



Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 7 October 2026

Time: 6.00 p.m.

Venue: Wallasey Town Hall

Contact Officer: Rhys Edwards

Tel: 0151 691 8517

e-mail: rhysedwards@wirral.gov.uk

Website: <http://www.wirral.gov.uk>

PLEASE NOTE: Public seating is limited therefore members of the public wishing to attend are asked to register their attendance in advance by emailing committeeservices@wirral.gov.uk. Wirral Council is fully committed to equalities and our obligations under The Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty. If you have any adjustments that would help you attend or participate at this meeting, please let us know as soon as possible and we would be happy to facilitate where possible. Please contact committeeservices@wirral.gov.uk

This meeting will be [webcast](#)

AGENDA

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked whether they have any personal or prejudicial interests in connection with any application on the agenda and, if so, to declare them and state the nature of the interest.

4. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 10)

To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2026.

5. APP/25/00915 - KINGSMEAD SWIMMING POOL CARLTON LANE, HOYLAKES, WIRRAL, CH47 0LL (Pages 11 - 32)

- 6. APP/26/00734 - GLEGG ARMS, CHESTER ROAD, GAYTON, WIRRAL, CH60 3SD (Pages 33 - 66)**

Planning Committee Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for this committee can be found at the end of this agenda.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 10 September 2026

Present:

Councillor S Kelly (Chair)

Councillors	S Foulkes	GJ Davies
	A Gardner	C Cooke
	J Walsh-McDonald	H Gorman
	L Luxon-Kewley	G Bennett
	P Stuart	A Ainsworth

20 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed Members of the Planning Committee, Officers, members of the public and those watching the webcast to the meeting.

21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received by Councillors Jerry Williams and Brian Kenny. Councillors Paul Suart and Ann Ainsworth were in attendance as substitutes.

22 MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to consider whether they have any disclosable pecuniary interests and/or any other relevant interest in connection with any item(s) on this agenda and, if so, to declare them and state the nature of the interest.

Councillor Jason Walsh-McDonald declared a non-pecuniary, personal and prejudicial interest in relation to item six, (APPH/26/01027 - 5 Woodcote Bank, Higher Bebington, Birkenhead, Wirral, CH42 4NL) as he had a close personal connection with a number of residents in Woodcote Bank, and to prevent any potential conflict of interest he subsequently left the meeting for this item.

The Senior Planning Manager declared a personal interest in relation to item five (ADV/26/00958 - Corner of Duke Street and Beckwith Street, Birkenhead, Wirral, CH41 8BB) as his spouse was the Case Officer for this application, and to prevent any potential conflict of interest he subsequently left the meeting for this item.

23 MINUTES

Resolved – That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 13 August 2026 be approved as a correct record.

The Chair suggested changing the order of the agenda to hear item six (5 Woodcote Bank, Higher Bebington, Birkenhead, Wirral, CH42 4NL) as the last item on the agenda. This was agreed by assent. The minutes remain in the order of the agenda.

24 **ADV/26/00958 - CORNER OF DUKE STREET AND BECKWITH STREET,
BIRKENHEAD, WIRRAL, CH41 8BB**

The Senior Planning Manager left the meeting room.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report of the Assistant Director - Chief Planner in relation to the above application. The application proposed a digital advertisement board with a maximum sunrise to sunset luminance level of 2,400cd/m² and maximum sunset to sunrise luminance level of 300cd/m².

A ward Councillor, Councillor Elizabeth Grey addressed the committee.

Members debated the application.

The Chair moved and Councillor Steve Foulkes seconded a motion to refuse the application.

The motion was put to a vote, and it was:

Resolved (unanimously) – That the Assistant Director - Chief Planner be authorised to refuse the application, due to its proposed illuminance levels and its location on a complex junction, which would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety by distracting motor vehicle users and would fail to accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy WS 9 of the Wirral Local Plan.

25 **APPH/26/01027 - 5 WOODCOTE BANK, HIGHER BEBINGTON, BIRKENHEAD,
WIRRAL, CH42 4NL**

Councillor Jason Walsh-McDonald left the meeting room.

The Chair noted that the Scheme of Delegation advised that in the event the Elected Member who called in the application does not register their attention to speak to the item, then consent may be sought from the committee to withdraw the agenda item to enable it to be determined under Officer delegation.

Resolved – That the Planning Committee was content for the application to be withdrawn from the agenda and returned to Officer delegation.

26 **APP/26/00691 - LIGHTHOUSE INN, 228 WALLASEY VILLAGE, WALLASEY,
WIRRAL, CH45 3LP**

The Senior Planning Manager returned to the meeting room.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report of the Assistant Director - Chief Planner in relation to the above application. The application proposed a temporary construction compound, in association with proposed works carried out by United Utilities as a wastewater statutory undertaker for the construction of an underground storm water detention tank.

A ward Councillor, Councillor Ian Lewis addressed the committee.

The applicants addressed the committee and were questioned by Members.

Members debated the application.

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

Resolved (unanimously) – That for the reasons set out in the report, the Assistant Director - Chief Planner be authorised to approve the application subject to the conditions set out below.

