statement and additional information received by Warrington Borough Council on {6th July 2015}
   (b) Submitted drawing No's {A2814 L02 Rev P1 dated May 2015}.

   Reason: for the avoidance of doubt and to enable Warrington Borough Council to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area and to conform with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Core Strategy.

3. None of the building(s) hereby approved shall be constructed until written and photographic details of the external roofing and facing materials (including manufacturer's details) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. Materials samples shall be made available to view on site and shall NOT be deposited with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details/samples

   Reason: In order to comply with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Core Strategy and the Warrington SPD: Design and Construction
**Informatives**

1. The Local Planning Authority operates a pre-planning application advice service. All applicants are encouraged to engage with the Local Planning Authority at pre-planning application stage. As part of the determination of this planning application the Local Planning Authority has worked pro-actively and positively with the applicant ensuring that upon receipt all representations and consultation responses are available to view on the Council's web site. The Local Planning Authority has considered the application and where necessary considered either the imposition of planning conditions and/or sought reasonable amendments to the application in order to deliver a sustainable form of development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. In many cases your proposal will also require consent under the Building Regulations 2010, for advice and guidance on the requirements of the Building Regulations, please contact our Building Control section on 01925 442554 or email building.control@warrington.gov.uk
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Proposed plans
Site plan showing the extensions in relation to neighbouring properties
Appendix 2 – Photographs of Site

Photograph showing the location of the canopy

Photograph showing the boundary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26018</td>
<td>5, BEECHWAYS, APPLETON, WARRINGTON, WA4 5EL</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed construction of dormer windows to rear elevation of existing dwelling including recovering of main roof. (Resubmission of Planning Reference 2015/25402).</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26011</td>
<td>STUD FARM, LUMB BROOK ROAD, APPLETON, WARRINGTON, WA4 3HL</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed new doors to rear of approved extension (2011/17835)</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26040</td>
<td>6, BROOMFIELDS ROAD, APPLETON, WA4 3AE</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed attached garage to side elevation with bedroom and study over, plus bedroom to rear elevation. (Resubmission of 2015/25477)</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26017</td>
<td>2, MENTMORE GARDENS, APPLETON, WARRINGTON, WA4 3HF</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed single storey extension to rear and porch to front (Resubmission of 2014/24868)</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26032</td>
<td>BARLEYCASTLE TRADING ESTATE, LYNCASTLE ROAD, APPLETON, WARRINGTON</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed construction of new workshop.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25852</td>
<td>HOLLYDENE, WINDMILL LANE, APPLETON, WARRINGTON, WA4 5JN</td>
<td>TPO - Proposed felling of mature Beech (T4) covered by TPO 237</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Delegated Decisions

