

**DOCUMENT CG12**

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**APPEAL  
ON BEHALF OF**

**SATNAM MILLENNIUM LIMITED**

**IN RESPECT OF  
LAND AT PEEL HALL, WARRINGTON**

**PUBLIC INQUIRY 14 – 25 SEPTEMBER 2020**

**PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF:  
APP/M0655/W/17/3178530  
LOCAL AUTHORITY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE: 2016/28492**

**OUR REF: 470SBCGWARR**

**REBUTTAL PROOF  
OF  
COLIN GRIFFITHS BA (HONS) MRTPI**

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>CONTENTS</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>Section 1</b>	SCOPE OF THIS REBUTTAL	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 2</b>	HEALTHCARE ISSUES	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 3</b>	HYDROLOGY, DRAINAGE & FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	<b>5</b>
<b>Section 4</b>	LOSS OF AMENITY	<b>6</b>

## **SECTION 1 – SCOPE OF THIS REBUTTAL**

- 1.1 This rebuttal evidence responds to the following evidence submitted in respect of this appeal,
  - 1.1.1 Martha Hughes (Nick Armstrong), Healthcare, specifically paragraphs 3.10-3.27 of Mrs Hughes Proof of Evidence.
  - 1.1.2 David Sawyer, Hydrology, Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment.
  - 1.1.3 Jon Parr, Loss of Amenity.
- 1.2 The form of this rebuttal is to deal with the separate topics in turn, with specifically prepared technical notes attached as Appendices.
- 1.3 My conclusions having prepared this rebuttal proof remain unaltered from those set out in my full Proof of Evidence submitted to this appeal.

## SECTION 2 - HEALTHCARE ISSUES

- 2.1 On Thursday 6 August at 6:31pm Martha Hughes circulated an “*Estates Feasibility & Options Appraisal Report: Delivery of a New Primary Care Facility for Padgate Medical Centre and Fernhead Cross Medical Centre*”, dated March 2020 (Final Version). The email (at [Appendix 1](#)) also explains that Mr Armstrong will provide a Proof of Evidence for the Inquiry on this topic.
- 2.2 It is important to note that I have sought updates on this topic since 19/12/2019. I attach at [Appendix 2](#) a list of dates on which email requests for information on this topic were sent to the Council (Mrs Hughes). It is now clear that information was available to the Council prior to 6 August (as Mr Armstrong had been requested to and had provided a proof of evidence by that date) but not sent to the Appellants despite these repeated requests. There is no explanation in the email why this information (which is dated March 2020) had been withheld.
- 2.3 The submission of the report one working day prior to the submission of evidence (and on account that Mrs Hughes does not work on Fridays) meant there was no time to review and consider this new information. So the SoCG:P was amended at paragraph 6.14 to note the report had been produced and that an Addendum to the SoCG:P would be produced, following evidence exchange, to deal with this topic.
- 2.4 I prepared a draft Addendum and sent this to Mrs Hughes on Monday 17<sup>th</sup> August (draft at [Appendix 3](#)). Mrs Hughes replied by email on 19<sup>th</sup> August rejecting the draft. No suggestions or amendments that might be suitable to the Council have been put forward (I attach the email exchange at [Appendix 4](#)).
- 2.5 In my view it is regrettable the Council have refused to engage in seeking to agree the basic matters arising from this Feasibility Report. I stand by the proposed list of matters that should be capable of agreement set out at [Appendix 3](#).
- 2.6 Nothing in this Feasibility Report changes my views set out at paragraph 9.12-9.15 of my Proof of Evidence.

### **SECTION 3 - HYDROLOGY, DRAINAGE & FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 3.1 I attach at Appendix 5 a Technical Note prepared by drainage consultants TPA on the evidence submitted by Mr David Sawyer.
- 3.2 This sets out that the drainage and flood risk strategy agreed with the Environment Agency, United Utilities and Lead Flood Authority is acceptable and robust.

#### **SECTION 4 - LOSS OF AMENITY**

- 4.1 I attach at Appendix 6 a Technical Note prepared by Lichfields on the evidence submitted by Mr Jon Parr on Loss of Amenity issues.
- 4.2 The note sets out the estimated population projection used in the assessment is soundly based using recognised standard methodology.
- 4.3 The note also sets out the open space proposals, whilst illustrative at this stage, are based on relevant planning policies and standards in force in Warrington at present. I note that based on current, updated Council guidance on this topic, there is now a significant over-provision of formal open space arising from the appeal scheme.

## Colin Griffiths

---

**From:** Hughes, Martha <Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 06 August 2020 18:31  
**To:** Colin Griffiths  
**Cc:** Jim Sullivan  
**Subject:** FW: Peel Hall health requirements - feasibility appraisal  
**Attachments:** Padgate & Fearnhead Final Report 300320.pdf

**Importance:** High

Colin

In relation to the requirement for the health contribution, I have now received the attached report on behalf of the two GP practices.

Nick Armstrong at the CCG has advised that following the 2018 inquiry for the proposed development, NHS Warrington CCG commissioned Gbpartnerships via Renova Developments to undertake an estates feasibility and option appraisal on behalf of the GPs at Padgate Medical Centre and Fearnhead Cross Medical Centre. The study forms part of the pre-business case work to support the delivery of a new primary care centre for Padgate Medical Centre and Fearnhead Cross Medical Centre. This work was completed in March 2020.

Further discussions following completion of this study had to be put on hold due to the NHS response to the Covid-19 pandemic since March 2020. Work on this project will resume after Primary Care is de-escalated from the current incident and are no longer working under national directions.

Nick Armstrong will update his proof of evidence and this report will be appended as justification for the requirement for the health contribution contained in the draft s106 agreement.

I appreciate that there is limited time to review this and potentially update the relevant section of the SoCG before Monday – but hopefully this assists in moving matters forward.

Kind regards

Martha Hughes  
Principal Planning Officer

Development Management  
East annexe  
Town Hall  
Sankey Street  
Warrington WA1 1UH

01925 442 803

### **PLEASE NOTE I DO NOT WORK FRIDAYS**

*Warrington's Development Management service is now operating remotely and we have the technology and resources that we need to continue with our service delivery. We remain able to comment on pre-applications submissions, to validate and consider planning applications and to move the majority of applications to determination. However we will need to employ alternative operating procedures to deliver results due to the necessary introduction of restrictions on movement by Government. In some instances this may lead to delays. Where this is the case I will endeavour to liaise with you so that you are kept up to date with the*

## **Appendix 2**

List of Dates emails were sent by Colin Griffiths to Martha Hughes requesting information on Healthcare provision.

19 December 2019

11 February 2020 (2 emails)

24 February 2020

03 March 2020



**Addendum to SoCG:P**

**Peel Hall, Warrington**

**APP/M0655/W/17/3178530**

**REGARDING PARAGRAPHS 6.12 – 6.16 INCLUSIVE (HEALTHCARE MATTERS)**

1. This Addendum records the agreement / disagreement on this topic following the submission of the Feasibility Report (March 2020) as recorded at para 6.14.
2. Areas of Agreement,
  - a. There is an *“aspiration”* to co-locate two medical centres into a new *“primary care health centre”* (quotes taken from para 1 of the Feasibility Report, see also 2).
  - b. A preferred geographical area for the new facility has been identified.
  - c. A preferred location for the new facility has not been identified.
  - d. The practices have not identified their estates requirements.
  - e. Only approximate / average size requirements and land / build cost assumptions have been undertaken so far.
  - f. There is no agreed procurement route.
  - g. The project is too small to qualify for LIFT/ PPP funding.
  - h. The GPs have yet to determine if they wish to move the project forward (see 2 page 6).
  - i. All work on the matter is currently on hold due to COVID19.
  - j. There are considerable next steps/ stages before this project is fully agreed, including,
    - i. GP acceptance of the in principle proposals
    - ii. GP selection of procurement route

- iii. Selection, if required, of an external investor/ developer/ investor
- iv. Site selection
- v. Site acquisition
- vi. Building design
- vii. Detailed assessment of costs
- viii. Consultation with Warrington Borough Council
- ix. Consultation with patients and the public
- x. Reassessment of the impact of the use of technology on future premises requirements
- xi. Preparation and approval of a timescale for the project
- xii. Outline business case preparation and submission/ approval of the OBC
- xiii. Funding.

3. Areas of Disagreement,

- a. Whether the project is able to be regarded as sufficiently firm or secure (so as to qualify as directly related or fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development).

DRAFT

## Colin Griffiths

---

**From:** Colin Griffiths  
**Sent:** 19 August 2020 14:18  
**To:** 'Hughes, Martha'  
**Cc:** Jim Sullivan; Susan Brown  
**Subject:** RE: Peel Hall - health contribution requirement

Martha,  
So what would you suggest...in the spirit of trying to reach as much agreement as possible for the Inspector?

Regards  
Colin

Satnam Group  
T +44 (0) 1242 227159  
M +44 (0) 7932 042253  
F +44 (0) 1242 227160  
17 Imperial Square, Cheltenham, Glos., GL50 1QZ  
United Kingdom

Skype name: colingriffiths1

The contents of this email are confidential to the intended recipient at the email address to which it has been addressed. It may not be disclosed to or used by anyone other than this addressee, nor may it be copied in any way. If received in error, please contact Satnam Investments Limited +44 (0)1242 227159 quoting the name of the sender and the addressee and then delete it from your system. Satnam Investments Limited and its associated companies make every effort to ensure messages contain no viruses and do not accept any responsibility for viruses. All emails are scanned and filtered by Mail Defender anti virus and anti spam software nevertheless it is your responsibility to scan this email and attachments (if any). No contracts may be concluded on behalf of Satnam Investments Limited or its associated companies by means of email communications.

---

**From:** Hughes, Martha [mailto:Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 19 August 2020 14:14  
**To:** Colin Griffiths <colin@satnam.co.uk>  
**Cc:** Jim Sullivan <jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk>; Susan Brown <Susan@satnam.co.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Peel Hall - health contribution requirement

The addendum is considered to be your legal submission.