Conditions:

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.**
- 2. The use hereby permitted must be discontinued within 15 months of the commencement of the development hereby permitted. Any items (including but not limited to cabins, hard standings, stockpiles of materials, equipment and machinery), associated with the use hereby permitted must be removed from the land on or before that date.**
- 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

80065626-RPT-51071-NA-DR-C-00006-Rev-P09-Proposed-Site-Plan

- 4. The external materials of the cabins and fencing hereby permitted shall be in accordance with those shown in:**

**Sandy Lane Welfare Cabin Details
Sandy Lane CSO Welfare Compound Fencing Examples**

- 5. No development shall commence until details of existing and proposed ground levels and finalised details of the proposed boundary treatment scheme, including the height of the boundary fencing, have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in writing. Thereafter, the approved ground levels and Boundary Treatment Scheme approved within this condition shall be implemented in full for the duration of the development.**
- 6. The Welfare Cabins of the development hereby permitted shall be installed at the ground level approved under Condition 4 of this permission only and no cabins shall be stacked on top of each other or installed on any raised platform.**
- 7. The Dust Control and Topsoil Management measures described in:**

QF3225 Site Environmental Control Plan - Sandy Lane CSO_2026-08-27 (02) Sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.2a shall be implemented in full for the lifetime of the temporary use hereby permitted.

8. The Tree Protection Measures described in: WIR0059SO Sandy Lane Arboricultural Method Statement shall be implemented in full for the lifetime of the temporary use hereby permitted.
9. Prior to six weeks after the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Landscape Restoration Scheme including a timetable of works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved landscaping scheme shall include:

Planting Plans

Phasing for Landscaping Scheme implementation and completion, including the proposed remediation of the land after the temporary use has ceased and all items have been removed from the land in accordance with condition 2 attached to this permission.

All planting, seeding and/or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out no later than the first planting and seeding seasons following the demobilisation of the site, and any trees, shrubs, hedges or plants which within a period of five years from the occupation of the site die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

10. The following Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) shall be undertaken during the construction phase of the development hereby permitted: 1. Existing vegetation on the site will be gradually cut and removed under ecological supervision to encourage any amphibians to move away from the affected areas; 2. The working area, together with any storage areas, will be kept clear of debris, and any stored materials will be kept off the ground on pallets so as to prevent amphibians from seeking shelter or protection within them; and 3. Any open excavations (e.g. foundations / footings / service trenches etc) will be covered with plywood sheeting (or similar) at the end of each working day. The edges of these sheets will be covered with a thick layer of topsoil or similar) to prevent (amphibians/mammals) from seeking shelter beneath them. Any excavation must be in-filled and made good to ground level with compacted stone or similar at the earliest opportunity, so as to remove any hazard to amphibians/mammals.
11. No shrub or hedgerow felling is to be carried out on the site between 1 March and 31 August in any year. If it is necessary to undertake works during the bird breeding season then all buildings, trees, scrub, hedgerows and vegetation are to be checked first by an appropriately experienced ecologist to ensure no breeding birds are present. If present, details of how they will be protected are required to be submitted for approval.
12. The Red Fox Translocation Scheme:

Red Fox Translocation Scheme Dated 28/08/2026 shall be implemented in full prior to any works taking place on the site and shall be adhered to for the lifetime of the temporary use hereby permitted.

13. The Invasive Species measures described in:

QF3225 Site Environmental Control Plan - Sandy Lane CSO_2026-08-27 (02) Section 4.6.1 shall be implemented in full for the lifetime of the temporary use hereby permitted.

14. No development shall commence until a Bat Lighting Scheme for the developed area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall: a. identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and b. show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places. All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

15. The Highways Safety and Waste Management mitigation measures within the red edge and described in:

Car Park Management Plan Rev B (005) Sandy Lane Lighthouse Public House Sections 3-8 shall be implemented in full for the lifetime of the development.

16. The site will not be brought into first use until finalised details of security arrangements have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority in writing. Thereafter the approved security arrangements shall be implemented at all times throughout the lifetime of the temporary use hereby permitted.

27 APP/26/00814 - GROVE HOUSE HOTEL, 45 GROVE ROAD, WALLASEY VILLAGE, WIRRAL

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report of the Assistant Director - Chief Planner in relation to the above application. The application regarded full planning consent for the change of use of the premises to a hostel on a permanent basis.

A ward Councillor, Councillor Ian Lewis addressed the committee.

The applicant's agent addressed the committee.

Members debated the application.

On a motion by the Chair and seconded by Councillor Louise Luxon-Kewley, it was:

Resolved (unanimously) – That for the reasons set out in the report, the Assistant Director - Chief Planner be authorised to approve the application subject to the conditions set out below.

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans received by the local planning authority and listed as follows:

 'Existing -Location Plan', 2096-ABWA-XX-00-DR-A-(00)0001 Rev P01, received 1st July 2026;

 'Proposed Cycle Provision', 2096-ABWA-Z1-ZZ-DR-A-(38)0100, received 1st July 2026; and

 'Proposed - Floor Plans', 2096-ABWA-Z1-ZZ-DR-A-(20)0100, received 1st July 2026.
3. There shall be no more than 18 rooms with a maximum of 36 residents provided at any time, in accordance with the details submitted and shown on plan reference; 'Proposed - Floor Plans', 2096-ABWA-Z1-ZZ-DR-A-(20)0100.
4. The approved cycle parking showing on submitted drawing 'Proposed Cycle Provision', 2096-ABWA-Z1-ZZ-DR-A-(38)0100 shall be implemented and made available for use within 3 months of the decision date of the development and shall thereafter be retained.

