

PLANNING (URGENT REFERRALS) COMMITTEE

**MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, BOOTLE
ON 22 APRIL 2010**

PRESENT: Councillor Moncur (in the Chair)
Councillors Glover and Preston

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Connell and Storey.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2007 be confirmed as a correct record.

4. APPEAL AT PENDLE VIEW, LITHERLAND

Further to Minute No. 178 of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 March 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director advising of an appeal lodged with the Planning Inspectorate against the non-determination by the Council of Application No. S/2009/771 for the erection of 8 two-storey dwellinghouses comprising of two pairs of semi-detached dwellinghouses and one block of four town houses with associated landscaping and car parking at the car park at Pendle View, Litherland.

The Planning Committee, at its meeting held on 10 March 2010, considered Application No. S/2009/771 and resolved that:

- (1) consideration of the application be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee; and
- (2) Sefton Council's One Vision Housing's Board representatives, the Cabinet and Council note the Committee's concern regarding the lack of a comprehensive plan for the area that involved Pendle Hall.

The submission of an appeal against non-determination now prevented the Council from making a decision on the application; and that the Council must submit a view and present its statement of case to the Inspectorate by 5 May 2010.

PLANNING (URGENT REFERRALS) COMMITTEE- THURSDAY 22ND
APRIL, 2010

The Committee also considered a letter from Inspector S. Thompson, Merseyside Police, to Councillor M. Dowd, in which Inspector Thompson expressed concerns about aspects of the application.

RESOLVED:

That the appeal be defended on the principal grounds that the continued presence of the hall in its current derelict state renders redevelopment of the site for housing premature, and that the inability to complete the comprehensive development of the site whilst the hall remains in situ is harmful to the amenity of both prospective residents and of existing occupiers and residents in the wider area. This is contrary to UDP policies CS3, DQ1 and H10.