Kind regards

Martha Hughes  
Principal Planning Officer

Development Management  
East annexe  
Town Hall  
Sankey Street  
Warrington WA1 1UH

01925 442 803

**PLEASE NOTE I DO NOT WORK FRIDAYS**

*Warrington's Development Management service is now operating remotely and we have the technology and resources that we need to continue with our service delivery. We remain able to comment on pre-applications submissions, to validate and consider planning applications and to move the majority of applications to*

determination. However we will need to employ alternative operating procedures to deliver results due to the necessary introduction of restrictions on movement by Government. In some instances this may lead to delays. Where this is the case I will endeavour to liaise with you so that you are kept up to date with the situation. In the meantime you can continue to correspond with me electronically or, if the matter is urgent, call me on the number stated above if you would like to speak with me.

---

**From:** Colin Griffiths [<mailto:colin@satnam.co.uk>]  
**Sent:** 19 August 2020 14:12  
**To:** Hughes, Martha <[Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk](mailto:Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Jim Sullivan <[jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk)>; Susan Brown <[Susan@satnam.co.uk](mailto:Susan@satnam.co.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Peel Hall - health contribution requirement

Martha,  
Thank you, please set out reasons, what can you agree?  
You confirmed earlier that a SoCG:P addendum is a good concept for this.

Regards  
Colin

Satnam Group  
T +44 (0) 1242 227159  
M +44 (0) 7932 042253  
F +44 (0) 1242 227160  
17 Imperial Square, Cheltenham, Glos., GL50 1QZ  
United Kingdom

Skype name: colingriffiths1

The contents of this email are confidential to the intended recipient at the email address to which it has been addressed. It may not be disclosed to or used by anyone other than this addressee, nor may it be copied in any way. If received in error, please contact Satnam Investments Limited +44 (0)1242 227159 quoting the name of the sender and the addressee and then delete it from your system. Satnam Investments Limited and its associated companies make every effort to ensure messages contain no viruses and do not accept any responsibility for viruses. All emails are scanned and filtered by Mail Defender anti virus and anti spam software nevertheless it is your responsibility to scan this email and attachments (if any). No contracts may be concluded on behalf of Satnam Investments Limited or its associated companies by means of email communications.

---

**From:** Hughes, Martha [<mailto:Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 19 August 2020 14:09  
**To:** Colin Griffiths <[colin@satnam.co.uk](mailto:colin@satnam.co.uk)>  
**Cc:** Jim Sullivan <[jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk)>; Susan Brown <[Susan@satnam.co.uk](mailto:Susan@satnam.co.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Peel Hall - health contribution requirement

Colin

I have reviewed the draft addendum to the SoCG and unfortunately we cannot agree.

Kind regards

Martha Hughes  
Principal Planning Officer

Development Management  
East annexe  
Town Hall  
Sankey Street  
Warrington WA1 1UH

01925 442 803

**PLEASE NOTE I DO NOT WORK FRIDAYS**

*Warrington's Development Management service is now operating remotely and we have the technology and resources that we need to continue with our service delivery. We remain able to comment on pre-applications submissions, to validate and consider planning applications and to move the majority of applications to determination. However we will need to employ alternative operating procedures to deliver results due to the necessary introduction of restrictions on movement by Government. In some instances this may lead to delays. Where this is the case I will endeavour to liaise with you so that you are kept up to date with the situation. In the meantime you can continue to correspond with me electronically or, if the matter is urgent, call me on the number stated above if you would like to speak with me.*

---

**From:** Colin Griffiths [<mailto:colin@satnam.co.uk>]  
**Sent:** 17 August 2020 15:49  
**To:** Hughes, Martha <[Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk](mailto:Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Jim Sullivan <[jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk)>; Susan Brown <[Susan@satnam.co.uk](mailto:Susan@satnam.co.uk)>  
**Subject:** FW: Peel Hall - health contribution requirement

Martha,

You must be physic, I had just opened an email to send you this draft.....

I attach a draft SoCG:P Addendum on this topic, based on the Feasibility Study sent through recently.

Hopefully this will clarify the position for evidence at the inquiry.

Mr Sullivan, I send this to you for information, as I note you did not make comments on this part of the draft SoCG:P nor is the topic forming evidence in your proofs. Obviously if you wish to make any comments please do so.

Many thanks,

Regards  
Colin

Satnam Group  
T +44 (0) 1242 227159  
M +44 (0) 7932 042253  
F +44 (0) 1242 227160  
17 Imperial Square, Cheltenham, Glos., GL50 1QZ  
United Kingdom

Skype name: colingriffiths1

The contents of this email are confidential to the intended recipient at the email address to which it has been addressed. It may not be disclosed to or used by anyone other than this addressee, nor may it be copied in any way. If received in error, please contact Satnam Investments Limited +44 (0)1242 227159 quoting the name of the sender and the addressee and then delete it from your system. Satnam Investments Limited and its associated companies make every effort to ensure messages contain no viruses and do not accept any responsibility for viruses. All emails are scanned and filtered by Mail Defender anti virus and anti spam software nevertheless it is your responsibility to scan this email and attachments (if any). No contracts may be concluded on behalf of Satnam Investments Limited or its associated companies by means of email communications.

---

**From:** Hughes, Martha [<mailto:Martha.Hughes@warrington.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 17 August 2020 15:40  
**To:** Colin Griffiths <[colin@satnam.co.uk](mailto:colin@satnam.co.uk)>  
**Cc:** Jim Sullivan <[jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:jim.sullivan@hotmail.co.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Peel Hall - health contribution requirement

Colin

For info, after lunchtime on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> August I am on annual leave until Wed 2<sup>nd</sup> September.

Satnam Millennium Limited

Peel Hall,  
Warrington

Project Reference: 1506-45/TN/04



The Stables  
7 Chesterton Mill  
French's Road  
Cambridge  
CB4 3NP  
01223 455385  
cambridge@tpa.uk.com  
www.tpa.uk.com

Technical Note – Response to Rule 6 Proof of Evidence, Authored by David Sawyer

---

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 Transport Planning Associates (TPA) prepared the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and a preliminary drainage strategy to support the outline planning application for the proposed development of Peel Hall, Warrington.
- 1.2 The proposed development, which was the subject of an outline planning application, was for a new residential neighbourhood including C2 and C3 uses; local employment (B1 use); local centre including a food store up to 2000m<sup>2</sup>; A1 – A5 (inclusive) and D1 uses class units of up to 600m<sup>2</sup> total (with no single unit of more than 200m<sup>2</sup>) and a family restaurant / pub of up to 800m<sup>2</sup> (A3 / A4 use); a site for a primary school; open space including sports pitches with ancillary facilities; means of access and supporting infrastructure at Peel Hall, Warrington.
- 1.3 The planning application (planning reference: 2016/28492) was refused by the local planning authority and this decision was subsequently appealed by Satnam. The appeal was heard and whilst this was initially dismissed a High Court ruling has since found this decision to be unsound and ruled that the appeal should be reconvened.
- 1.4 During the outline planning application matters relating to flood risk and surface water drainage were agreed in principle by the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority, on the condition that a final drainage strategy would form part of a detailed reserved matters application for submission and approval. Positive consultation responses, see Paragraph 1.7, were received from key stakeholders on flood risk and drainage matters and, as such, these were not matters on which the outline planning application was refused, nor were they raised in the 2018 appeal inquiry.
- 1.5 To support the original planning application, a FRA and Drainage Strategy document, which was produced by TPA, was submitted (document reference: 1506-45/FRA/01 Revision B, dated June 2016 [CD APN 15]).

Following the submission of the FRA, an FRA Addendum was produced and submitted to provide supplementary information in relation to commentary received by Satnam pursuant to Schedule 4 of Regulation 22 of the 2011 EIA Regulations from the Planning Inspectorate, namely the inclusion of a Water Framework Directive assessment.

1.6 Following the most recent appeal proceedings a Proof of Evidence and review of the submitted FRA documentation has been produced by a Mr David Sawyer on behalf of the Rule 6 Party. It is therefore the purpose of this note, despite no objections to the information presented regarding flood risk and drainage matters by the Lead Local Flood Authority, to provide a response to the comments raised within the Rule 6 Party Proof of Evidence.

1.7 There has been extensive consultation with the respective approving authorities over several years, and appended to this Technical Note are the key responses from the Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority and United Utilities. In all cases, the information presented within the FRA was considered acceptable with no objections, subject to a number of conditions. For ease of reference, the summary of the conditions is set out as follows with the full conditions appended to this report:

- Prior to the commencement of development, a phasing plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- At the same time as the submission of the First Reserved Matters application for all or part of the development hereby permitted, an updated Surface Water Drainage Strategy shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.
- At the same time as the submission of each subsequent Reserved Matters application for all or part of the development granted in outline, an Updated Surface Water Drainage strategy shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.
- No part of the development granted in outline shall be commenced on any phase or part of any phase of the development hereby permitted unless and until the Updated Surface Water Drainage Strategy submitted with the relevant Reserved Matters application has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- Unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority there shall be no surface water connections between plots or phases of development other than those in accordance with the connections identified and approved under the updated and approved Surface Water Drainage Strategy.
- Prior to the commencement of each phase or part phase of the development, full details for a surface water regulation system and means of disposal for that phase or part phase, based wholly on sustainable drainage principles shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.
- Prior to the occupation of each phase or part phase of the development, a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development (including a management and maintenance plan for on-site watercourses / culverts) shall be submitted to the local planning authority and agreed in writing.