28 **APP/26/00418 - NORTHCROFT, 282 - 284 TELEGRAPH ROAD, HESWALL, WIRRAL, CH60 7SG**

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report of the Assistant Director - Chief Planner in relation to the above application. The application proposed demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuilding and the proposed erection of 5No. apartments, together with single storey outbuilding to provide 5No. garages, and associated landscaping, improved access, parking, refuse and cycle storage (amended description and drawings).

The applicant's agent addressed the committee and was questioned by Members.

Members debated the application.

Resolved (unanimously) – That for the reasons set out in the report:

- 1. The Assistant Director – Chief Planner be authorised to approve the application subject to the following conditions and subject to the completion of an agreement pursuant to section 106 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 to be prepared, in accordance with section 8.10 of this report**
- 2. That the Assistant Director-Chief Planner be authorised to refuse the application in the event that a satisfactory section 106 agreement is not received within 6 months of the date on which Planning Committee resolve to approve the application unless an extension of time is agreed to the satisfaction of the Assistant Director-Chief Planner in consultation with the Chair and Spokespersons of the Planning Committee.**

Conditions:

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than [3] years from the date of this decision.**
- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans received by the local planning authority on 18 August 2026 and listed as follows:**
 - 1008.P12.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P13.B (dated 18.08.2026)**
 - 1008.P14.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P15.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P16.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P17.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P18.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P19.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P21.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
 - 1008.P23.A (dated 23.07.2026)**
- 3. No development shall take place until a Sustainable Drainage Strategy and associated detailed design, management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using SuDS methods, and demonstrating that the sustainable drainage hierarchy has been followed, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Sustainable Drainage**

Strategy prior to the use of the building commencing and maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

- 4. No development above ground floor level shall take place until full details of swift bricks for nesting birds has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details**
- 5. No development involving the use of any facing materials shall take place until full details (including samples, where required) of the materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces of the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**
- 6. Prior to first occupation of the dwelling(s) hereby approved, full details of the alterations to the side boundary wall (facing Poll Hill Road) including materials and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The alterations to the side boundary wall shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and retained as such thereafter.**
- 7. Prior to first occupation of the dwelling(s) hereby approved, full details of secure, lockable and covered cycle parking and/or storage facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

These facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be retained for use at all times thereafter.

- 8. Prior to first occupation of the development, full details of the photovoltaics' design, appearance and the method of installation on the garage roofs shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of each dwelling.**
- 9. Apartments 4 and 5 hereby approved shall not be occupied until full details (including materials and height) of the privacy screens to the southeast facing side elevation of the balconies have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screens shall be installed in accordance with the approved details, before the first occupation of apartments 4 and 5 and thereafter shall be retained**
- 10. The flat roof of the development hereby permitted (with the exception of the balconies as shown on drawing 1008.P14.A dated 23.07.2026) shall not be used as a balcony or similar outdoor amenity area.**

- 11. The development hereby approved shall be carried out with finished floor levels and surrounding ground levels across the site in accordance with the levels shown on the approved Proposed Site Plan (dwg no. 1008.P13.B), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the relevant works.**
- 12. The landscaping plan (dwg no. 7630.01 dated April 2025) included at Appendix B of the submitted Landscape Management Plan (TBA Landscape Architects dated March 2025) shall be carried out no later than the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner.**

Any trees, shrubs, hedges or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 13. As a precautionary measure the following Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) are required to ensure that the site is kept unattractive to terrestrial mammals during construction works and to minimise any harm to terrestrial mammals which may be present in the vicinity:**
 - A pre-commencement check for terrestrial mammals;**
 - Work only allowed between 8am and 6pm;**
 - Any holes or trenches dug during the course of construction works and left open overnight must provide a means of escape (e.g. a ramp) for any animal which may fall in;**
 - Any temporary exposed open pipe system should be capped in such a way as to prevent terrestrial mammals gaining access whilst the contractors are off-site; and**
 - Materials used during the construction works, especially those containing lime, should be stored away from terrestrial mammals pathways so that terrestrial mammals cannot access them**
- 14. No tree felling, scrub clearance, hedgerow removal, vegetation management, ground clearance and/or building works is to take place during the period 1 March to 31 August inclusive. If it is necessary to undertake works during the bird breeding season then all buildings, trees, scrub, hedgerows, and vegetation are to be checked first by an appropriately experienced ecologist to ensure no breeding birds are present. If present, details of how they will be protected are required to be submitted for approval.**
- 15. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement as set out at Appendix 5 of the submitted 'Tree Solutions' Arboricultural Impact**

Assessment (dated April 2025) and the accompanying Tree Protection Plan at Appendix 4 at all times during construction.

