Development Management Committee REPORT TO:

15 January 2024 DATE:

REPORTING OFFICER: Executive Director - Environment &

Regeneration

Planning Applications to be Determined by the Committee – AB Update List **SUBJECT:**

WARD(S): Boroughwide

PAGE NO.	LIST A*	LIST B**	Updated Information
11		22/00423/OUTEIA	To update members in relation to heritage, the committee report concludes that the identified assets make a positive contribution to the character of the area and that the proposal would have an indirect minor adverse impact on their setting.
			To explain this further, Chapter 8 of the submitted Environmental Impact Assessment states that an EIA Scoping exercise was undertaken in relation to designated and non-designated built heritage assets. There are no listed buildings within the study area; the Halebank Conservation Area is located to the north-west of the site and four potential non-designated built assets were identified as worthy of assessment. The built heritage assets with the potential to be affected by the proposed development are: - Halebank Conservation Area - The Beehive Public House - Hope Farm - Mill Farm - Middlefield Farm
			The desk-based assessment concluded that in all cases, apart from Mill Farm, the site forms part of the wider agricultural setting to these assets and that the development site does not contribute to the asset's significance. It concluded that no further assessments are required in relation to the Beehive Public House, Hope Farm and Middlefield Farm.

The desk-based assessment identified that the application site, in its present state, makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Halebank Conservation Area and Mill Farm. Therefore development of the site may have a negative impact on the setting of the Halebank Conservation Area and Mill Farm. A change in the appearance of the development site whilst it is under construction will result in a change in the wider setting of the conservation area. The submitted report states that the contribution that the development site makes to the setting of the Conservation Area is considered minor and therefore the proposed development will not result in a significant change to the significance of the conservation area or how it is experienced. If no mitigation strategy were adopted the proposed development would result in a temporary, indirect adverse effect of minor significance. This effect would be redundant once the construction period ends.

Mill Farm is not a listed building and there is no local listing for the area, however it is noted that the farmhouse is present on the tithe map and as such may be considered a non-designated heritage asset. The development site is considered to form part of the asset's wider surroundings and agricultural setting and makes a very minor contribution to the asset's significance. Again, a change in the development site's appearance whilst it is under construction will result in a change in the wider setting of Mill Farm. The contribution that the development site makes to the setting of the farm is considered minor and therefore the development will not result in a significant change to the significance of the farm or how it is experienced. If no mitigation strategy were adopted the proposed development would result in a temporary, indirect adverse effect of minor significance. This effect would also be redundant once the construction period ends.

A change in the appearance of the site once development is complete will result in a change in the wider setting of the Conservation Area and Mill Farm. The development site forms part of the wider

rural setting of both the Conservation Area and Mill Farm and makes a positive contribution to their settings. The contribution that the development site makes is considered to be minor, and therefore the proposed development would result in a permanent, indirect adverse effect of minor significance.

Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The designated heritage asset in this case relates to the Halebank conservation area as Mill Farm is not a designated heritage asset.

With regard to the statutory test in the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), Paragraph 208 of the NPPF and the policy requirements set out in Policy HE2 of the Halton Delivery and Allocations Local Plan, Paragraph 18a-020 of the Planning Practice Guidance outlines what is meant by public benefits:

Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the NPPF (paragraph 8). Public benefits should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit.

In considering any planning application for development, the Local Planning Authority must be mindful of the framework set by Government policy, in this instance the NPPF, current Development Plan Policy and any other material considerations. The development site is a strategic housing allocation and so has been assessed as land required to provide housing which, due to the scale of the site, is of a large scale public benefit. It is therefore considered that the less than significant harm caused to the Conservation Area could be justified by the public benefit as a result of the proposed development and a refusal based on this could not be

		The Council's Conservation Officer has not objected to the application and has
		welcomed the proposal to incorporate the use of character areas. They have also noted that materiality will be a key consideration in terms of built form which can be assessed at reserved matters stage with particular regard to reducing any impact on the conservation area and opportunities to enhance it.
		In relation to the Conclusion, officers have come to is that the development is in accordance with the development plan as a whole. If however, as officers acknowledge, the School element is not in accordance with the development plan and if a conclusion is taken that this non compliance means that the development plan is not complied with when read as a whole. The decision maker still needs to consider the material considerations for and against the development. Given the need for the provision of homes, the provision of affordable homes and that the
		proposed development would still enable the provision for a school, then these material considerations would significantly weigh in favour of the grant of planning permission. In this case the material consideration would outweigh the non compliance with the development.
68	23/00349/COU	

- * LIST A items are those items that are not considered to raise significant issues that require further explanation. Members have a full report and these items are not anticipated to initiate further discussion. List A items are considered at the start of the meeting unless a Member specifically requests that an item be moved to List B.
- ** LIST B items are those items which are considered to raise more potentially significant issues, that may warrant further update, explanation, discussion or other announcement. List B items may also have speakers registered who wish to address the committee.

Note:- Background Papers

With respect to all applications to be determined by the Committee, the submitted planning applications are background papers to the report. Other background papers specifically mentioned and listed within the report are open to inspection by contacting Dev.control@halton.gov.uk in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.