## 2 Review of Rule 6 Party Proof of Evidence - Hydrology, Drainage, & Flood Risk Assessment

### Rule 6 Party submissions

- 2.1 Insofar as flood risk and drainage matters are concerned, two documents, both produced by David Sawyer, have been received from the Rule 6 party:
- A Proof of Evidence - Vol 5 – Hydrology, Drainage, & Flood Risk Assessment; and
  - A Proof of Evidence – Summary Hydrology, Drainage, & Flood Risk Assessment.
- 2.2 A review of the provided documentation has been undertaken to understand the matters raised within the documentation. Within the Proof of Evidence Summary document, five bullet points are set out which summarise the key matters that are raised within the full Proof of Evidence. These key points are as follows:
- the ability or otherwise of the Spa Brook and other field ditches to discharge surface water run-off from the site;
  - the source of the Spa Brook upstream and the potential for flooding should local groundwater abstractions eventually cease;
  - the potential for flooding via the use of a long and fixed diameter existing culvert to discharge surface water at the downstream end of the site;
  - the potential for flooding across the site from existing groundwater discharge; and
  - the location of two critical drainage areas immediately downstream from the site and the potential to cause additional flooding in these locations.
- 2.3 A response to each of these, suggested, key points will be set out in turn along with any other key matters highlighted within the Proof of Evidence if not covered within the commentary associated with the key points.
- 2.4 There is, in our view, a constant misunderstanding of current surface water drainage design throughout the proof of the Rule 6. It fails to recognise the standing principle of developments retaining flows inside their borders to a prescribed and controlled outflow limit so as to avoid downstream instances of flood or inundation.

### Ability to discharge into Spa Brook

*7.22 As we know the appellant's current proposals are centred upon the use of Spa Brook to discharge surface water from the site. However as early as 1977 the Peel Hall Action Area Team dismissed the idea of using the Spa Brook on the basis that 'Spa Brook has no spare capacity for any increase in flow.'*



- 2.5 The Spa Brook, in its current form albeit diminished from its historic size, has the ability to carry a certain volume of surface water, and within the confines of the site, opportunity is present, should it be necessary to expand the capacity of the Spa Brook.
- 2.6 This said, the approved outline surface water drainage strategy limits the level of surface water discharge to the brook so that it does not exceed the current level of surface water flows entering into the Spa Brook meaning that downstream flow conditions would be no worse as a result of the development.
- 2.7 Furthermore, through the implementation of controlled surface water discharge, during the peak flood events, the volume of water from the site will be controlled to retain flood water within the site and provide betterment to the downstream conditions highlighted within the Local SFRA. Ultimately, given the outline nature of the planning application, the exact mechanism, locations and size of surface water features and methods of control are yet to be fully developed. Greater detail and consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority will occur during the detailed design and reserved matters applications associated with the development in the usual way should grant of planning be consented.

### **The source of the Spa Brook upstream and the potential for flooding should local groundwater abstractions eventually cease**

*4.16.5 We believe that the details provided by Mark Thewsey are crucial to any future proposals for the Peel Hall site. In particular we think that the matters he outlines with regard to groundwater flooding, overland flooding and soakaways should be investigated thoroughly at the earliest possible opportunity and simply not left to chance.*

- 2.8 The proposals do not rely on surface water soakaways as the methodology for discharge of surface water. In advance of the potential upstream changes to extraction, as part of the detailed analysis of the site, additional on-site attenuation could be implemented to provide appropriate control of the potential locations where groundwater flooding may occur, such as the lower levelled areas of the site. Discussions with the Lead Local Flood Authority at the reserved matters stage will confirm whether further measures are deemed necessary and any such measures would need to be incorporated within the detailed designs of the attenuation and points of discharge.

### **The potential for flooding via the use of a long and fixed diameter existing culvert to discharge surface water at the downstream end of the site;**

*4.20.7 According to the FRA the appellant intends to discharge surface water to Dallam Brook via Spa Brook and Mill Brook. In addition the appellant highlights a drainage ditch as a means of discharge within the application boundary which connects to Dallam Brook via a large diameter culvert which runs via Densham Avenue and Northway.*

*4.20.8 However he makes no attempt in the FRA to explain how he proposes to deal with these issues other than to continue to restate that 'surface water from the development will be managed on-site via attenuation and will be restricted to the existing run-off rate.' Crucially there is nothing in the appellant's FRA to suggest that there has been an integrated approach to the problems associated with the critical drainage areas downstream from the Peel Hall site.*

- 2.9 As previously identified, the proposed outline surface water strategy seeks to implement discharge control that would regulate the discharge of water into the brook so that it does not exceed the current level, with climate change allowances of increased by 30% considered, of surface water flows entering the Spa Brook. A 30% climate change factor is in excess of the total potential change in peak rainfall for the 2050s and represents an average between Upper End and Central catchments for the total potential change anticipated for the 2080s as set out within the current Environment Agency guidance on Climate Change allowances. It is therefore considered to appropriately account for climate change at this outline stage of development.
- 2.10 As part of the detailed design of attenuation features within the proposed development, should further control be required to be implemented to ensure that the discharge into the culvert does not exceed its volumetric capacity, additional attenuation could be identified within the site to accommodate the difference during flood events, allowing for a more gradual release of flood water rather than the uncontrolled release as is currently present on the greenfield site.
- 2.11 This would mean that as a result of the development, the downstream flow conditions would be no worse than as a result of the development.

### **The potential for flooding across the site from existing groundwater discharge**

*4.16.5 We believe that the details provided by Mark Thewsey are crucial to any future proposals for the Peel Hall site. In particular we think that the matters he outlines with regard to groundwater flooding, overland flooding and soakaways should be investigated thoroughly at the earliest possible opportunity and simply not left to chance.*

- 2.12 Potential for flooding across the site from Groundwater sources was considered as part of the outline drainage strategy, Section 5 of the FRA. These findings were agreed with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority. Any future reserved matters application will need to consider this further as part of any final drainage strategy that is brought forward for final technical approval and construction.

## **The location of two critical drainage areas immediately downstream from the site and the potential to cause additional flooding in these locations.**

*4.20.3 In addition the Longford surface water flooding map comparison which is set out on Page 24 of Volume II of the SFRA shows severe flooding for both scenarios in the vicinity of Densham Avenue and Northway. Both of these locations are prone to flooding, and both are located only a very short distance downstream from the Peel Hall site.*

- 2.13 The proposed outline surface water strategy seeks to implement control that would regulate the discharge of surface water such that it would not exceed the current level of surface water flows that enter into the Spa Brook, adjusted to take account of increased rainfall events due to climate change. This would mean that downstream flow conditions would be no worse as a result of the proposed development during non-flood events and through the implementation of controlled surface water discharge the volume of water discharged from the site would be controlled to retain a level of flood water within the site meaning betterment to the downstream conditions during heavy and prolonged periods of rainfall.

### **Other raised matters**

#### *The site's presence within the SFRA*

- 2.14 It is highlighted within the Proof of Evidence that the lack of the presence of the site within the SFRA should mean that the surrounding context of the site should be considered wider rather than in isolation.
- 2.15 It is clear that the findings and outcomes of the SFRA would be of key consideration of the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority in their determination of the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development. This document would also have been relied upon during the determination of the Local Plan review that is being undertaken at present.
- 2.16 It is therefore considered that if the findings of the SFRA strategically or in isolation set out that the site would be inappropriate or unsuitable for development and that any impacts from development could not be mitigated then this would have been raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority during the outline planning application or Local Plan review process.

#### *Flood Events nearby following the production of the FRA*

- 2.17 Within the Proof of Evidence, it is identified that since the production of the FRA there have been a number of flood events in and around Warrington, emphasising that there is a significant level of concern among local residents about the impact the proposed development would have on existing development up and downstream.

- 2.18 Firstly, of the locations identified, none were identified to be within the site boundary of the appeal site. Secondly, it is not highlighted within the Proof of Evidence, the source of the flooding that occurred at these locations. However, as a result of the development, control will be implemented that would regulate the discharge of water from the site, meaning that as a result of the development, the downstream flow conditions would be no worse as a result of the development and betterment could be expected during the peak flood events due to the introduction of drainage control measures.

### *Uncontrolled discharge*

- 2.19 The proposed drainage strategy does not rely on the uncontrolled discharge of surface water, instead it is based on the principle of controlling the discharge of surface water to a rate equivalent to the existing mean greenfield runoff rate that is supported by the provision of attenuation to hold any excess surface water that could accumulate during peak rainfall periods with a factor of safety inbuilt to account for climate related change in annual rainfall and rainfall intensity.

### 3 Conclusion

- 3.1 Transport Planning Associates was commissioned by Satnam Millennium Limited to undertake a flood risk assessment and prepare a preliminary drainage strategy for the proposed development of Peel Hall, Warrington and surrounding land.
- 3.2 The findings of this flood risk assessment and preliminary drainage strategy were reviewed and agreed by both the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority, such that they raised no objection to the development proposal, subject to planning conditions requiring the submission and approval of a final drainage strategy prior to development.
- 3.3 A review of a Rule 6 Party Proof of Evidence has been undertaken and a response has been provided to the key topics. Through the implementation of the proposed development, the existing uncontrolled discharge of flood water from the site downstream would be controlled and limited to ensure that, at worst, the proposed development would not result in any negative impact or increase in flooding downstream.
- 3.4 Whilst the current drainage matters are set out in outline, establishing the principle methodology of discharge of surface water, the further reserved matter submissions and detailed designs of the management strategy would evolve alongside the most up to date guidance to ensure that appropriate measures to account for influences that the site may have upstream and downstream as well as the potential changes in conditions resulting from changes in groundwater pumping.
- 3.5 The proposed development seeks to implement control that would regulate the discharge of surface water from the site to equate to the current discharge rates (i.e. no increase). As part of these calculations, a climate change allowance of 30% is considered appropriate against current flood risk climate change guidance set out by the Environment Agency.
- 3.6 The planning conditions previously requested by the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority confirm acceptance of work undertaken to date on matters relating to flood risk and the preliminary drainage strategy and a requirement for further detailed information prior to implementation of the development proposal.

## Document Management

© 2020 Transport Planning Associates Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by Transport Planning Associates for the sole use of our client in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of service agreed between Transport Planning Associates and our client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by Transport Planning Associates, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third parties may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of Transport Planning Associates.