- 16. 100% of the dwellings hereby approved shall be accessible and adaptable (in accordance with M4(2) of the Building Regulations).**
- 17. The dwellings hereby permitted shall incorporate water efficiency measures to achieve usage of no more than 110 litres of water per person per day under Part G of Schedule 1 and regulation 36 of The Building Regulations 2010. No occupation of any dwelling shall take place until a Building Regulations assessment confirms that the development has been constructed in accordance with Part G of Schedule 1 and regulation 36 of the Building Regulations 2010 for water efficiency and has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**
- 18. The measures outlined in the Digital Connectivity Statement (dated April 2026 by MF Architecture) shall be adhered to in full.**

Planning Committee	7 October 2026
---------------------------	-----------------------

Reference:	PS Development Code	Case Officer:	Ward:
APP/25/00915	Q20 - Change of use	Mrs S Lacey	Hoylake and Meols

Location:	Kingsmead Swimming Pool Carlton Lane, Hoylake, Wirral, CH47 0LL
Proposal:	Change of use of the building and land from a former Kingsmead Private School swimming pool, annexe buildings and teaching rooms (Use Class F1) to a new leisure and wellness facility with a mixed use and cafe space, Class F2 and Class E (Amended plans received to provide additional parking and access to parking from Bertram Drive)
Applicant:	Ms Helen Diamond
Agent:	Ms Danielle Booth

Reason for referral to Planning Committee	Qualifying petitions of objection and support received. The application was deferred from Planning Committee on 13th August to allow for further consideration of the parking provision
--	--

Site Plan:



1. Development Plan designation:	Primarily Residential Area Neighbourhood Forum Area Settlement Area 6 - West Kirby and Hoylake Viability Zone 4 Residential Density Zone RES-DZ3 Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zone
---	---

2. Relevant Planning History:	APP/25/01131 - Following an application to Change of use of the building and land from a former Kingsmead Private School swimming pool, annexe buildings and teaching rooms (Use Class F1) to a new leisure and wellness facility with a mixed use and cafe space, Class F2 and Class E (Ref APP/25/00915) , the proposal seeks to create 2no. new single storey extensions to create a new main entrance porch and a swimming pool viewing/seating area for the swimming pool users – decision pending until application APP/25/00915 determined
--------------------------------------	---

3. Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received:

3.1 Ward Member Comments	Councillor Cox raised concerns the proposal would be an enormous imposition on residents, particularly as the opening hours are likely to be much greater than that of the school, as was. He requested confirmation the site has a right of access down Carlton Lane, which it does.
3.2 Summary of Representations	<u>REPRESENTATIONS</u> Having regard to the Council Guidance on Publicity for Applications and the Statement of Community Involvement, 13no. notification letters were sent to neighbouring properties on 25 June 2025 and 2 site notices were displayed on Birkenhead Road and Carlton Lane on 26 June 2025.
3.2.1	In response, a petition was received on 18 July 2025 objecting to the development signed by 32 individuals from 25 separate addresses and 19 individual representations objecting to the application were received The objections are summarised below: • Inappropriate commercial development in a residential area where the only vehicular access is via the unadopted road Carlton Lane • Noise and disturbance – excessive opening hours, increased traffic, increased pedestrian movement, light pollution, loss of privacy, arguments between residents and parents over parking, noise from exercise classes, noise from café use. • Access and traffic issues via Carlton Lane - Carlton Lane is an unadopted, narrow lane with potholes, no pavements, no passing

	places, no lighting and no drainage. Proposal will increase traffic. It cannot accommodate the anticipated increase in traffic. Up to 160 cars per day, creating serious congestion, safety risks, and conflict with existing residents. Loss of parking for neighbours. Vehicle reversing onto Birkenhead Road. Vehicles speeding presents safety risk to pedestrians. Refuse wagons reverse down Carlton Lane and parked cars once prevented a fire engine from reversing in Carlton Lane. Arguments between residents due to cars blocking the lane have resulted in the police being called out • Insufficient and inadequate parking provision – only 8 parking spaces proposed, with possibly 5 used by staff, leaving insufficient capacity for visitors. There is no provision for disabled access, EV charging, or secure cycle parking, resulting in overspill parking. There is a second retrospective application for an unauthorised car park. • Lack of Travel Plan – would highlight access requirements for emergency services • Ecological damage – mature trees and hedgerows were removed during nesting season without ecological surveys, potentially destroying wildlife habitats of bats and protected species like the Natterjack Toad and Pipistrelle Bat. No EIA or BNG assessments. • Retrospective nature and disregard for planning procedures • Air pollution and air quality deterioration • Potentially breaching existing covenants • Lack of public consultation from applicant and Council • Concerns regarding the future maintenance of Carlton Lane • Conflict with neighbouring commercial use, no mitigation proposed. Safeguarding risks • This is a town centre use with other gyms and classes in Hoylake and West Kirby • Increase in neighbours' insurance premiums • Potential damage to property and concerns of the impact of the condition of the lane. • Potential asbestos risk during demolition • There was a dismissed Planning Inspectorate decision in 1999 on the grounds of traffic and highway safety • Inadequate bin provision, increased litter, smells, vermin
3.2.3	An online petition of support which has reached 1142 signatures at the time of writing this report and 22 individual representations of support were received. The representation of support are summarised below: • The swimming pool, once a lively place for families and schools, will be refurbished to become fully inclusive, ensuring everyone has the chance to learn to swim—a vital life skill—and enjoy the benefits of being active in water. • Multi-purpose studios for yoga, Pilates, and a variety of community activities, creating spaces for wellness and social gatherings. These amenities are essential for bringing people together, fostering community spirit, and contributing to the well-being of Hoylake's residents.

