

**NOTE TO WARRINGTON LOCAL PLAN EIP INSPECTORS**

**POLICY MD4 – PEEL HALL**

**13/10/22**

At the hearing session on Matter 6d – Peel Hall, the Council was asked to liaise with Satnam to consider potential modifications to Policy MD4 and its structure taking account of the outline planning permission and matters that would legitimately be covered by reserved matters applications whilst also providing a planning policy framework should a new application be submitted.

The Council has considered the detail of the policy and has consulted colleagues in Development Management who have dealt with the extant outline planning consent. The Council is of the view that the wording of Policy MD4 should remain as it is, reflecting the position on other main development areas and associated policies within the draft local plan. The policy, whilst detailed, sets out requirements which are necessary to mitigate the impact of the development and provide essential infrastructure.

The Council does however appreciate that recognition within the policy of the extant planning consent is required and some additional wording is proposed to clarify that the policy requirements set out under Policy MD4 apply only in the case that a new outline or full planning application is submitted. It is proposed that a new subheading is inserted at the end of the introduction to the site allocation in section 10.4 of the UPSVLP (page 210) to read:

**Current status of the site**

10.4.8 It is important to note that at the time of writing the plan, there is an extant outline planning permission (Application Reference 2016/28492) for up to 1,200 homes, and associated infrastructure, on land at Peel Hall. The provisions of Policy MD4 are therefore relevant in the event that a new outline or full planning application is submitted to the Council. Matters which need to be addressed under the current planning permission are set out in the relevant planning conditions.

The Council has been in contact with the landowner's representative Satnam Planning Services (on behalf of Brooklyn Ltd) to confirm its position and provide the additional wording to the introductory text as set out above. Satnam has confirmed that whilst it welcomes the additional clarification, its position is that the policy can only be considered sound if modifications to the policy wording are made in line with the suggestions made in their Matter Statement M6d.05 and Regulation 19 Representations UPSVLP 1434.

The Council and the landowner disagree on this matter and so this note is submitted on the basis that it represents the Council's views only.