### **Document Review**

	<b>Status</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Checker</b>	<b>Approver</b>	<b>Date</b>
01	Draft	TH	-	-	14   08   20
-	Issue	TH	JH	JH	20   08   20

Warrington Borough Council  
Development Control  
New Town House  
Buttermarket Street  
Warrington  
Cheshire  
WA1 2NH

**Our ref:** SO/2016/116357/01-L01

**Your ref:** 2016/28492

**Date:** 07 September 2016

**FAO Mike Davies**

Dear Sir

**OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A NEW MIXED USE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTION (RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME - USE CLASS C2); UP TO 1200 DWELLING HOUSES AND APARTMENTS (USE CLASS C3); LOCAL CENTRE INCLUDING FOOD STORE UP TO 2000 SQUARE METRES (USE CLASS A1); FINANCIAL & PROFESSIONAL SERVICES; RESTAURANTS AND CAFES; DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS; HOT FOOD TAKEAWAYS (USE CLASSES A2-A5 INCLUSIVE); UNITS WITHIN USE CLASS D1 (NON RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTION) OF UP TO 600 SQ M TOTAL WITH NO SINGLE UNIT OF MORE THAN 200 SQ M; AND FAMILY RESTAURANT/ PUB OF UP TO 800 SQ M (USE CLASSES A3/A4); EMPLOYMENT USES (RESEARCH; ASSEMBLY AND LIGHT MANUFACTURING - USE CLASS B1); PRIMARY SCHOOL; OPEN SPACE INCLUDING SPORTS PITCHES WITH ANCILLARY FACILITIES; MEANS OF ACCESS AND SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE. (ALL DETAILED MATTERS OTHER THAN ACCESS RESERVED FOR SUBSEQUENT APPROVAL.) (APPLICATION IS ACCOMPANIED BY AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT). LAND AT PEEL HALL; LAND SOUTH OF M62 BOUNDED BY, ELM ROAD; BIRCH AVENUE; POPLARS AVENUE; NEWHAVEN ROAD; WINDERMERE AVENUE, GRASEMERE AVENUE; MEREWOOD CLOSE, OSPREY CLOSE LOCKERBIE CLOSE, BALLATER DRIVE AND MILL LANE, POPLARS & HULME, WARRINGTON**

Thank you for referring the above application which was received on 18th August 2016.

**Environment Agency position**

We have no objection in principle to the proposed development but wish to make the following comments:-

We welcome the new Peel Hall development aspirations (D&A Statement July 2016) to retain and enhance key wildlife corridors, and integrate new sustainable drainage systems as part of overall scheme.

Environment Agency  
Richard Fairclough House Knutsford Road, Warrington, WA4 1HT.  
Customer services line: 03708 506 506  
[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

Cont/d..

However, we would request that the following planning condition is included on any approval requiring a scheme to be agreed to ensure that the landscape within the site is managed in such a way as to protect the ecological value of the site including the Spa Brook watercourse and interconnected pond landscape.

### **Condition**

No development shall take place until a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas (except privately owned domestic gardens), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The scheme shall include the following elements:

- details of retained and enhanced wetlands, grasslands and woodlands along key wildlife corridors.
- detail extent and type of any new planting including planting schedule largely based on native species
- details of maintenance regimes
- details of any new habitat created on site
- details of treatment of site boundaries and/or buffers around water bodies
- details of management responsibilities

The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

### **Reason**

To ensure the protection of wildlife and supporting habitat and secure opportunities for the enhancement of the nature conservation value of the site in line with national planning policy.

We also request that a planning condition is included requiring the following surface water drainage details for the large Peel Hall development site.

### **Condition**

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

The scheme shall also include:

- detail of all new retention ponds and linking SUDs infrastructure, including potential new wetland habitat creation.
- details of any new surface water drainage works associated with Spa Brook waterbody and ecological network.
- details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion.

### **Reason**

To improve and protect water quality and improve habitat of existing Spa Brook and connected Padgate Brook catchment, and prevent any increase flood risk associated with development of greenfield site.

We also request that a planning condition is included requiring a method statement to be agreed to put appropriate control measures in place regarding the invasive



species Japanese knotweed, Giant hogweed, and Himalayan balsam that are present on site.

### **Condition**

No development shall commence until a detailed method statement for removing or the long-term management/control of Japanese knotweed, Giant hogweed, and Himalayan balsam, identified on the (Appletons Feb 2016) site, is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The method statement shall include:-

- proposed measures that will be used to prevent the spread of Japanese knotweed, Giant hogweed, and Himalayan balsam during any operations e.g. mowing, strimming or soil movement.
- measures to ensure that any soils brought to the site are free of the seeds/root/stem of any invasive plant covered under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended.

Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved method statement.

### **Reason**

To prevent the spread of Japanese knotweed, Giant hogweed, and Himalayan balsam which are invasive species.

### **For information**

The site is shown on the Environment Agency's Flood Maps as being within Flood Zone 1, which is low probability of fluvial flooding.

The site however is greater than 1 hectare in size and a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The FRA is to include the risk of flooding from other sources and, in particular, how the discharge of surface water from the proposed development is to be managed, such that flood risk elsewhere is not increased. This will need to be discussed with the 'Lead Local Flood Authority', which for this area is Warrington Borough Council, as they are the statutory consultee for surface water flood risk.

Please send me a copy of the decision notice and forward a copy of this letter to the applicant.

Yours faithfully

**Ms DAWN HEWITT**  
**Planning Advisor**

Direct dial 02030250535

Direct e-mail dawn.hewitt@environment-agency.gov.uk



## Economic Regeneration, Growth and Environment Directorate Internal Memorandum

---

**To:** Michael Davies  
Development Control

**From:** Jim Turton  
Engineering & Flood Risk  
Manager  
Ext 2542

**Date:** 09/09/16

**Ref:** 2016/28492

**Planning Application Location:**

Land at Peel Hall; Land South of M62 bounded by, Elm Road: Birch Avenue; Poplars Avenue; Newhaven Road; Windermere Avenue, Grasmere Avenue; Merewood Close, Osprey Close Lockerbie Close, Ballater Drive and Mill Lane, Poplars & Hulme, Warrington

**Planning Application Proposal:**

Major Development: Outline planning application for a new mixed use neighbourhood comprising residential institution (residential care home - Use Class C2); up to 1200 dwelling houses and apartments (Use Class C3); local centre including food store up to 2000 square metres (Use Class A1); financial & professional services; restaurants and cafes; drinking establishments; hot food takeaways (Use Classes A2-A5 inclusive); units within Use Class D1 (non residential institution) of up to 600 sq m total with no single unit of more than 200 sq m; and family restaurant/ pub of up to 800 sq m (Use Classes A3/A4); employment uses (research; assembly and light manufacturing - Use Class B1); primary school; open space including sports pitches with ancillary facilities; means of access

and supporting infrastructure. (All detailed matters other than access reserved for subsequent approval.) (Application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment).

The Asset & Flood Risk Team have considered the above application and assessed the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and have no objection in principle to the proposed development as long as they adhere to the recommendations made and provide the information requested in the condition below.

Condition

1. A detailed design for the surface water drainage layout and attenuation will be submitted

I trust this is of assistance and please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information.

**Jim Turton**  
**Engineering & Flood Risk Manager**



**United Utilities Water Limited  
Developer Services & Planning**  
Warrington North WWTW  
Barnard Street off Old Liverpool Road  
Gatewarth Industrial Estate  
Sankey Bridges  
Warrington  
WA5 1DS

Telephone: 01925 679311  
Planning.liaison@uuplc.co.uk

Your ref: 2016/28492  
Our ref: DC/16/3494

14 December 2016

Warrington Borough Council  
New Town House  
Buttermarket Street  
Warrington  
Cheshire  
WA1 2NH

Dear Sir/Madam

**Location: Land at Peel Hall, Warrington**

**Proposal: Outline planning for a major development for a mixed use neighbourhood**

With respect to the above development proposal, United Utilities Water Limited ('United Utilities') wishes to provide the following comments.

This is a significant application for major development and following discussion of the proposed development with the Lead Local Flood Authority, United Utilities has no objection to the planning application at this stage. In accordance with good practice, United Utilities suggests that if the council is minded to grant planning permission that the approved plans are clearly referenced within the decision notice within a condition to avoid any ambiguity.

**Foul and Surface Water Drainage**

As stated above, following discussion with Colin Ludden from the Lead Local Flood Authority, we do not wish to object to the scheme, however we have suggested a number of conditions aimed at ensuring foul and surface water drainage remain a key consideration as the design and layout of the scheme develops. These will be requested by the Lead Local Flood Authority who would have the responsibility for advising on the discharge of the majority of the conditions, should planning permission be granted. The conditions reflect the strategic nature of the proposed development.

**Water Comments**

We are currently planning a scheme to improve resilience in this area and therefore this development would have an impact on this scheme. We therefore request early and ongoing dialogue on the outcome of this application for planning permission so that we can most appropriately plan for expected demands.

Please note that this will require a designated supply main and more than likely need pumping to meet standards of service. In addition further mains reinforcements may be required to manage pressures in the area. This area will require district metering and should be considered in more detail before all the properties are constructed.

Our water mains may need extending to serve any development on this site. The applicant, who may be required to pay a capital contribution, will need to sign an agreement under sections 41, 42 and 43 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

For properties three or more storeys high the developer may need to install some internal storage and internal booster pumps to ensure a constant supply to the upper storeys.

We can readily supply water for domestic purposes, but for larger quantities for example, commercial/industrial we will need further information.

A separate metered supply to each unit will be required at the applicant's expense and all internal pipe work must comply with current water supply (water fittings) regulations 1999.

United Utilities strongly recommends the construction of the dwellings and buildings so that they achieve high water efficiency standards.

The applicant must undertake a complete soil survey, as and when land proposals have progressed to a scheme design, and results submitted along with an application for water. This will aid in our design of future pipework and materials to eliminate the risk of contamination to the local water supply.