### Bewsey and Whitecross

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25965</td>
<td>23, SANKEY STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 1XG</td>
<td>Advertisement - Application for consent to display various illuminated and non-illuminated advertisements</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25993</td>
<td>23, SANKEY STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 1XG</td>
<td>Listed Building Application - Listed Building application for various works, both internally &amp; externally</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26028</td>
<td>23, SANKEY STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 1XG</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposal of new ATM to be installed to the external facade to replace the existing ATM.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26324</td>
<td>Former Dallam Day Centre, Dallam Lane, Warrington, Cheshire, WA2 7NG</td>
<td>Non-Material Amendment - Proposed re-wording of conditions 10 and 11 attached to planning permission 2014/24713 to provide for the submission of details prior to the occupation of the building (rather than prior to the commencement of development).</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26071</td>
<td>11, BRIDGE STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 2EY</td>
<td>Listed Building - Replacement of existing external ATM - To be equality act compliant Replacement of 2No Existing internal ATM's</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26116</td>
<td>43, ARPLEY STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 1LX</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed First Floor Extension</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26132</td>
<td>1, OLD MARKET PLACE, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 1QB</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed external alterations to the building including new shopfront and windows</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26000</td>
<td>Car Park at junction of, Wilson Patten Street, and Winmarleigh Street, Warrington, WA1 1LE</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed erection of single mixed use building comprising 1no 243sqm A1 retail unit and 1no 470sqm ‘F1 Auto Centre’ garage/servicing unit with 25sqm external/bin storage unit and associated parking and access infrastructure.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26066</td>
<td>20, BRIDGE STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 2QW</td>
<td>Listed Building consent - Proposal for non-illuminated shaped panel sign (Cash Generator)</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25940</td>
<td>20, BRIDGE STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA1 2QW</td>
<td>Advertisement - Proposal for non-illuminated shaped panel sign</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25912</td>
<td>POLAR FORD WARRINGTON, WINWICK ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA2 7NY</td>
<td>Advertisement - Proposed installation of 'Ford' window graphic (wrap) design</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26026</td>
<td>46, BEWSEY STREET, BEWSEY AND WHITECROSS, WARRINGTON, WA2 7JE</td>
<td>Prior Notification - Prior approval for change of use from B1 use to C3 use (Conversion of offices into 2 residential flats)</td>
<td>Prior Approval Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26054</td>
<td>32, CAMPION CLOSE, BIRCHWOOD, WARRINGTON, WA3 7NP</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed single storey side extension to existing dwelling, resubmission of application 2015/25659</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26135</td>
<td>55, WOOLMER CLOSE, BIRCHWOOD, WARRINGTON, WA3 6TT</td>
<td>42 Day Householder Prior Approval - Proposed extension to garage to extend by 5.445 metres from the rear wall, maximum height of the extension is to be 3.15 metres and the height of the extension to the eaves is to be 1.5 metres.</td>
<td>Prior Approval Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25919</td>
<td>OAKWOOD GATE SERVICE STATION, OAKWOOD GATE, BIRCHWOOD, WARRINGTON, WA3 6RW</td>
<td>Discharge of Conditions - Application for approval of details reserved by condition 1 (Commencement), condition 2 (Plan Accordance), condition 3 (Materials), condition 4 (Landscaping), condition 5 (Tree Protection), condition 6 (Energy), condition 7 (Acoustics), condition 8 (Land Contamination Pre-Commencement), condition 9 (Land Contamination Completion), condition 10 (Car Park), condition 11 (Cycle Park) and condition 12 (Ped Route) following previously approved application 2014/23300</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25921</td>
<td>OAKWOOD GATE SERVICE STATION, OAKWOOD GATE, BIRCHWOOD, WARRINGTON, WA3 6RW</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Condition 1 (Development to be commenced before the expiration of 3 years), Condition 2 (Development carried out in accordance with the planning application forms, specifications and drawings), Condition 3 (Material Samples), Condition 4 (Landscaping drawing), Condition 5 (Management Plan), Condition 6 (Acoustic report), Condition 7 (GEO2 Ground investigation report), Condition 8 (GEO2 Ground investigation report), Condition 9 (Drainage), Condition 10 (Underground Tanks), Condition 11 (Parking arrangements), Condition 12 (Cycle parking), Condition 13 (Footway construction details) following previously approved application 2015/25196</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26175</td>
<td>24, JAY CLOSE, BIRCHWOOD, WARRINGTON, WA3 6QJ</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed Single storey porch extension</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26039</td>
<td>REEVES HOUSE, HERMITAGE GREEN LANE, WINWICK, WARRINGTON, WA2 8SJ</td>
<td>42 day Householder Prior Approval: Proposed single storey rear extension to extend by 8m from the rear wall, maximum height of the extension is to be 3.88m max and the height of the extension to the eaves is to be 2m</td>
<td>Prior Approval Not Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CULCHETH, GLAZEBURY AND CROFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25928</td>
<td>12, TWISS GREEN DRIVE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 4HY</td>
<td>Householders - Proposal to erect a conservatory to the rear of the property</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25920</td>
<td>1, COMMON LANE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 4EH</td>
<td>Change of Use - Proposed change of use from office to dental surgery (D1) and 2 beauty treatment rooms</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26022</td>
<td>30, HURST MILL LANE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 5NR</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed garage conversion and extension into kitchen/dining room, first floor extension and balcony to living space and Juliet balconies to second floor bedrooms.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26079</td>
<td>67, WITHINGTON AVENUE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 4JE</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26025</td>
<td>LOWES FARM HOUSE, KENYON LANE, CROFT, WARRINGTON, WA3 4AY</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate - Proposed demolition of existing leisure outbuilding and the provision within the curtilage of the dwelling house of a new outbuilding to provide a swimming pool enclosure gym and changing facilities</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26008</td>
<td>HOPE FARM, WARRINGTON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA3 6BG</td>
<td>Part Discharge of Condition - Condition 4A (Site characterisation), Condition 4B(Submission of remediation scheme) from previous approved application 2012/20165</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26037</td>
<td>39, MEDWAY ROAD, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 5EL</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed single storey extension to side and rear. (Resubmission of Planning Application 2014/24198)</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26019</td>
<td>OLD TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, COMMON LANE, CULCHETH AND GLAZEBURY, WARRINGTON, WA3 4HA</td>
<td>Prior Notification - Proposed installation of an electronic communications base station comprising a 12m high slim line monopole mast, an Omni antenna, a GPS antenna, an equipment cabinet and an electric meter cabinet</td>
<td>Planning Permission Not Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Delegated Decisions

