

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

*At a meeting of the Development Management Committee on Monday, 1 November 2021 at the Bridge Suite - Halton Stadium, Widnes*

Present: Councillors S. Hill (Chair), Leck (Vice-Chair), Abbott, J. Bradshaw, Carlin, Hutchinson, A. Lowe, Philbin, Polhill, J. Stockton and Thompson

Apologies for Absence: None

Absence declared on Council business: None

Officers present: A. Jones, T. Gibbs, A. Plant, G. Henry, P. Peak, L. Wilson-Lagan and K. Thompson

Also in attendance: Councillors A. McInerney, T. McInerney, V. Hill and Wallace, 63 members of the public and one member of the press

### ITEMS DEALT WITH UNDER DUTIES EXERCISABLE BY THE COMMITTEE

	<i>Action</i>
DEV19 MINUTES	
The Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2021, having been circulated, were taken as read and signed as a correct record.	
DEV20 PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COMMITTEE	
The Committee considered the following applications for planning permission and, in accordance with its powers and duties, made the decisions described below.	
DEV21 21/00408/FUL - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM CARE HOME (C2) TO 3 NO. SELF CONTAINED HMOS (SUI GENERIS) WITH ASSOCIATED INFILL EXTENSION, LAY OUT OF CAR PARK AND LANDSCAPING AT 61 DERBY ROAD, WIDNES, WA8 9LG	
The consultation procedure undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site.	

Officers advised the Committee that a further objection to the scheme was received over the weekend, a copy of which was emailed to the Committee today and paper copies were presented to Members at the meeting. In response to the resident's concerns over loss of privacy, noise and disturbance and lack of consultation, the Case Officer outlined mitigation measures that would be put in place, which would be secured by conditions. In relation to lack of consultation, it was reported that a letter was sent to the property on 15 July 2021.

It was confirmed that the Contaminated Land Officer had raised no objections to the proposal. In addition to the conditions required above, it was also recommended that an additional condition be added regarding the requirement for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Ireland, who spoke in objection to the proposal, representing 801 local residents. He argued, *inter alia*:

- This would be the largest House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) in Halton and would set a dangerous precedent;
- The market was saturated with HMO's;
- The allocation of 13 car parking spaces was not enough for 29 rooms so on road parking would occur, causing more congestion in an already congested area;
- Local retailers had raised concerns;
- He disagreed with the claim that the property would provide a boost to the local economy;
- There would be an increase in noise pollution; and
- The peace and privacy of local residents would be impacted and the proposal had already caused stress and anxiety for many residents.

Ms Dickson, the Agent representing the Applicant, then addressed the Committee, clarifying some issues in respect of the application for the local residents:

- The applicants had met all planning policy requirements;
- The applicants were experienced HMO operators and would keep the property well maintained;
- The proposal met national and local requirements and was in a sustainable location;
- Car ownership tended to be lower amongst HMO residents;
- Halton needed housing and the current housing

market was buoyant, leaving many lower income people without the opportunity to have their own space; and

- The location was ideal for single professional working people with good transport links.

The Committee was then addressed by local Ward Councillor Angela McInerney, who spoke in objection to the proposal, on behalf of local residents. She outlined some facts about Farnworth within the context of the application and made the following comments *inter alia*:

- Farnworth was a residential area with a mixed community but mainly families and elderly people;
- The proposal was out of character with the area;
- The building would be split into 3 sections – she described these and how they would be shared;
- There would be 29 double rooms so potentially 58 people living in the building;
- There were plenty of bedsits available for rent in Halton;
- Farnworth Village is narrow and Derby Road is congested – there was a nursery, two primary schools and a secondary school all within the vicinity, all creating traffic congestion, which was difficult to police;
- This development would exacerbate the congestion in the area; and
- The applicant was not the owner of the building.

She concluded saying that she wished to record her own objections to the proposal as a resident of Farnworth and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Following responses to Members' questions, the following information was provided:

- The number of people in the property at any one time could not be restricted;
- The licence for the HMO would be issued by the Environmental Health Department;
- The site's ownership could be confirmed following the meeting;
- The ratio used for calculating the parking was based on the emerging local plan recommended standards. 0.5 spaces per room was the proposed recommended standard for a town centre location and although the site was not within the Widnes Town Centre boundary, it was in a local centre with good links to public transport and access to local amenities;

- The suggestion of splitting the building into 3 HMO's was not material to the application – it had to be determined on what was presented in the report.

One Member moved a proposal to defer the application so that the Committee as a whole could visit the site. This proposal was seconded and the Committee agreed that the application be deferred to a future meeting.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred to a future meeting, to allow the Committee to make a site visit.