If this development requires the stopping up of any public highways or footpaths, the developer should advise United Utilities of this at an early stage to avoid delays in any necessary divisionary work, which will be carried out at the applicant's expense.

Should this planning application be approved, the applicant should contact United Utilities on 03456 723 723 regarding connection to the water mains or public sewers.

### **General Comments**

Public sewers and water mains pass through the site. These include a pressurised treated water distribution main. We will not permit building over these assets. We will require an access strip in accordance with our standard terms and conditions (enclosed) for access, maintenance or replacement and to prevent damage occurring to our assets. Therefore a modification of the site layout, or a diversion of the affected public sewer or water main at the applicant's expense, may be necessary. To establish if a sewer or water main diversion is feasible, the applicant must discuss this at an early stage with a developer engineer at [wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk) (for the sewer) or [DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk) (for the water main) as a lengthy lead in period may be required if a diversion proves to be acceptable. The level of cover to the water mains and sewers must not be compromised either during or after construction.

There is also a foul water pumping station and rising main. The applicant should note that we will need access to both of these assets including a vehicular access to the pumping station. The existence of the pumping station and access to it will need to be considered in the site layout. We recommend that this access is discussed with our Property Services team if this outline application for planning permission is approved so appropriate access can be agreed in the site layout.

Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of the public sewer and overflow systems or the water main.

Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. United Utilities offers a fully supported mapping service and we recommend the applicant contact our Property Searches team on 03707 510101 to obtain maps of the site.

Due to the public sewer transfer, not all sewers are currently shown on the statutory sewer records, if a sewer is discovered during construction; please contact a building control body to discuss the matter further.

If the applicant intends to offer wastewater assets forward for adoption by United Utilities, the proposed detailed design will be subject to a technical appraisal by an adoptions engineer as we need to be sure that the proposal meets the requirements of sewers for adoption and United Utilities' asset standards. The proposed design should give consideration to long term operability and give United Utilities a cost effective proposal for the life of the assets. Therefore, should this application be approved and the applicant wishes to progress a section 104 agreement, we strongly recommend that no construction commences until the detailed drainage design, submitted as part of the section 104 agreement, has been assessed and accepted in writing by United Utilities. Any works carried out prior to the technical assessment being approved is done entirely at the developers own risk and could be subject to change. We recommend the applicant specifically clarifies adoption arrangements with our Developer Services team at [WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk). Further information regarding developer services and planning, can be found on our website at <http://www.unitedutilities.com/builders-developers.aspx>.

Yours faithfully

Mrs G Gaskell  
United Utilities  
Developer Services and Planning

-----Original Message-----

From: Ludden, Colin

Sent: 15 December 2016 11:34

To: Davies, Michael (Planning)

Subject: Planning Application: 2016/28492 - Land at Peel Hall; Land South of M62 bounded by, Elm Road; Birch Avenue; Poplars Avenue; Newhaven Road; Windermere Avenue, Grasmere Avenue; Merewood Close, Osprey Close Lock

Mike

I have spoken with UU and these are the conditions that we would like to apply and as LLFA it is our responsibility to discharge them.

If you would like to discuss them let me know.

Regards

Colin A Ludden

Asset Design Engineer

Economic Regeneration, Growth & Environment, Warrington Borough Council, New Town House,  
Buttermarket Street, Warrington, WA1 2NH

Tel: 01925 442540

Mobile 07740 075778

Email: [cludden@warrington.gov.uk](mailto:cludden@warrington.gov.uk)

Web: [www.warrington.gov.uk](http://www.warrington.gov.uk)

## Draft Conditions

---

### Phasing

*1. Prior to the commencement of development, a phasing plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Phasing Plan shall include details of the maximum number of dwellings and other development to be implemented within each phase of the development / development parcel. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved Phasing Plan.*

*This Phasing Plan shall not be amended without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Any proposal to amend the Phasing Plan / Development Parcels should provide evidence to demonstrate that such changes would not be likely to give rise to any significant environmental impacts. In instances where phasing changes may give rise to environmental impacts then the amended Phasing Plan shall be accompanied by an Environmental Statement prepared in accordance with the (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011.*

*Reason: To ensure the satisfactory phasing of the development and to ensure that utility infrastructure is delivered in a coordinated and planned way.*

### Site Wide Drainage Strategy

*2.*

*2.1 At the same time as the submission of the First Reserved Matters application for all or part of the development hereby permitted, an updated Surface Water Drainage Strategy shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The strategy shall be in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment in respect of Peel Hall, Warrington, reference 1506-45/FRA/01 Rev B, dated June 2016. The updated Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy shall include the following details as a minimum:*

- a. no surface water shall discharge directly or indirectly into the existing public sewerage systems, unless agreed in writing as part of the updated Surface Water Drainage Strategy; and*
- b. investigate the potential for a surface water drainage system based on infiltration through an assessment of site conditions for the entire site;*
- c. identify any drainage infrastructure connections ( surface water) including the volume of flows between the different phases/plots of the development; and*
- d. the details of any improvement works to on-site watercourses/culverts;*
- e. the details of any pumping arrangements demonstrated as necessary.*

*2.2 At the same time as the submission of each subsequent Reserved Matters application for all or part of the development granted in outline, an Updated Surface Water Drainage strategy shall be*



*submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. Such strategy shall include as a minimum the details listed above at condition 2.1.*

*2.3 No part of the development granted in outline shall be commenced on any phase or part of any phase of the development hereby permitted unless and until the Updated Surface Water Drainage Strategy submitted with the relevant Reserved Matters application has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*2.4 Unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority there shall be no surface water connections between plots or phases of development other than those in accordance with the connections identified and approved under item 2.1.*

*Reason: To prevent flooding and pollution and to ensure a holistic approach to the construction of the detailed drainage infrastructure for the site so that the drainage infrastructure which is constructed is able to cope with the foul and surface water discharges from the entire development site. This condition is imposed in light of policies set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and Policies within the Warrington Borough Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted July 2014).*

#### **Surface Water Drainage Details**

*4. Prior to the commencement of each phase or part phase of the development, full details for a surface water regulation system and means of disposal for that phase or part phase, based wholly on sustainable drainage principles shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The details for each phase must be consistent with the Updated Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy submitted and approved pursuant to condition [2] above. The details shall:*

- a. Demonstrate that the surface water run-off from rainfall events generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm plus climate change will not exceed the run-off to watercourse from the existing undeveloped site and following the corresponding rainfall events.*
- b. No surface water shall discharge to the existing public sewerage system, unless agreed in writing as part of the updated Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy pursuant to condition [2] above.*
- c. In the 1 in 100 year critical storm plus climate change event the approved drainage scheme shall demonstrate any overland flow paths on and off site do not flood dwellings or their associated residential curtilages; and*
- d. Include the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses.*

*No housing or other development shall be occupied for that phase until the approved surface water drainage scheme for that phase has been completed in accordance with the approved details.*

*Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. This condition is imposed in light of policies set out within the NPPF, NPPG and the Warrington Borough Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted July 2014).*

## **Drainage Maintenance and Management**

*4. Prior to the occupation of each phase or part phase of the development, a sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development (including a management and maintenance plan for on-site watercourses / culverts) shall be submitted to the local planning authority and agreed in writing. The sustainable drainage management and maintenance plan shall include as a minimum:*

- a. Arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, or, management and maintenance by a resident's management company; and*
- b. Arrangements for inspection and ongoing maintenance of all elements of the sustainable drainage system to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.*

*The development shall subsequently be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved plan.*

*Reason: To ensure that management arrangements are in place for the sustainable drainage system in order to manage the risk of flooding and pollution during the lifetime of the development.*



**United Utilities Water Limited  
Developer Services & Metering**  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Grasmere House  
Lingley Mere Business Park  
Lingley Green Avenue  
Warrington  
WA5 3LP

Planning.liaison@uuplc.co.uk

Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

**Your ref:** APP/M0655/W/  
17/3178530  
**Our ref:** DC/20/1603  
**Date:** 17-JUN-20

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Location: Land at Peel Hall Warrington WA2 9LH**

**Proposal: Major Development: Outline planning application for a new mixed use neighbourhood comprising residential institution (residential care home - Use Class C2); up to 1200 dwelling houses and apartments (Use Class C3); local centre including food store up to 2000 square metres (Use Class A1); financial & professional services; restaurants and cafes; drinking establishments; hot food takeaways (Use Classes A2-A5 inclusive); units within Use Class D1 (non-residential institution) of up to 600 sq m total with no single unit of more than 200 sq m; and family restaurant/ pub of up to 800 sq m (Use Classes A3/A4); primary school; open space including sports pitches with ancillary facilities; means of access (including the demolition of 344; 346; 348; 458 and 460 Poplars Avenue) and supporting infrastructure. (All detailed matters other than access reserved for subsequent approval.) (Application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment)**

With regard to the above development proposal, United Utilities Water Limited ('United Utilities') welcomes the opportunity to provide comments upon the Environmental Statement Addendum, ES Documents and Figures and ES Non-Technical Summary. United Utilities would like to draw your attention to comments previously submitted in respect of the outline planning application (ref: 2016/28492) dated 14 December 2016 and a subsequent pre-application request dated 19 February 2019 and specifically our suggested draft conditions which we enclose again for ease of reference. These conditions are reflective of recommended conditions 16, 17, 18 and 19 set out within Appendix C of the Planning Inspectorate's report to the Secretary of State dated 1 October 2018. In addition to our suggested conditions we also support draft condition 20 regarding ground water protection and draft condition 31 regarding a Construction Environmental Management Plan, including the protection of existing utility assets and infrastructure.

The ES Addendum, and specifically Part 1, Chapter 7 'Hydrology, Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment' remains unchanged from the previous version of the ES to which we provided comments upon as part of planning application ref: 2016/28492. United Utilities wishes to re-iterate comments previously made to these consultations which are set out below:

United Utilities advises the following key points should be adhered to:

- Foul and surface water drain on separate systems.