## Fairfield and Howley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26045</td>
<td>Land at Church Street and Farrell Street, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Application for approval of details reserved by Condition 6 (Characterisation - PRA/desk study, GQRA, DQRA, Remedial options appraisal and Submission of a remediation and verification strategy) &amp; Condition 30 (Piling) from previous application 2015/25136</td>
<td>Condition Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26283</td>
<td>10, RIVERSIDE CLOSE, FAIRFIELD AND HOWLEY, WARRINGTON, WA1 2JD</td>
<td>Section 192 (Lawful Development Certificate) - Proposed single storey kitchen/dining room extension to rear elevation.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26134</td>
<td>QUADRANT HOUSE, CHURCH STREET, FAIRFIELD AND HOWLEY, WARRINGTON, WA1 2TF</td>
<td>Non-Material Amendment - Application for non-material amendment for rebuilding of parapet wall.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25941</td>
<td>36, CHURCH STREET, FAIRFIELD AND HOWLEY, WARRINGTON, WA1 2SY</td>
<td>Change of use - Proposed change of use from cafe to form a new 'Italian Cuisine Takeaway, pasta &amp; Salads '</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26015</td>
<td>Land at Church Street and Farrell Street, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Condition 14 (Full construction details of site access and roads), Condition 15 (Scheme/details comprising of highway improvements), Condition 16 (Surface water drainage system, Condition 24 (Create adequate exceedance flood flow paths and routing) and Condition 28 (Details of existing and proposed levels including finished slab levels of all buildings on previous application 2015/25136 (resubmission of 2014/24613)</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Delegated Decisions
delegated 26th August 2015