	• Improving the local quality of life and an investment in the future of the community. • Appropriate use given the previous use as a boarding school • Saltwater is more accessible for people with sensitivities • Better re-use of the site than allowing it to deteriorate or developing into flats or a supermarket. • Providing jobs • The applicant is a professional and long-established swim school owner
3.2.4	The applicant amended the drawings to address highway concerns. This involved extending the red boundary and therefore a second neighbour consultation was undertaken, with additional neighbours to address the new boundary. 26 neighbours were notified on 24 June 2026 and 3 site notice were displayed 29 June 2026 on Bertram Drive, Birkenhead Road and Carlton Lane.
3.2.5	12 additional objections were received. Many of the objections repeated the previous objections received regarding the significant increase in public access and the highway safety and amenity issues relating to this. Additional objections are as follows: • The transport technical note portrays the development as a continuation of the previous activities but the claims are inaccurate, exaggerated and unsupported (eg the operating hours) and direct comparisons cannot be made. Non-compliance emergency vehicle access. • There is no evidence the applicant has the legal authority to undertake the resurfacing mitigation works to Carlton Lane • The amended plans increasing the number of parking spaces represents a further intensification on Carlton Lane • When the site was part of the school there was severe congestion, blocked access, cars abandoned in the lane, police attendance – the proposal will worsen this • Since the removal of 7 matures trees and hedgerows there is a complete absence of bats – no assessment to address this loss • Carlton Lane is unadopted and likely a private lane – no evidence has been provided to demonstrate the developer holds a legal easement and commercial use of Carlton Lane may constitute trespass and the use unlawful. • There is a further planning application in to extend the building's footprint • Application APP/25/01000 for a car park on Carlton Lane refused on highway safety grounds and harm to residential amenity • Enlarged car park adjacent to homes • Car park spaces too small and proposed number of spaces unrealistic • Inaccuracies such as Carlton Lane has passing points and the lane width is 0.6m narrower than claimed

	Unlike a school, which generally operates under a single management structure with relatively predictable arrival and departure periods, the proposed development is capable of generating activity throughout the day and evening, with differing session lengths, varying arrival and departure times, and potentially overlapping occupancies.
3.2.6	92 additional representations of support were received reinstating support for the inclusive health and wellbeing community use and the benefits of providing swimming opportunities for everyone, specifically SEND swimming provision for children and adults. Other benefits noted include bringing a building back to life and the wider economic and social benefits for the area.

	<u>CONSULTATIONS</u> Highways - No objection to the amended parking arrangements and the scheme as a whole subject to conditions. Environmental Health - No objection. Hoylake Neighbourhood Forum – Object due to insufficient information on environmental impacts. Loss of trees and hedgerows. BNG required. Fire Service – No objection, requested an informative
--	--

4. Site and Surroundings	
4.1	The site comprises of two single-storey buildings; a swimming pool (with changing rooms, kitchen area and 2no. former science classrooms) and a detached building which was a former office and maths classroom facility. These buildings were all previously used in connection with Kingsmead School, which has been closed since 2020. The site also has an un-marked car park to the front.

4.2



Site visit June 2025 - buildings and car park

4.3

The site is located on Carlton Lane, which is a narrow, unadopted road with no pavements, accessed off Birkenhead Road. There are residential properties along Carlton Lane, together with a building to the north of the site which is used to provide a service to support children with complex additional needs and their families.

4.4



Site visit March 2026 - Carlton Lane access

4.5

The site is designated as a Primarily Residential Area. As noted, there are residential properties along Carlton Lane, and there are residential properties to the rear of the site on Sandringham Road and on Bertram Drive.

4.6

The site is close to Hoylake Town Centre, and the surrounding area contains other non-residential uses within the residential area including a

	petrol filling station, dental practices, churches, nursery, verts and tennis club.
5. Proposed Development	
5.1	The application proposes the change of use of the building and land from a former Kingsmead Private School swimming pool, annexe buildings and teaching rooms (Use Class F1) to a new leisure and wellness facility and cafe space (Class F2 and Class E). The change of use will require minor external alterations.
5.2	 Site visit March 2026 – pool renovation The swimming pool is currently being refurbished and upgraded to a saltwater pool, which the applicant claims is one of the few examples in the north-west and offers health benefits including eliminating large amounts of chlorine and chemicals.
5.3	The applicant submitted amended plans to address highway concerns to provide additional parking and pedestrian access to parking from Bertram Drive. Following the concerns raised by Planning Committee Members on 13 th August 2026, the number of parking spaces provided in the existing car park accessed from Carlton Lane has been reduced to 10no. spaces and 3no. DDA spaces (13no. spaces in total) and there will be provision for cycle storage and bin storage. A pedestrian walkway will be provided to Bertram Drive where there are an additional 10no. parking spaces (though not exclusive for the use of the leisure use). This will result in 23no. parking spaces in total.

5.4



Proposed site plan 16D (as amended)

6. Development Plan

6.1

Under the provisions of section 70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the provisions of the NPPF (paragraph 2) applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The statutory development plan at present consists of the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31st March 2025) and the Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside and Halton (adopted 18 July 2013).

