

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Update List

10th June 2013

PAGE NO.	LIST A	LIST B	Updated Information
4		13/00011/S73	<p>13 Letters of support have been received from employees of Viridor, the letters are identical but individually signed. They support the application on the grounds that it will ensure the future viability and sustainability of the INEOS ChlorVinyls and the EfW plant, supply a reliable source of energy, reducing costs and securing jobs in the local area.</p> <p>One further objection has been received from a local resident on the grounds of traffic congestion.</p> <p>Freight on Rails objection letter was received in January and the issues raised have already been considered within the committee report. However they have re-sent the objection and asked that their objection letter be presented to members on the update list. In summary the objection raised the following concerns:-</p> <p>Ineos gained planning permission the to transport 90% of the RDF would be transported by a combination of rail and water on sustainability grounds, therefore INEOS should keep to this and honour this condition.</p> <p>They suggest that the applicant demonstrates its long term commitment to using rail by amending its application to agree that: for any future RDF contracts requiring transport by road are set for a maximum 5 year period (once the 85,000 tonnage limit for road deliveries has been exceeded).</p>

			<p>They ask the Council to safeguard rail use to the plant at Runcorn for the benefit of local communities and the wider public for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The planning conditions, agreed by Ineos, are designed to mitigate the adverse impacts to local residents in particular and society as a whole. 2. We believe that HBC must take into account all the external costs imposed on society as the original decision was made on sustainability grounds. 3. Unless Ineos is obliged to use rail to transport a significant tonnage with a defined period, it will set an unhelpful precedent for other waste to energy plants 4. Furthermore , the condition suggested by Ineos where it would report annually to HBC on progress on securing more of the required RDF by rail is meaningless. 5. Much of the information which Ineos sites for its justification for its application for variation was available in 2008. 6. The constraints of location which dictate that the only direct access is from locations to the south of Weaver Junction were always known and therefore that locally sourced RDF was never going to be viable via rail. 7. Impact on traffic congestion, the are no proposals for highways improvements. 8. Rail offers a low carbon energy efficient safe alternative to road transport which reduces road congestion both locally and nationally.
38		13/00071/FUL	
46		13/00092/FUL	<p>The proposals will result in the loss of a number of trees from the site. The application is supported by a detailed</p>

			<p>tree survey. Whilst the trees are considered to have some amenity value the Councils Open Spaces Officer has advised that the trees to be removed are not worthy of Tree Preservation Order. Whilst the loss of trees is regrettable it is not considered possible to retain the trees through the development and it is considered that the wider benefits of the scheme outweigh any harm resulting from the loss. It is considered that replacement planting in compliance with the adopted Castlefields Tree Strategy can be adequately secured by condition.</p> <p>The scheme is considered deficient with regards open space provision when measured against UDP Policy H3. In accordance with the Councils adopted Provision of Open Space SPD financial contributions for off-site provision have been calculated and can be adequately secured by legal agreement or other agreement.</p>
53	13/00112/FUL		