

PLANNING COMMITTEE

At a meeting of this Committee held on
24 November 2020

(Present) **Councillor D Long (Chairman)**
Councillors Banks, Bowden, Burns, Clarke, Gomez-Aspron,
J Johnson, Jones, Maloney, McCauley, McDonnell,
Osundeko, Pearl, Tasker and van der Burg

15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence

16 MINUTES

* **Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2020, be approved and signed.**

17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS

Item	Title	Member(s)	Declaration
6	Planning Applications Determined under Delegated Powers	Councillor D Long	Declared a Personal non-pecuniary interest the item.

18 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE

* **Resolved that the planning application be dealt with as shown below:**

P/2017/0254/OUP

Land to the North East of the A580 East Lancashire Road / A49 Lodge Lane, Haydock
Outline Planning application with all matters other than access reserved for the development of the site for up to 16,225 square meters B8/B2 (upto 20% B2 floor space), ancillary office and associated site facilities floor space, car parking, landscaping, site profiling, transport, drainage and utilities infrastructure.

In presenting the application to Members, the Services Manager, Development and Building Control (SMDBC) gave a presentation to the Committee which detailed the following:

- Location Plan;
- Parameter Plan;
- Illustrative master Plan;
- Floorspace Comparison; and

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Location and Parameters.

The Committee were also informed that since publication of the agenda an additional representation had been received. A summary of this representations was presented to the Committee.

Two Agents of the Applicant joined the meeting to make representations on the application to the Committee.

Members recognised that the Council was no longer in a position to determine this application. However, the Committee was required to make a decision in order to enable it to play a full part at the forthcoming Planning Inquiry. The following decision was taken by the Committee :-

That had the Council remained as the determining authority, planning permission would have been refused on the following grounds:-

There would be landscape and visual harm caused to the character and appearance of the area that outweighs the economic benefits including jobs and investment in the planning balance. Very special circumstances do not exist to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The development would be contrary to saved policy GB1 of the St Helens Unitary Development Plan and paragraphs 143 and 144 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

19 CURRENT PLANNING APPEALS

A report was submitted which informed Members of the current position with regards to the planning appeals that were pending or had recently been concluded.

- * **Resolved that the report and verbal update be noted.**

20 PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

A report was submitted which informed Members of planning applications determined under delegated powers.

- * **Resolved that the report be noted.**

21 CURRENT ENFORCEMENT CASES

A report was submitted which informed Members of the current position with regard to enforcement cases.

- * **Resolved that the report be noted.**