- A holistic strategy for foul and surface water for the entire site. This should identify how the phases will interact within each other and reflect the surface water hierarchy which is outlined in the National Planning Practice Guidance. The approach to surface water should also be in accordance with the requirements of the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage produced by Defra.
- Given the nature of the site we would expect there to be no reliance on the public sewer for the drainage of surface water.
- The strategy for wastewater infrastructure should seek to avoid the need for pumped solutions.
- The strategy should outline how different phases of the development will interact and ensure that infrastructure in the earlier phases, and that interconnects between phases, is appropriately sized.
- The site will require multiple connection points. A future strategy should identify possible connection points to the public sewerage network and clean water network.
- Given the size of the site, upgrades to infrastructure may be required. Until more detail is known about the development, it is difficult to comment on this further.
- For larger premises or developments of more than one property, including multiple connections, where additional infrastructure is required, a water network behaviour/demand modelling exercise would be required to determine the network reinforcements required to support the proposed development.
- If the appellant intends to obtain a water supply from United Utilities for the proposed development, we strongly recommend they engage with us at the earliest opportunity. If reinforcement of the water network is required to meet the demand, this could be a significant project and the design and construction period should be accounted for.
- If infrastructure upgrades are necessary, it may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with upgrades to infrastructure.
- The appellant should give consideration to the approach to management and maintenance of any on-site sustainable drainage system.
- United Utilities is not responsible for advising on rates of discharge to the local watercourse system and therefore we recommend the appellant engages with the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding these proposals.
- The proposed development site is situated within Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 3, close to United Utilities water abstraction boreholes and within a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone for Groundwater. Drinking Water Safeguard Zones, designated by the Environment Agency under the Water Framework Directive, are used for areas around

abstractions where water quality is poor and are where additional measures are needed to improve water quality. Action is targeted at these zones to address water contamination. Land drainage and new development has the potential to impact on the quality of groundwater supplies, and given the scale of this development the potential effects of poorly designed SuDS need to be managed. We feel it is particularly important that the proposed SuDS are designed in accordance with the Ciria SuDS manual. In addition, the requirements from the Environment Agency's "Approach to Groundwater Protection" should also be applied to ensure that the development does not impact on groundwater quality in the area. Details of the approach of the EA is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>. We believe any future development/construction activity should be supported by a risk assessment and construction management plan.

- Further to the assessment of assets and infrastructure crossing the proposed site we strongly recommend a construction management plan is provided with any future planning submission to afford appropriate protection for United Utilities assets both during and post construction.
- Any proposed layout should also reflect United Utilities' Right of Way to Elm Road wastewater pumping station.
- The appellant should consult Sewers for Adoption 8<sup>th</sup> Edition and United Utilities Pumping Station Addendum document (available on United Utilities website) when considering potential layout in relation to pumping stations; in line with sewers for adoption 8th Edition, the minimum distance between the edge of the wet well and the wall of a habitable dwelling is 15m.
- Should the Planning Inspectorate be minded to allow this appeal or the Local Planning Authority approve a future planning application at this location; and the appellant intends to offer wastewater assets forward for adoption by United Utilities, the proposed detailed design will be subject to a technical appraisal. Therefore the proposal should meet the requirements of Sewers for Adoption and United Utilities' Asset Standards. The detailed layout should be prepared with consideration of what is necessary to secure a development to an adoptable standard.

In addition to the above, United Utilities would like to understand potential build out rates and the phasing of the development to best inform the drainage strategy.

Furthermore it is important to reiterate some other matters which need to be taken into consideration by the appellant

### **United Utilities Property, Assets and Infrastructure**

#### **Water main**

**A water main crosses the site. As we need unrestricted access for operating and maintaining it, we will not permit development over or in close proximity to the main. We require an access strip as**

**detailed in our 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines', a copy of which was provided with our previous consultation responses.**

The appellant must comply with our 'Standard Conditions' document. This should be taken into account in the final site layout, or a diversion may be necessary. Unless there is specific provision within the title of the property or an associated easement, any necessary disconnection or diversion required as a result of any development will be at the appellant's expense. If considering a water mains diversion, the appellant should contact United Utilities at their earliest opportunity as they may find that the cost of mains diversion is prohibitive in the context of their development scheme.

The Water Industry Act 1991 affords United Utilities specific rights in relation to the maintenance, repair, access and protection of our water infrastructure;

- Sections 158 & 159, outlines the right to inspect, maintain, adjust, repair or alter our mains. This includes carrying out any works incidental to any of those purposes. Service pipes are not our property and we have no record of them.
- Under Section 174 of the Act it is an offence to intentionally or negligently interfere with any resource main or water main that causes damage to or has an effect on its use or operation.

It is in accordance with this statutory provision that we provide standard conditions to assist developers when working in close proximity to our water mains.

Both during and post construction, there should be no additional load bearing capacity on the main without prior agreement from United Utilities. This would include earth movement and the transport and position of construction equipment and vehicles.

#### **Public sewer**

**Public sewers, including a rising main cross this site and we will not permit building over them.** We will require an access strip width in accordance with the minimum distances specified in "Sewers for Adoption", for maintenance or replacement. This should be incorporated into any future site layout. Therefore a modification of the site layout, or a diversion of the affected public sewer may be necessary. All costs associated with sewer diversions must be borne by the appellant.

To establish if a sewer diversion is feasible, the appellant must discuss this at an early stage with our Developer Engineer at [wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk) as a lengthy lead in period may be required if a sewer diversion proves to be acceptable.

Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of the public sewer and overflow systems.

Where United Utilities' assets exist, the level of cover to the water mains and public sewers must not be compromised either during or after construction.

For advice regarding protection of United Utilities assets, the appellant should contact the teams as follows:

Water assets – [DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk)

Wastewater assets – [WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk)

## **Pumping Station**

**As set out above, a Pumping Station and right of way is also located within the site boundary. The appellant should note that we will need access to these assets including a vehicular access to the pumping station. The existence of the pumping station and access to it will need to be considered in the site layout. We recommend that this access is discussed with our Property Services team if this appeal is allowed so appropriate access can be agreed in the site layout.**

**It is the appellant's responsibility to investigate the possibility of any United Utilities' assets potentially impacted by their proposals and to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development.**

A number of providers offer a paid for mapping service including United Utilities. To find out how to purchase a sewer and water plan from United Utilities, please visit the Property Searches website; <https://www.unitedutilities.com/property-searches/>

You can also view the plans for free. To make an appointment to view our sewer records at your local authority please contact them direct, alternatively if you wish to view the water and the sewer records at our Lingley Mere offices based in Warrington please ring [0370 751 0101](tel:03707510101) to book an appointment.

Due to the public sewer transfer in 2011, not all sewers are currently shown on the statutory sewer records and we do not always show private pipes on our plans. If a sewer is discovered during construction; please contact a Building Control Body to discuss the matter further.

Should this planning appeal be allowed the appellant should contact United Utilities regarding a potential water supply or connection to public sewers. Additional information is available on our website <http://www.unitedutilities.com/builders-developers.aspx>

## **Drainage**

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. Our suggested drainage conditions are as per the suggested conditions submitted in relation to planning application ref: 2016/28492. For ease of reference we enclose a copy of the draft conditions submitted as part of our consultation response in relation to planning application reference: ref: 2016/28492.

The appellant can discuss this with Developer Engineer, **Matthew Dodd**, by email at [wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk).

Please note, United Utilities is not responsible for advising on rates of discharge to the local watercourse system. This is a matter for discussion with the Lead Local Flood Authority and / or the Environment Agency (if the watercourse is classified as main river).

If the appellant intends to offer wastewater assets forward for adoption by United Utilities, the proposed detailed design will be subject to a technical appraisal by an Adoptions Engineer as we need to be sure that the proposal meets the requirements of Sewers for Adoption and United Utilities' Asset Standards. The detailed layout should be prepared with consideration of what is necessary to secure a development to an adoptable standard. This is important as drainage design can be a key determining factor of site levels and layout. The proposed design should give consideration to long term operability and give United Utilities a cost effective proposal for the life of the assets. Therefore, should this appeal be allowed and the appellant wishes to progress a Section 104 agreement, we strongly recommend that no construction commences until the detailed drainage design, submitted as part of the Section 104 agreement, has been assessed and accepted in writing by United Utilities. Any works carried out prior to the technical assessment being approved is done entirely at the developers own risk and could be subject to change.

### **Management and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems**

Without effective management and maintenance, sustainable drainage systems can fail or become ineffective. As a provider of wastewater services, we believe we have a duty to advise the Local Planning Authority/Planning Inspectorate of this potential risk to ensure the longevity of the surface water drainage system and the service it provides to people. We also wish to minimise the risk of a sustainable drainage system having a detrimental impact on the public sewer network should the two systems interact.

We support draft condition 17 regarding a management and maintenance regime for any sustainable drainage system, albeit our suggested draft condition 4, submitted in response to the outline planning application and enclosed for ease of reference, provides further details required in the preparation of a management and maintenance plan.

Please note United Utilities cannot provide comment on the management and maintenance of an asset that is owned by a third party management and maintenance company. We would not be involved in the discharge of the management and maintenance condition in these circumstances.

### **Water Supply**

If the appellant intends to obtain a water supply from United Utilities for the proposed development, we strongly recommend they engage with us at the earliest opportunity. If reinforcement of the water network is required to meet the demand, this could be a significant project and the design and construction period should be accounted for.

To discuss a potential water supply or any of the water comments detailed above, the appellant can contact the team at [DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk).

Please note, all internal pipework must comply with current Water Supply (water fittings) Regulations 1999.



Yours faithfully

Jill Walker  
United Utilities  
Developer Services and Metering

Enc Draft Conditions

# Technical Note

---

**Our ref** 41640/07/SPM/CRo

**Date** 20<sup>th</sup> August 2020

**Subject** **Loss of Amenity Technical Note**

---

## **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 This Technical Note has been prepared ahead of the reconvened Peel Hall Inquiry [APP/M0655/W/17/3178530] on behalf of Satnam Millennium Limited [Satnam]. It responds to relevant points relating to Sports Provision within the Rule 6 Party Proof of Evidence Volume 8 – Loss of Amenity (produced by Mr Jon Parr), which provides a critique of the population impact figures and open space, sports and recreation analysis set out in both the original ES and the 2020 ES update.