### GRAPPENHALL AND THELWALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25956</td>
<td>45, BARLEY ROAD, GRAPPENHALL AND THELWALL, WARRINGTON, WA4 2EZ</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed ground floor kitchen and toilet extension to side elevation</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26090</td>
<td>THE RECTORY, CHURCH LANE, GRAPPENHALL AND THELWALL, WARRINGTON, WA4 3EP</td>
<td>TPO Conservation Area - Proposal felling of T1 &amp; T2 (identified on site as the two trees secured with rope)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25971</td>
<td>32, ALL SAINTS DRIVE, GRAPPENHALL AND THELWALL, WARRINGTON, WA4 2JJ</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate - Replacement of existing conservatory with single storey kitchen/family room extension to rear elevation plus part conversion of garage to create utility room</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25997</td>
<td>1, ST ANNES AVENUE, GRAPPENHALL AND THELWALL, WARRINGTON, WA4 2PL</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed part single and part two storey extension to side</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26191</td>
<td>LAND ADJACENT TO THE BRIDGE HOUSE, STOCKPORT ROAD, GRAPPENHALL AND THELWALL, WARRINGTON, WA4 2SZ</td>
<td>Non-Material Amendment - Proposed minor adjustments to reflect the detailed design drawings prepared for construction purposes (see attached list) in relation to previously approved application 2014/24149</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25986</td>
<td>19, WILSON CLOSE, WARRINGTON, WA4 2ET</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed two storey rear extension and loft conversion</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GREAT SANKEY NORTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25970</td>
<td>4, MAYFAIR CLOSE, GREAT SANKEY, WARRINGTON, WA5 3PL</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed single storey dining room and bedroom extension to side and rear elevations</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26076</td>
<td>10, SHANKLIN CLOSE, GREAT SANKEY, WARRINGTON, WA5 3JN</td>
<td>42 day Householder Prior Approval: Proposed single storey rear extension to extend by 5.4m from the rear wall, maximum height of the extension is to be 3.875m and the height of the extension to the eaves is to be 2.675m</td>
<td>Prior Approval Not Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GREAT SANKEY SOUTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25963</td>
<td>12, FLEETWOOD CLOSE, GREAT SANKEY, WARRINGTON, WA5 2UZ</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed single storey side and rear wrap around extension.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26149</td>
<td>11, LYTHAM CLOSE, GREAT SANKEY, WARRINGTON, WA5 2GH</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed rear garage extension</td>
<td>Approved withConditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HATTON, STRETTON AND WALTON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26068</td>
<td>86, WHITEFIELD ROAD, STOCKTON HEATH, WARRINGTON, WA4 6NB</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed single storey extension to rear and new roof and reduction in length of existing garage</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25938</td>
<td>31, PEWTERSPPEAR GREEN ROAD, APPLETON, WARRINGTON, WA4 5FD</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed single storey side / rear extension and alterations to existing garage roof.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26345</td>
<td>Land adjacent to A56 Chester Road, close to junction with Hob Hey Lane, Warrington</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate (Section 192) - Proposed construction of 2x temporary pedestrian bridges across the A56</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25967</td>
<td>Former Ship Inn, Chester Road, Walton, Warrington, Cheshire, WA4 6EN</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 21 (Japanese Knotweed), 24 (Remediation Scheme) &amp; 26 (Noise Levels) following previously approved application 2014/23334</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25914</td>
<td>HATTON HALL, WARRINGTON ROAD, HATTON, WARRINGTON, WA4 5NU</td>
<td>Listed Building - Application for proposed refurbishment the building to replace defective windows, remedy water ingress from the roof, remedy damp issues, improve its thermal performance and make a number of minor internal alterations.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26043</td>
<td>Former Ship Inn, Chester Road, Walton, Warrington, Cheshire, WA4 6EN</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Application for approval of details reserved by Condition 2 (Scheme for the provision of refuse and recycling storage facilities) and Condition 3 (Details of cross sections of the window frames in the conversion units only, including materials) following approval of Outline permission 2014/23334.</td>
<td>Condition Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Latchford East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26030</td>
<td>1, MORRIS AVENUE, LATCHFORD, WARRINGTON, WA4 1SG</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed single storey side extension</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26064</td>
<td>120, GREENALLS AVENUE, LATCHFORD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6RJ</td>
<td>Householder - Retrospective application for external alterations comprising blocking of the original front door and creation of a new front door at the entrance to an adjoining former passage including internal works involving incorporation of the passage into the dwelling to form an entrance hall for work to a listed building.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26065</td>
<td>120, GREENALLS AVENUE, LATCHFORD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6RJ</td>