6.2

The following Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31st March 2025) Policies are relevant to the determination of this planning application:

- WS6 - Placemaking for Wirral
- WS7 - Principles of Design
- WS9 - Strategy for Transport
- WS 11 - Strategy for Town, District and Local Centres
- WP6 - Settlement Area 6
- WD8 - Specialist Housing
- WD10 - Development in Primarily Residential Areas
- WD22 - Servicing and Parking in Development
- WD23 - Design Details

Appendix 8 Parking Standards, Transport Assessment and Travel Plan Thresholds

7. Other Material Planning Considerations	
7.1	<u>National Planning Policy Framework (2026)</u> The updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports sustainable development which takes opportunities to improve the quality and character of the area by supporting improved community facilities and promoting healthy communities. It also aims to ensure the vitality of town centres. Chapter 3- Decision making policies (policy DM3 & DM6) Chapter 4 - Achieving sustainable development (policies S3 & S4) Chapter 8 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres (policy TC3 & TC4) Chapter 12 - Making effective use of land (policies L2) Chapter 14 - Achieving well-designed places (policy DP3) Chapter 15 - Promoting sustainable transport (policies TR3, TR4 & TR6) Chapter 16 – Promoting healthy communities (policies HC4, HC6) Chapter 17 - Pollution, public protection and security (policy P3) Chapter 19 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (policies N2 & N3) The National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance are material considerations in the determination of all planning applications. The Framework sets out a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’, which means development which is consistent with the development plan should be granted without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Planning decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The NPPF directs commercial uses into Town Centres and requires a Sequential Assessment to justify out of centre development.
7.2	<u>Supplementary Planning Document 4: Parking Standards (SPD4) June 2004</u> Sets out maximum parking standards and requires cycle parking provision.
7.3	<u>Tree, Hedgerow and Woodland Strategy 2020-2030 (hereafter referred to as The Tree Strategy)</u>

	Seeks to retain and protect trees and hedgerows and encourage sustainable planting.
--	---

8. Assessment	
8.1.1	The main issues pertinent in the assessment of the proposal are: • Principle of Development • Visual Appearance and Design • Amenity • Ecology, Biodiversity and Trees • Traffic and Transportation

8.2 Principle of Development	
8.2.1	The application site is an existing swimming pool within a designated Primarily Residential Area. Local Plan policy WD10 permits development in Primarily Residential Areas which are of an appropriate scale and will not result in a detrimental change in the character of the area or cause a nuisance to neighbouring uses.
8.2.2	The NPPF directs the majority of commercial uses into Town Centres and policy TC3 requires a Sequential Assessment to justify out of centre development. The applicant supplied a Sequential Assessment setting out that the existing teaching rooms and pool are highly suitable for the proposal as no major alterations are required to bring the building back to a functioning suitable use. The proposal is located in a suitable and sustainable area for the local community and already has a car park and wider transport connections making access suitable by car, walking, train, bus and cycling. The applicant searched several sites and found this site fit for purpose, on the edge of a town centre and for sale. The application will guard against the loss of a valued facility and make effective use of the land. There were no other viable available commercial premises in the immediate or wider local area. The primary consideration is that the swimming pool is existing and this is accepted.
8.2.3	The proposal is not considered to compromise the long-term development of Hoylake town centre in accordance with WS 11 Strategy for Town, District and Local Centres. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to the further assessment of the relevant policies.

8.3 Visual Appearance and Design	
8.3.1	The only minor external alterations proposed include a ramp to the entrance for access, a pedestrian gate and bin/bike storage which are subordinate in scale and acceptable. It is therefore considered that there

	would be no significant effect on the external appearance of the building and the street scene would not be adversely affected.
8.3.2	The creation of a new car park will have limited impact on the character of the area, with the street scene of Carlton Lane already containing other areas of hardstanding. It is therefore considered that the proposal will not harm the appearance of the site or the character of the area and the design implications therefore accord with policies WS6, WS7, WD10 and WD23 of the Wirral Local Plan.

8.4 Amenity	
8.4.1	Consideration has been given to the impact on neighbouring amenity. Policy WD10 states that development for non-residential uses will only be permitted in Primarily Residential Areas where they would be of an appropriate scale and not result in a detrimental change in the character of the area or cause a nuisance to neighbouring uses. Similarly, the NPPF states that all development must respond to the prevailing local character of an area.
8.4.2	As noted, the application site forms part of the Kingsmead School site, which was an independent school for day and boarding pupils, but closed in 2020. Kingsmead school was a private school opened in 1904 and the swimming pool and senior block were constructed around 1980. The GOV.UK website sets out the school had a capacity for 325 pupils and had nursery and sixth form provision.
8.4.3	The swimming pool was primarily used by the school for pupils. However, it is understood to have also been used by other organisations and the general public throughout the week and at weekends to provide the school with a secondary income. This included use of the office room for storage as required. Therefore, whilst the swimming pool remained incidental to the wider school site, its ancillary use outside of school hours by non-school organisations has been well established.
8.4.4	The application site is located on Carlton Lane which, as noted, is a narrow access with no pavements accessed off Birkenhead Road. There are residential properties along the lane, some of which have front doors directly opening onto the lane. Carlton Lane leads to a track with access across the railway line to the fields beyond, and is also the primary access point for AJ and Friends (a non-residential, community use located within another former part of Kingsmead School) – therefore, whilst it is a narrow, unadopted road, it does have reasonable levels of traffic. Although the primary access for the school is on Bertram Drive, a Land Registry search confirmed the school also does have a right of access across Carlton Lane.
8.4.5	The proposal is to continue the swimming pool use and provide fitness classes (including personal training sessions, yoga and Pilate classes) and a café. At full occupancy, the applicant advises that there will be capacity for approximately 69no. persons on site.
8.4.6	When considering if the proposal to change from a F1 use to a F2 use is acceptable, consideration must be given to the effect of any change in the character of the land and the degree of intensification of use. In particular