## **2.0 Recreational Amenity**

### **Population Impact**

2.1 The Rule 6 Party’s Proof of Evidence on Loss of Amenity begins with a critique of the population calculation, comparing the 2,753 residents estimated to be generated by Lichfields from the 1,200 C3 dwellings plus 60 C2 care home units, with Mr Parr’s own calculation. Mr Parr asserts in paragraph 3.4 that the current UK average household size is 2.4 people, based on ONS Families and households in the UK data (2017). Applying this to the 1,200 dwellings and including 60 care home residents, he concludes that the proposed Peel Hall development is likely to house 2,940 residents. He suggests in paragraph 3.6 that this would have a knock-on effect on “*transport and journeys which in turn have a direct correlation with noise and air quality*”. On page 8 of his Proof, he then recalculates the open and recreational space standards using the higher population figure, indicating a higher level of need.

2.2 In paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8, Mr Parr further criticises the approach of excluding the 60 care home residents from the requirement calculations for equipped play, informal play and outdoor sports on the grounds that they will also have recreational requirements and to go outdoors for leisurely walks.

2.3 In response to these points, and taking the latter criticism first, it is hardly unreasonable to exclude the 60 care home residents from the equipped play and informal play area calculations, which are for the use of children and not elderly (and potentially mobility impaired) adults. Similarly, it is not likely that any of the C2 care home residents will be willing or able to use the upgraded sports pitches. The 60 care home residents have been included in the calculations for Parks & Gardens, Natural/Semi Natural greenspace and allotments calculations however, which would more clearly align with Mr Parr’s suggestion that they should be provided with areas they can visit for recreational walks.

2.4 Turning to the population calculation itself, Addendum 2 to Environmental Statement Volume 10 [the ES] paragraph 13.5.4 sets out that by using data from the 2011 Census the average household size of each house type has been estimated to provide an indication of the likely population size of the proposed development. As the exact dwelling split of the proposed

development was not known, the market housing requirement from the Mid-Mersey (Halton, St. Helen's and Warrington) SHMA (2016) was used: 1-bed: 6%, 2-bed: 32.2% 3-bed: 51.7%, 4+bedrooms: 10.1%.

- 2.5 Lichfields then calculated the number of residents living in 1, 2, 3 and 4 bed properties for Warrington Borough based on the 2011 Census and divided it by the number of residential units of that size likely to be living in the development (i.e. 1.3 residents living in every 1-bed property, to 3.0 residents living in every 4-bed property). It was assumed that there would be 1 person for each residential care home unit.
- 2.6 This amounts to a population increase of 2,753 new residents, of which 60 residents would reside in the proposed C2 care units.
- 2.7 Overall, this equates to 2.18 residents per unit, rising to **2.24** residents per household excluding the C2 care home (given that by ONS's definition, C2 occupants are defined as institutionalised residents not living in separate households). This is similar to the 2.3 average household size for Warrington as a whole recorded in the 2011 Census (Table reference KS403EW). This analysis is unchanged since it originally appeared in the 2016 and has not been challenged by the Council at any stage.
- 2.8 The Rule 6 Party argues that Lichfields should have used a figure of 2.4 rather than 2.24 for the C3 homes component on the basis that this is the UK-wide average.
- 2.9 There are a number of responses to this. Firstly, as demonstrated above, household sizes are lower for Warrington Borough than they are for the UK as a whole, and therefore it might be anticipated that a similar pattern is observed at the Peel Hall development.
- 2.10 Secondly, the 2011 Census data is now 9 years old, and there is more up-to-date information which demonstrates that household size has been falling rapidly in Warrington just as it has been across the country in recent years. Analysis of the recently-released 2018-based Sub-National Population Projections [SNPP] (March 2020) for Warrington indicates that there are a total of 206,819 people living in households in the Borough as of 2020. The 2018-based Household Projections (June 2020) show a total of 91,296 households in Warrington in 2020. This equates to an average number of persons per household in the Borough of **2.27**, some years before the Peel Hall development is even due to begin construction (if approved).
- 2.11 Figure 1 illustrates how average household size in Warrington Borough is projected to decline over the coming years due to societal changes that are in line with the rest of the country, based on ONS SNPP/SNHP data. It indicates that by the time the first dwelling is likely to be completed at Peel Hall (2022/23, presuming a favourable appeal decision), then average household size would be **2.24** – identical to the assumption currently applied to the C3 dwellings at Peel Hall. By the time the proposed development is nearing completion in 2033/34, average household size is projected to fall to **just 2.17**. If applied to the 1,200 C3 homes, this lower rate would generate just 2,664 residents – 89 lower than the figure used in the ES.
- 2.12 This demonstrates that the 2,753 resident assumption applied in the Peel Hall ES is a reasonable and robust figure for the purposes of calculating likely impact on services.

Figure 1: Warrington Borough Average Household Size vs. Estimated Peel Hall annual housing Delivery



Source: ONS 2018-based SNPP /SNHP / Lichfields' analysis

### 3.0 Outdoor Sports (Formal Play)

3.1 The Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence states on page 10 'Outdoor Sports' that:

*“iv. The calculation in Table 13.15 suggests a sporting provision of 4.31 ha to accommodate 2,693 residents which is to be provided by a combination of the appellants land and that of Radley Common playing fields.*

*v. The combined area of both existing facilities is 6.17 ha made up of Ballater Playing Fields 3.2 ha and Radley Common Playing Fields 2.97 ha.*

*vi. Given this land already facilitates the existing community, the appellant is therefore only offering an additional 2.98 ha. Based on the appellants figures, this equates to a net gain of 11.07 m<sup>2</sup> per person against the standard prescribed 16m<sup>2</sup> per person.*

*vii. We therefore fail to see why Warrington Borough Council and the appellant would agree to a net provision of 4.4ha (item 13.100) when this is less than the existing provision prior to adding almost 3,000 additional residents – quite simply, this is not acceptable.*

*viii. Furthermore these calculations make no allowance for the complete loss of amenity on Ballater Playing Fields that would be lost entirely to the community.”*

3.2 There are a number of apparent misunderstandings and inaccuracies in the above.



has therefore been insufficient allowance made for the needs of the proposed development as a consequence.

- 3.5 This misunderstands WBC’s policy requirements. The developer contribution requirements for sports pitch provision are clearly summarised in the 2017 Planning Obligations SPD [CD LP14] as follows:

*“Planning obligations relating to pitch sports and built sports facilities will be sought on residential developments of 40 units or more where **existing facilities have insufficient capacity to serve the increase in population** arising from the development.*

***Where a contribution is sought for upgrading existing sports pitches, this will be defined based on the specific improvement the Council is seeking to implement and the scale of increased use likely to arise from the development proposal using information set out in the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and secured by S106 Agreement.***

*Where a contribution is sought for upgrading indoor sports and recreation provision, this will be defined based on the specific improvement the Council is seeking to implement and the scale of increased use likely to arise from the development proposal using information set out in the Sports Facilities Strategic Needs Assessment (SFSNA) and secured by S106 Agreement.*

*For strategic development proposals where the unmet need justifies the delivery of new pitches or built leisure or recreation facilities, the Council will seek to secure these facilities as part of the overall development proposal.” [page 28, Lichfields’ emphasis]*

- 3.6 This is clear that developer contributions are not just about the quantity of land provided, but specifically the quality and whether existing facilities should be upgraded to meet needs, based on information set out in the Council’s January 2020 Playing Pitch Strategy & Action Plan [PPSAP] [CD LP22].

- 3.7 The Council’s earlier Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report (December 2018) [CD LP49] provides an assessment of the quality of existing pitch provision at the Mill Lane (referred to here as Peel Hall Playing Fields) and Radley Common sites in terms of Match Equivalent Sessions [MES]. The 2020 PPSAP relies upon this assessment but provides updated analysis on how future needs will be met and adjusts the strategy accordingly. Table 2 overleaf provides an update of Table 13.9 of the ES having regard to both documents.

Table 2 Existing Playing Pitch Provision on Site – WBC Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report

Name	PPS 2018 Agreed Quality Rating	Existing Facilities	Current Site Capacity (MES)	Current Play (MES)	PPS & Action Plan 2020 Commentary
Peel Hall Playing Fields (ref 82) 1no. Adult 11v11-Grass	Poor	No changing facilities. No Drainage system. Limited existing car parking.	1	0	Site currently subject to development proposal, therefore actions are separated into two parts 1) what you want to happen if the site is not developed and 2) what will happen if planning permission is granted. Option 1. Ensure maintenance of pitch continues in order that the level of play can be sustained. Car park provision requires extension and upgrade. Option 2. Ensure developer contributions are sought to replace existing provision, and cater for additional demand created by development, both in terms of pitch provision and ancillary facilities. Explore feasibility of introducing AGP provision to the site (page 63).
Peel Hall Playing Fields (ref 82) 1no. Youth 9v9-Grass	Poor		1	0	
Peel Hall Playing Fields (ref 82) 1no. Youth 7v7-Grass	Poor		2	0	
Radley Common (ref 88) 1no. Adult 11v11-Grass	Disused	Currently open space, with no playing pitch provision.	1 adult football pitch	0	Closed for more than 5 years. Could be brought back into use subject to improvements being made (page 36).  Currently open space, with no playing pitch provision. Potential relocation site for site ID 82, if appeal successful (page 63).
<b>Total MES per week:</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	

Source: WBC Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report (December 2018) CD LP49 Table 14: Football pitch capacity analysis for community use pitches pages 112 and 113 and Appendix 2 pages 228 and 229 / WBC Playing Pitch Strategy & Action Plan CD LP22, Central Neighbourhood Action Plan, pages 36 and 63

3.8 It is quite clear therefore, that based on the Council’s recent assessment, the existing sports pitch provision on the two sites (Peel Hall Playing Fields and Radley Common) **are assessed to be of poor quality and/or disused, and whilst there is a current Match Equivalent Sessions [MES] capacity of 5 per week, the pitches are not currently used.**

3.9 The Rule 6 Party’s claim in paragraphs 3.15 and 3.17 that the pitches are actually in good shape does not align with the Council’s own evidence. Furthermore, even if Ballater Playing Fields are being used by Winwick Junior Football Club and a number of ‘adult social groups’ during the week and at weekends (as suggested in paragraph 3.16), this still represents a very significant under-utilisation of the pitches that could be made available as a result of the development.