DEV22 21/00448/S73 - APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 73 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 TO VARY CONDITION 2 OF PERMISSION 18/00567/FULEIA, IN ORDER TO MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THE LOCATION OF THE AIR MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND SUBSEQUENT ALTERATIONS TO DRAWINGS 183131/WTS/PL/004, 183131/WTS/FP/005A AND 183131/WTS/PL/005B AT WIDNES SKIP AND RECLAIM, DITTON ROAD (WEST), WIDNES, WA8 0PA

The consultation procedure undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site.

Further to the publication of the report it was confirmed that no other representations had been received and the Contaminated Land Officer had raised no objection to this application (noted however that the previous comments to the original application and recommended conditions were still valid). Also, the applicant had requested if access condition no.5 could be changed from '*no development shall begin*' to '*prior to the construction of any new buildings*'. This request was considered to be reasonable, for the reasons given.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Robinson, who was the Agent for the Applicant. He described a number of issues that the company had to deal with recently since the approval of the application in May 2019 that contributed to a delay, such as Covid and a change in investor. He reassured Members that the applicant was now keen to progress the current planning permission. He added that the applicant would use local suppliers and provide employment contracts for local people.

Councillor Wallace addressed the Committee objecting to the proposals, on behalf of local residents. She tabled two photographs, which showed the condition of

different areas of the site. Councillor Wallace stated that she was inundated with complaints from her constituents about the smell from the WSR site. She argued that local residents suffered this on a daily basis and despite contact being made with Environmental Health, nothing had been done to help them. She also argued *inter alia*:

- That the health and safety procedures of the company were in question – referring to a breach in relation to blocked fire doors;
- The site attracted rats;
- The site attracted seagulls who attacked residents in the street and were a constant problem for the businesses on Ditton Road (relating to seagull droppings); and
- Local residents' health was at stake.

She urged the Committee to visit the site before making a decision.

Following Councillor Wallace's presentation Officers advised that the Council was aware of the smell and seagull problems in relation to the site but WSR was under the control of the Environment Agency in respect of this. These complaints were also passed to the new owner of the site. It was noted that health and safety matters in relation to the property itself were matters for WSR to address and covered by other legislation.

The Committee was reminded that this was a Section 73 application – an amendment to the previously approved application in May 2019.

Responses were provided to Members questions and it was confirmed that licensing for the operation of the site was controlled by the Environment Agency, not the Local Authority.

The application was approved subject to the conditions listed below.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the following:

1. Timescale for commencement of development by 23 May 2022;
2. Specifying approved plans;
3. Condition requiring submission and agreement of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, as outlined in the submitted ES (BE1 and MW1);

4. Condition requiring a construction phasing plan – with works to be enabled to be carried out in any order (BE1);
5. Condition relating to off-site highway works to facilitate parking provision and curb re-alignment (TP12);
6. Submission and agreement of Site Waste Management Plan (WM8);
7. A condition requiring a site investigation scheme, remediation and verification plan (PR14);
8. Materials condition(s), requiring submission and agreement of building external finishing materials (BE2);
9. Condition requiring boundary treatments for north and south of the site (BE22);
10. Condition requiring treatment of the ground level enclosure to stack; fan; and carbon absorber; adjacent to building TFS1A as shown on drawing 183131/WTS/PL/004 Rev B (BE2);
11. Submission and agreement of site and finished floor levels (BE1);
12. Condition relating to/requiring submission and agreement of a sustainable drainage scheme (BE1 and PR5);
13. Condition requiring landscaping scheme (BE1, BE3 and MW1);
14. Condition requiring submission and agreement of cycle parking details (TP6);
15. Submission of a Bird Hazard Management Plan (MW1);
16. Condition requiring vehicle access, parking, servicing etc to be constructed prior to occupation of properties/commencement of use (BE1);
17. Submission and agreement of a lighting scheme (BE1);
18. No piling or other foundation design using penetrative methods unless demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater (PR14);
19. Conditions relating to the air management system for building TFS1A;
20. Waste stored and processed in TFS1A under negative pressure conditions;
21. Condition restricting surface water run-off onto the adopted highway (TP17);
22. Condition restricting waste throughput to 450,000 tonnes per annum (BE1 and MW1);
23. There shall be no external storage other than that as approved on drawing number 183131/WTS/PL/004 Rev B;
24. Condition(s) restricting external storage locations,

- height, processing (BE1, PR16 and MW1);
25. The materials stored in the external storage bays and area as shown on drawing number 183131/WTS/PL/004 Rev B, shall be stacked no higher than 4m (BE1 and MW1); and
26. No material, waste or otherwise shall be burnt on site (BE1 and MW1).

DEV23 21/00529/FUL - PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT 1 SANDIWAY AVENUE, WIDNES, WA8 8LE

The consultation procedure undertaken was outlined in the report together with background information in respect of the site.

The Committee agreed that the application be approved.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the following:

1. Standard 3 year expiry;
2. Approved plans; and
3. Materials to match existing (BE1).

*Meeting ended at 8.05 p.m.*