

STRATEGIC APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE

Thursday, 27 October 2022

Present: Councillor S Kelly (Chair)

Councillors S Foulkes
H Gorman
K Hodson
M Jordan
P Stuart

Deputy: Councillor G Davies (for B Kenny)

13 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Brian Kenny, with Councillor George Davies deputising.

14 MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Sub Committee were asked whether they had any personal or prejudicial interests in connection with any application on the agenda and if so to declare them and state the nature of the interest.

No such declarations were made.

15 **OUT/22/00946 - LAND EAST OF GLENWOOD DRIVE, IRBY, CH63 1JD. OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR UP TO 290 DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3), INCLUDING 30% AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND 10% SELF-BUILD / CUSTOM BUILD PROPERTIES; DELIVERY OF PART OF THE BOROUGH'S CYCLE SUPERGREENWAY; GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING SPORTS PITCHES, PLAY AREAS AND PARKLAND, WILDLIFE HABITATS AND GREEN CORRIDORS; AND OFF-SITE HIGHWAY, ENVIRONMENTAL, BIODIVERSITY AND ACCESSIBILITY ENHANCEMENTS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS)**

The Principal Planner presented the report in relation to the above application for consideration.

Alison Glascott addressed the Sub Committee on behalf of the petitioners.

Ward Councillor, Mike Collins addressed the Sub Committee.

On a motion by the Chair and seconded by Councillor S Foulkes it was:

Resolved (unanimously) – That the application be refused on the following grounds:

1. The site lies in an area of Green Belt where the siting of new dwellings is considered to be inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. The proposal would be contrary to the core planning principles within the NPPF of protecting the Green Belt, preventing urban sprawl and recognising the intrinsic character of the countryside. There are no very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm and detrimental impact of the proposal upon the openness of the Green Belt and so development is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policies URN1 (General Principles and Urban Regeneration) and GB2 (Guidelines for development in the Green Belt) of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (Adopted February 2000) and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed dwellings would represent an imposing and obtrusive urban built form of development and urban encroachment into this attractive undeveloped countryside/ rural landscape location, which would detract from and have a permanent detrimental impact upon the natural rural character and appearance of the site, landscape and setting of this particular part of the open countryside and Green Belt. As such the proposal therefore fails to accord with the advice set out in the NPPF on the basis that it fails to conserve and enhance the natural character and appearance of this part of the open countryside and it would adversely affect the intrinsic character and beauty of this part of the countryside contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policies URN1, LA7 Wirral Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2000).

3. By reason of its extent and depth beyond existing development, and the proposed indicative layout, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the countryside, landscape, and settlements of Irby and Thingwall. The development would also result in the loss of Grade 3a ‘Best and Most Versatile’ agricultural land, with no public benefits present to override the need to protect the land. The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies AGR1, AG1, AG2 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2000).

4. Insufficient information has been submitted in support of the application in respect of the ecological impact of the proposal. The application fails to demonstrate how it would protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the borough, especially those areas designated as of international, national and local importance, due to a

lack of information submitted. It has therefore not been demonstrated that there would be no unacceptable harm to any protected species, wildlife diversity and protect ecological sites and as such the development would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (Chapter 15) Policies NCO1, NC1, NC3, NC4, NC7 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2000).

5. The provision for sustainable and active travel modes have not been satisfactorily supported within the proposals and as a consequence it is considered that the development will become car dominated and vehicles become the primary choice of travel. In addition, the submitted Transport Assessment does not adequately assess cumulative impact of the development, along with other developments, on junctions on the M53 motorway. As such the proposals are in conflict with TRT1, TRT3 and TR11 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2000) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. A Section 106 Agreement has not been completed to secure the following facilities/contributions/details, which are considered necessary to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development:

- Off-site highway improvements:**
- Sports facilities/pitch provision:**
- Education:**
- Affordable housing:**
- Open Space and Play provision; and**
- Off Site Ecological Contributions**

This would be contrary to Policy URN2 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan and Paragraphs 55-58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.