Figure 3: Peel Hall Indicative Sports and Recreation Provision



## PEEL HALL, WARRINGTON Indicative Sports and Recreation Provision

FIGURE APP 16

- 3.10 Table 13.16 of the ES set out the proposed outdoor sports provision on the new Peel Hall site, which indicated that the MES capacity would increase from 5 at present, to 12 per week. Mr Parr’s proof (page 10, iii) asks why these figures appear to be different to the appellant’s plan ref 1820\_28 Revision J, which is reproduced in Figure 3 (above).
- 3.11 Lichfields understands that since the ES open space information was provided to us by appletons in February 2020 (which related only to the new Peel Hall sports site), further clarity was provided in an updated Open Space schedule that was issued to Sport England in April 2020 after the ES had been submitted.
- 3.12 This is reproduced in Appendix 1 and indicates that the MES capacity could be increased still further. This is summarised below and suggests that the capacity could increase from 5 to 22 MES. It should be noted that the exact number and size of pitches provided as new formal outdoor sports provision at Radley Common will be maximised and agreed with Sport England and WBC at the Reserved Matters stage.



Table 2 Existing and Indicative Playing Pitch Provision on Site

Site Name	Existing			Future Peel Hall Proposals	
	Agreed Existing Quality Rating	Existing Facilities	Current Site Capacity (MES)	Future Facilities	Future Site Capacity (MES)
Peel Hall Playing Fields (ref 82) 1no. Adult 11v11-Grass	Poor	No changing facilities.	1	n/a	0
Peel Hall Playing Fields (ref 82) 1no. Youth 9v9-Grass	Poor	No Drainage system.	1		0
Peel Hall Playing Fields (ref 82) 1no. Youth 7v7-Grass	Poor	Limited existing car parking.	2		0
Radley Common (ref 88) 1no. Adult 11v11-Grass	Disused	Currently open space, with no playing pitch provision.	1 adult football pitch	Changing facilities	1 Adult 11v11-Grass – 4 games per weekend 1 Youth 9 vs 9 pitch – 4 games per week
New On-Site Peel Hall Playing Fields	n/a	n/a	n/a	High quality drainage system Car parking	2 Adult 11v11-Grass – 8 games per weekend (with dual use with adjoining school) 1 Youth 7 vs 7 pitch – 6 games per week
<b>Total MES per week:</b>			<b>5</b>		<b>22</b>

Source: Source: WBC Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report (December 2018) CD LP49 Table 14: Football pitch capacity analysis for community use pitches pages 112 and 113 and Appendix 2 pages 228 and 229 / appletons' analysis

- 3.13 To set this increase in context, Part 7 of the PPSAP [CD LP22] uses the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator [PPC] to update the likely demand generated for sports pitches based on housing increases by converting demand into MES for Warrington Borough. The PPSAP provides a housing growth scenario using WBC's Local Plan figures from 2020 to 2037 to deliver a total of 16,065 dwellings, which the document equates to 36,950 people. The demand is shown in MES per week for the majority of sports, with the exception of cricket, where MES is by season.
- 3.14 According to the PPSAP, Table 3 (overleaf) indicates that this 36,950 population increase across the entire Borough over the plan period equates to 39.72 match equivalent sessions [MES] for football; 45.93 MES of demand per week for all grass pitch sports; and 1.39 MES of demand per week on AGPs for hockey. This equates to 47.32 MES in total.

Table 3 Likely demand for grass pitch sports generated in Warrington

Pitch Sport	Match demand [MES] per week generated by an additional 36,950 people
Adult football	6.36
Youth Football	17.77
Mini Soccer	15.59
<b>TOTAL FOOTBALL</b>	<b>39.72</b>
Rugby Union	1.81
Rugby League	4.40
<b>TOTAL GRASS SPORTS PITCHES</b>	<b>45.93</b>
Adult Hockey	1.13
Junior Hockey	0.26
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>47.32</b>

Source: WBC Playing Pitch Strategy & Action Plan CD LP22, Table 7.1 page 77

- 3.15 The proposed 1,200 C3 residential development at Peel Hall is estimated to accommodate 2,693 residents, or 7.29% of the 36,950 residents modelled in the PPSAP. If this was translated into a demand for match equivalent sessions on a pro-rata basis (i.e. Peel Hall generates 7.29% of the match demand as it will accommodate 7.29% of all new residents living in the Borough over the Plan period as modelled in the PPSAP), then based on the Council's own evidence in the 2020 PPSAP, this would potentially generate a need for:
- 2.89 MES on football pitches;
  - 3.35 MES on all grass sports pitches (including football);
  - 3.45 MES on all grass pitches and artificial grass pitches to include hockey (this includes the two categories above).
- 3.16 To summarise, at best, existing capacity at Radley Common and Peel Hall/Mill Lane is equivalent to 5 MES sports pitches per week. Adapting the evidence contained within the latest PPSAP suggests that an increase of 2,693 residents at the proposed Peel Hall development site could generate an additional match demand for a further 3.5 MES per week. The latest indicative masterplan indicates that the proposed development would increase the sports pitches capacity to 22 MES per week, an increase of 17 MES. This is more than 2.5-times the combined existing capacity and likely future need (totalling 8.5 MES) resulting from Peel Hall's new residents, based on the model set out in the latest PPSAP. The proposed development results in an over provision of 8.5 MES compared to that suggested in the PPSAP.
- 3.17 Furthermore, and as set out in the revised ES (paragraph 13.5.81), the pitches provided will be of a high standard, with high quality drainages systems, new changing facilities and car parking. The improved quality of the pitches and new changing facilities provides the development's outdoor sports requirement as agreed with the Council.

- 3.18 The proposed development, by providing suitable on-site open space provision and significant improvements to current sub-standard sports fields at a higher quality than currently exists, addresses the policy requirement set out by WBC.
- 3.19 This approach has been accepted by both WBC and Sport England as summarised in paragraphs 6.30 and 6.31 of the Statement of Common Ground:

*“it is agreed to be a qualitative and quantitative shortfall in sports provision in this part of the Borough (and qualitative in the Borough as a whole) having regard to the conclusions in section 1.6 of WBC Playing Pitch Strategy 2019 and the appeal proposals would provide an improvement (and thus a material consideration in that regard).*

*The replacement of the Mill Lane pitches to the centre and south of the site is agreed as appropriate. It is confirmed that Sport England raise no objection to this aspect of the proposals subject to the imposition of conditions.”*

## Appendix 1: Sports Provision Comparison Table (as issued to Sport England April 2020)

### APPENDIX 3- Sports Provision Comparison Table:

Number per dwellings: 2.24 no.

Proposed Dwellings: 1,200 no.

Projected Population: 2,753 no. people, including 60no. living in the proposed care home. (Figure based on Litchfields Socio-Economic Report 2016)

Local Plan Requirement Figures		Peel Hall Site Figures		Playing Pitches Usage	
Equipped Children's Play Space:	0.25 ha per 1,000 <b>0.69 ha</b> per 2,753	Play Space Provisions:	The equipped and informal play space provision to be met by individual housing plots.	Existing Provision	
Informal Children's Play Space:	0.55 ha per 1,000 <b>1.51 ha</b> per 2,753			Mill Lane Sports Pitches 1no. Full Size Grass Pitches	Weekend Use Only
Outdoor Sports:	1.60 ha per 1,000 <b>4.40 ha</b> per 2,753	Formal Sport Ground:	*Existing pitches at Mill Lane to be replaced by like for like pitches. Together with new high spec' adult grass pitches on site, this equates to replacement pitches for Mill Lane and additional required provision: <b>5.8 ha</b>	Radley Common Creation Ground Disused, no pitches.	N/A
Parks & Gardens:	1.60 ha per 1,000 <b>4.40 ha</b> per 2,753	Natural/ Semi Natural Areas (this includes all areas set aside as ecological/ motorway buffer zones, retained vegetation areas and attenuation pond areas):	<b>13.2 ha</b> (this includes a 0.19ha area for allotments)	Total: 1no. Pitches	4no. games per week maximum = 4no. with 90mins games
Natural and Semi-natural Greenspace:	2.00 ha per 1,000 <b>5.51 ha</b> per 2,753			Proposed Provision	
Allotments	0.07 ha per 1,000 <b>0.19 ha</b> per 2,753			Radley Common Creation Ground 1no. Youth 9v9 Grass Pitch 1no. Full Size Grass Pitch	Youth 9v9 Pitch- 4no. games per week Full Size Grass Pitch- 4no. games per weekend
		Development Plots (includes internal plot road layout, the school, employment land and apartments areas):	<b>42.7 ha</b>	On Site 2no. Full Size Grass Pitch 1no. Youth 7v7 Grass Pitch	Full Size Grass Pitch- 8no. games per weekend (with of dual use with school). Youth 7v7- 6no. games per week
		Road layout external to individual development plots.	<b>7.4 ha</b>	Total: 5no. Pitches	22no. games per week = Surplus of 6no. games per week.
		<b>Total Site Area:</b>	<b>69.1ha</b>	Number of matches that could be played on the existing grass pitches is based on a theoretical weekly capacity, not existing usage which appears to be minimal.	

Note: for the avoidance of doubt, the reference to 'Full size Grass Pitch – 8no games per weekend' in the Table above is referring to two Full size Grass pitches, not just one.