<td>Listed Building - Retrospective application for external alterations comprising blocking of the original front door and creation of a new front door at the entrance to an adjoining former passage including internal works involving incorporation of the passage into the dwelling to form an entrance hall for work to a listed building.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26050</td>
<td>KINGS CLUB, ST MARY STREET, LATCHFORD, WARRINGTON, WA4 1BH</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed Erection of 4 no. two storey dwellings with associated parking</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25974</td>
<td>Former timber planing mill off Chester Road, Lower Walton And Land To Immediate South Of, Landseer Avenue, Cranbourne Avenue, WARRINGTON</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Condition 5 (Contaminated Land survey report) following previously approved application 2007/10646</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25980</td>
<td>Former timber planing mill off Chester Road, Lower Walton And Land To Immediate South Of, Landseer Avenue, Cranbourne Avenue, WARRINGTON</td>
<td>Discharge of Conditions - Condition 13 (land contamination) relating to planning application 2011/17693</td>
<td>Condition Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25981</td>
<td>Former timber planing mill off Chester Road, Lower Walton And Land To Immediate South Of, Landseer Avenue, Cranbourne Avenue, WARRINGTON</td>
<td>Discharge of conditions - Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 12 (Site investigation) following previously approved application 2012/19970</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26146</td>
<td>42, CRANBORNE AVENUE, LATCHFORD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6DE</td>
<td>42 day Householder Prior Approval: Proposed single storey rear extension to extend by 3.3m from the rear wall, maximum height of the extension is to be 4m max and the height of the extension to the eaves is to be 2.3m</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26099</td>
<td>4, WHITBARROW ROAD, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 9AE</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed opening alterations and new balcony to approved planning scheme ref: 2013/21752</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25959</td>
<td>10, MANOR ROAD, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0AY</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed single storey front extension and replacement windows</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25830</td>
<td>33, OUGHTRINGTON CRESCENT, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 9JD</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed front porch, two-storey rear extension, single-storey rear extension and internal alterations</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25950</td>
<td>2, MASSEY BROOK LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0PN</td>
<td>Householders - Proposal to replace carport and extend, reposition side entrance to front and replace flat roof to duo pitch at front elevation</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25966</td>
<td>10, BOOTHS LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0PE</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate (Section 192) - Proposed single storey rear extension</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25903</td>
<td>2, LONGCROFT PLACE, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 9UD</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate for an existing use (Section 191) for Orangery to side of house in 2007.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26021</td>
<td>12, GRAMMAR SCHOOL ROAD, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0BQ</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed Amendment to Planning Permission 2014/23100 ? Erection of Two Storey Front Extension to form Principal Entrance &amp; External Remodelling with Rear Balcony to Second Floor</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26123</td>
<td>19, ELM TREE ROAD, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0ND</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed two storey and single storey front extension, garage conversion to habitable accommodation and installation of a pitched roof to the existing two storey flat roof bay window element to the rear</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26205</td>
<td>36, REDDISH CRESCENT, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 9PU</td>
<td>Section 192 (Lawful Development Certificate) - Proposed single-storey rear extension to form enlarged kitchen; removal of internal walls to create open plan kitchen dining space; single-storey side extension to form Wc &amp; utility room; replacement outbuilding- garden room &amp; artist studio/ hobbie room and altered driveway</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26070</td>
<td>WET GATE LANE FARM, WET GATE LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 9SN</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed replacement of existing agricultural building with agricultural workers dwelling</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26036</td>
<td>79, HIGHER LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 0BZ</td>
<td>TPO Works - Application for proposed crown reduction and crown lift to T4 Lime Tree covered by TPO 365.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26055</td>
<td>SPRING FARM, BRADSHAW LANE, LYMM, WARRINGTON, WA13 9JW</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed steel framed agricultural building for use as a stock shed for beef cattle</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PENKETH AND CUERDLEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26013</td>
<td>4, PHYTHIAN CRESCENT, PENKETH, WARRINGTON, WA5 2BT</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed erection of conservatory to rear elevation off dining room.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25945</td>