	the effect of proposed traffic and pedestrian movements along Carlton Lane and outdoor noise associated with the comings and goings of users of the facility on the living conditions of neighbours along Carlton Lane.
8.4.7	Under policy WD 10, consideration has been given to noise and disturbance, and whether it is of a level that would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties or would change the character of the residential area.
8.4.8	Given the previous use as a school and the ancillary activities associated with the site, it is considered that the level of noise and disturbance associated with the continued pool use and fitness classes/café within the building itself will be similar.
8.4.9	The proposed swimming pool will not be extended. It is approximately 163m ² with a maximum capacity of 20 persons. This will ensure that the use of the site and the associated amenity implications, is largely restricted due to the size of the swimming pool. Noise during swimming lessons will be contained by the building. Noise from the car park may occur (car doors banging, people chatting) but the additional car park is within the boundary of the site, and this will limit the impact. Whilst there may be a greater use of the pool (in terms of how often it is used throughout the day), the amenity and noise impact from the pool use itself is considered acceptable. The potential impact from increased traffic is considered in further detail below.
8.4.10	The former 3no. science and maths rooms will become wellness and fitness studios, available for Personal Training sessions, Yoga and Pilates classes and dance/gymnastic classes. The applicant has provided approximate capacity figures for each room. Room 1 measures 39m ² and can occupy 5no. students and 1no. teacher. Room 2 measures 78m ² and at maximum capacity can occupy 15no. students/1no. instructor. Room 3 measures 52m ² and can occupy 8no. students and 1no. instructor. These activities will not be noise intensive and are unlikely to impact residential amenity.
8.4.11	The intensification of the site, and thus the main amenity impact, will primarily come from the additional vehicle/pedestrian movements along Carlton Lane.
8.4.12	The applicant has proposed hours of opening of: Monday – Saturday 08:00am – 21:00; Sundays and Bank Holidays 09:00 - 19:30. These daytime hours are not unsociable hours and are considered reasonable and will ensure that any limited increased activity and associated noise will be at a reasonable time of day. Further to this, it is stated that swimming lessons have operated 9am-9pm previously. Whilst objections dispute this, what cannot be disputed is that the hours of use of the swimming pool under its current use (as an ancillary facility to the school which is also used by external bodies) is not controlled through the planning process. It is therefore proposed to secure the hours of use now proposed through a condition. This will avoid activity later at night or early in the morning, when residents should expect peace and quiet.
8.4.13	Whilst it is accepted that some customers will travel by car, it is also reasonable to assume that some residents of Hoylake and Meols will walk to the facility. Customers regularly attending by car would be aware of the

	narrow access and parking situation and may choose to park on Birkenhead Road or the surrounding side streets. The relatively small-scale nature of the proposal and its nature should mean that it will primarily be a local facility which customers will walk to. The pedestrian access from Bertram Drive and footpath via Sandringham Close will also allow users to access the site on foot or bicycle and this will further lessen the potential impact from cars travelling down Carlton Lane.
8.4.14	There are no records of the frequency of use of Carlton Lane when used as a school. It is, nevertheless, accepted that the frequency of vehicles and pedestrians passing in close proximity to the neighbouring dwellings will increase, which will cause some noise and disturbance. It is noted, however, that cars travelling along Carlton Lane will likely travel slowly due to the unmade nature of the lane and this will lessen noise impact to some effect.
8.4.15	Consideration must also be given to the existing use which would have involved movements of school pupils, school staff, deliveries and swimming club users. This is essentially an existing facility and although there will be an intensification of the site, the re-use of the swimming pool and associated building for a similar use is considered to be the most appropriate and sustainable form of development for this site. There is simply no alternative vehicular access to the application site other than via Carlton Lane, which the site has a right of access over. It is not considered that a relatively minor increase in noise to these properties, during daytime hours, is sufficient reason to warrant refusal of the application.
8.4.16	Furthermore, weight is given to the community and health benefits of the proposed development, in accordance with both the Wirral Local Plan and the NPPF.
8.4.17	Policy WS 6 (Placemaking for Wirral) encourages development proposals that promote healthy and active lifestyles, vibrant communities, and which contribute positively to the efficient revitalisation and regeneration of existing neighbourhoods. The proposal will provide health benefits for the local community and will contribute towards a vibrant community by re-purposing a swimming pool which would otherwise be left vacant or demolished. The proposal is therefore in accordance with WS 6.
8.4.18	The NPPF also promotes healthy and safe communities and sets out that planning decisions should enable and support healthy lives through promoting good health by providing sports facilities. Policy HC4 sets out substantial weight should be given to the benefits where an improved community facility, such as recreation facilities and meeting places, would be provided and would make a demonstrable contribution towards promoting good health, preventing ill-health, reducing health inequalities and supporting social interaction in the local community. Developments should be inclusive and reflect user needs. Providing social and recreational facilities that serve the local community enhances the sustainability of a residential environment. Access to opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities and the refurbishment of the swimming pool and provision of classes will benefit the community.. The application proposes the modernisation of an established pool facility and expansion of provision