<td>Land opposite, 37 &amp; 39, Hall Nook, Penketh, Warrington, WA5 2HR</td>
<td>Tree Works - Proposed removal of Horse Chestnut Tree</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25907</td>
<td>WHITE MOSS NURSERY AND GARDEN CENTRE, SOUTH LANES, WIDNES, WA8 3TZ</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed change of Use from A1 retail, landscaped area, children's play area and retail (A1) display area to D2 assembly and leisure consisting of Averie's (falcon rehabilitation centre) Log Cabins (education and visitors centre) and weathering's</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25896</td>
<td>19, PENROSE GARDENS, PENKETH, WARRINGTON, WA5 2UE</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed Garage Conversion</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26038</td>
<td>PENKETH HALL FARM, HALL NOOK, PENKETH, WARRINGTON, WA5 2HR</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate (Section 192) - Proposed gazebo (10m x 4m) to enable pony parties during weekends and school holidays.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25801</td>
<td>Land south of Station Road, Penketh, Warrington, WA5 2HR</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed development of solar energy farm (5MW) and associated works including inverter housing, access tracks, security fencing and cameras</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Poplars and Hulme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25946</td>
<td>64, POPLARS AVENUE, POPLARS AND HULME, WARRINGTON, WA2 9LG</td>
<td>Householder- Proposed two storey side/rear, &amp; single storey rear extension</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26047</td>
<td>158, Poplars Avenue, Poplars and Hulme, Warrington, WA2 9LZ</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate (Section 192) - Proposed single storey rear extension</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Poulton North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25976</td>
<td>7, STONEHAVEN DRIVE, POULTON-WITH-FEARNHEAD, WARRINGTON, WA2 0SR</td>
<td>Housholder - Proposed single storey rear elevation extension</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25885</td>
<td>4, CINNAMON LANE, POULTON-WITH-FEARNHEAD, WARRINGTON, WA2 0BD</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed change of use from residential to commercial including offices to ground floor and residential to first floor with associated parking to the rear.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26016</td>
<td>CINNAMON BROW COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION CENTRE, PERTH CLOSE, POULTON-WITH-FEARNHEAD, WARRINGTON, WA2 0SF</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed single storey side extension to the lounge bar area</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26148</td>
<td>14, NOOK LANE, POULTON-WITH-FEARNHEAD, WARRINGTON, WA2 0RT</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed two storey rear extension with associated works</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Poulton South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26136</td>
<td>20, NORTHDALE ROAD, POULTON-WITH-FEARNHEAD, WARRINGTON, WA1 3HH</td>
<td>42 day Householder Prior Approval: Proposed conservatory to the rear of the property to extend by 3 metres from the rear wall, maximum height of the proposed extension is to be 3.331 metres and the height of the extension to the eaves is to be 2.285 metres.</td>
<td>Prior Approval Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/07/2015</td>
<td>2014/25033</td>
<td>JTF, 1, Chesford Grange, Woolston, Warrington, WA1 4RQ</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed change of use from wholesale warehouse (Class B8) to retail use (Class A1) with ancillary car parking, service area and external storage area.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26088</td>
<td>20, BIRCH ROAD, RIXTON-WITH-GLAZEBROOK, WARRINGTON, WA3 6JJ</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate - Proposed conversion of existing loft space to habitable room, includes construction of a dormer to the rear roof and a change in profile to the side room from hip to gable</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26020</td>
<td>CLEVELANDS FARM, MOSS SIDE LANE, RIXTON-WITH-GLAZEBROOK, WARRINGTON, WA3 6HQ</td>
<td>Change of Use - Proposed change of use of a former poultry building to storage/workshop use including the removal of an adjacent building for parking and turning</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26010</td>
<td>14, SCHOOL LANE, RIXTON-WITH-GLAZEBROOK, WARRINGTON, WA3 6LL</td>
<td>Lawful Development Certificate (Section 191)- Existing rear single storey extension.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26074</td>
<td>83, WALTON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6NW</td>
<td>42 day Householder Prior Approval: Proposed single storey rear extension to extend by 4.07m from the rear wall, maximum height of the extension is to be 3.9m and the height of the extension to the eaves is to be 2.55m</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/26063</td>
<td>12, HILL TOP ROAD, STOCKTON HEATH, WARRINGTON, WA4 2DP</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed single storey side extension</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26118</td>
<td>72, LONDON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6HR</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed installation of 2No. new ATM's fitted in place of existing.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26119</td>
<td>72, LONDON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6HR</td>
<td>Advertisement - Proposal to remove existing brand signage, install 1No. internally illuminated Fascia sign, 1No. internally illuminated hanging sign, 1 x A1 Suspended Poster, 1 x Welcome Sign, 2 x ATM Tablet and 5 x Privacy Film</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25958</td>
<td>146, LONDON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6LE</td>
<td>Change of Use - Proposal for change of use from Beauty therapy establishment to office use within use class B1.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25942</td>
<td>49, LONDON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6SG</td>
<td>Prior Notification - Prior approval for change of use of ground floor from A1 use to A3 use (Italian Delicatessen &amp; wine lounge)</td>
<td>Prior Approval Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26185</td>
<td>49, LONDON ROAD, WARRINGTON, WA4 6SG</td>
<td>Advertisement consent - Application for proposed illuminated fascia sign</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25436</td>
<td>Gemini 16, Land to the South of Westbrook Crescent, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of condition - Proposed discharge of Conditions 1 (Plans Approved - noted), 2 (Materials Layout), 3 (Landscape Management) 4 (Car Parking - noted), 5 (Parking Provisions - noted) 6 (Flood Risk Assessment - Noted), 7 (Boundary Treatment) 8 (Landscaping) and 9 (Planting Plan - noted). Condition 3 (Open Space, to be submitted separately) (relating to Reserved Matters approval 2014/24762)</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25574</td>
<td>Gemini 16, Land to the South of Westbrook Crescent, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of Conditions - Condition 1 (implementation date), Condition 2 - 5 &amp; 7 (Dealt with under a Reserved matters application), Condition 6 (Tree Protection measures), Condition 8 (Local employment Scheme), Condition 9 (Bat Survey), Condition 10 (Nesting Birds) Condition 11 (Ecology Layout) Condition 12 (lighting scheme) Condition 13,14,15 (Private Drainage/Surface Water Drainage) Condition 16 ( Acoustic protection measures), Condition 17 &amp; 18 (Site investigation), Condition 20 (Affordable Housing) (pursuant to the outline planning permission 2013/22322).</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/25954</td>
<td>SIRIUS HOUSE, DELTA CRESCENT, BURTONWOOD AND WESTBROOK, WARRINGTON</td>
<td>Full Planning - Proposed Re arrangement of car parking spaces and associated external works, including new Bike and smoking shelter.</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26023</td>
<td>8, Penmark Close, Burtonwood and Westbrook, Warrington, WA5 9TG</td>
<td>Householders - Proposal to demolish existing attached garage and erect new 2 storey side extension and part single storey extension and walk in bay window to front elevation</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26295</td>
<td>Plot 7a, Zone 7, Omega South, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Discharge of Condition 19 (Lighting) on approved application 2014/23290</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26296</td>
<td>Plot 7D, Zone 7, Omega South, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of Conditions - Proposed discharge of Condition 19 (External lighting) on approved application 2014/23290</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Westbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision date</th>
<th>Application number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Decision type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26173</td>
<td>910, EUROPA BOULEVARD, BURTONWOOD AND WESTBROOK, WARRINGTON, WA5 7TY</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Application for approval of details reserved by Condition 9 (Scheme to limit surface water run-off) and Condition 10 (Scheme to manage risk of flooding from overland flow of surface water) following Planning Approval 2012/20304.</td>
<td>Condition Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>Application number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development description</td>
<td>Decision type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
<td>2014/24949</td>
<td>18, FARMLEIGH GARDENS, GREAT SANKEY, WARRINGTON, WA5 3FA</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed conversion of integral garage into living space.</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/07/2015</td>
<td>2015/25995</td>
<td>123, LIVINGSTONE CLOSE, GREAT SANKEY, WARRINGTON, WA5 8QB</td>
<td>Householders - Proposed ground floor extension to the side and rear of the property</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26296</td>
<td>Plot 7D, Zone 7, Omega South, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of Conditions - Proposed discharge of Condition 19 (External lighting) on approved application 2014/23290</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26295</td>
<td>Plot 7a, Zone 7, Omega South, Warrington</td>
<td>Discharge of Condition - Discharge of Condition 19 (Lighting) on approved application 2014/23290</td>
<td>Condition Part Discharged/Part Not Discharged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/2015</td>
<td>2015/26122</td>
<td>61, VIRGINIA GARDENS, GREAT SANKEY, WARRINGTON, WA5 8WN</td>
<td>Householder - Proposed conversion of half of the existing garage into Study Room</td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015/25898 101 Walton Road

Amended plans received – attached at Appendix 1

The amendments relate to;
'Hipped Roof' to Dormers, Existing rooflights indicated, and 1No 'off-street' parking space removed, width of garage door increased to 2.6m

2015/26057 – Land to side of 2 Whitefield Road

Additional comments received from Stockton Heath Parish Council (received 21.08.15)

After further consideration of the application please note that Stockton Heath Parish Council wishes to withdraw its objections and presumably therefore can be withdrawn from those applications being considered by the Development Management Committee on 26 August 2015.

OFFICER COMMENT – The withdrawal of the PC objection was received after the Development Management Committee agenda was published and therefore the application remains on the agenda for determination by Members.