	with public health benefits, which is considered to benefit the community. The applicant intends the pool to be inclusive to ensure everyone has the chance to learn to swim and provide SEND swimming provision for children and adults. Significant weight is therefore attributed to the health and community benefits of the proposal, in accordance with the guidance set out within the NPPF.
8.4.19	Overall, it is considered that the re-use of the existing buildings for leisure uses is the most suitable and sustainable use of the site. Consideration has been given to the narrow access of Carlton Lane and amenity implications on neighbouring properties and, on balance, the benefits of the proposed use are considered to outweigh the potentially minor amenity impact on neighbouring properties. The site and the proposed use is relatively modest in scale and the increase in traffic is not considered to be significant to the extent of causing substantial harm to residential amenity. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy WD 10 of the Wirral Local Plan.
8.4.20	<u>Café</u> The proposed cafe would occupy approximately 26m2 floorspace and would operate within the opening times of the leisure use. Objections were received that the café will attract more people and traffic, but whilst the cafe would be open to the public it would likely be primarily used by carers/users visiting the leisure use as a linked visit before/during/after a class, and given its relatively secluded location off the main road it is unlikely to attract a substantial number of the general public, especially given the close proximity to Hoylake Town Centre and the alternative provision available there. It is considered reasonable and necessary to condition the amount of floorspace used as café area.
8.4.21	<u>Summary</u> The existing use is a material consideration and, on balance, when the proposed use is compared to the existing use, it is not considered that the proposal would have significant harmful impacts on the amenity of neighbouring amenity, in terms of noise and disturbance. It is therefore considered that the proposal adequately accords with Policy WD10 of the Wirral Local Plan, and provisions of the NPPF, insofar as they relate to residential amenity.

8.5 Ecology, Biodiversity and Trees	
8.5.1	The proposed car park extension impacts biodiversity and a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is required. A BNG report and metric were submitted and the baseline calculations have been validated. It is noted that degradation occurred in 2022. These habitats have been added into the assessment via aerial photos and street views and assessed on an assumed basis, as is standard practice. There will be an on-site net loss of habitat units and an on-site net gain of hedgerow units. Therefore, limited off-site units will be required and secured by the deemed condition

	under paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
8.5.2	Objections were raised previously that trees and hedgerows have been removed on site, but no protected trees are present on site and, in any case, there are no trees being removed as part of this planning application itself.

8.6 Traffic and Transportation	
8.6.1	Wirral Local Plan Appendix 8 (Parking Standards, Transport Assessment and Travel Plan Thresholds) sets out minimum parking standards for F2 swimming baths as 1 space per 25m ² . There is approximately 549m ² of buildings included within the proposal and this equates to an approximate parking requirement of 22 spaces. Following discussions during the application process and at Planning Committee in August 2026, the applicant now proposes to extend the car park to create 13 on-site parking spaces (including 3 DDA spaces). The spaces also now measure 2.7m x 5m, which exceeds the Wirral standard. Following further discussions, an additional 10 spaces will also now be made available within the main school site on Bertram Drive. Whilst these spaces are not for the exclusive use of the proposed development, they will provide an element of overspill parking for customers to use. As such, the proposal for 23 parking spaces is considered to broadly accord with Appendix 8 of the Wirral Local Plan, although this would rely upon the continued availability of the parking spaces at Bertram Drive.
8.6.2	The Council's Traffic and Transportation team were consulted and concluded that the development is unlikely to result in any significant increase in traffic associated with the building. Due to the number of parking spaces proposed and the potential that not all parking may be accommodated on-site (prior to the inclusion of the Bertram Drive car park), a Parking Beat Survey was requested to be carried out. This Survey was undertaken on two days in May 2026 and adequately demonstrated that there is sufficient on street parking capacity to cover any overspill, in the event of it occurring.
8.6.3	The submitted Car Park Management Plan outlines how both the Carlton Lane and Betram Drive car parks will be managed. The Bertram Drive Car Park is gated and will be closed when the facilities are closed. The pedestrian link between Bertram Drive Car Park and Carlton Lane will also be closed at these times. A condition is attached to ensure that the Bertram Drive Car Park and pedestrian link remains open and available for use at all times when the proposed use is open to the public. The Carlton Lane car park is an open fronted car park to allow for vehicular turning and access for emergency vehicles. Vehicle tracking supplied shows this to work. Outside of opening hours the car park will likely be empty or have low occupancy.
8.6.4	Management and monitoring of both parking sites will be done in house by Kingsmead Leisure, together with the School Trust team. The following measures are proposed:

	• Installation of signs within the car parking areas in proximity to the spaces, which will display the parking restrictions on site which will be clearly visible • CCTV surveillance • Enforced private ticketing with booking system
8.6.5	Overall, the proposed Car Park Management Plan is proportionate and appropriate for the development and has sought to build upon existing arrangements, and is considered adequate to ensure that the car parks are managed in a way that will ensure the parking spaces will be made available for use by customers of the proposed use at all times.
8.6.6	The proposal accords with policy TR4 of the NPPF which encourages sustainable transport above car journeys. The site is within a residential area and will encourage walking. It is within 650m of a train station and within 150m of bus stops on Birkenhead Road. In addition, a condition has been attached to secure 11 cycle parking spaces, in accordance with Appendix 8 of the Wirral Local Plan, and this will support customers using alternative and more sustainable forms of transport to visit the site. This is not only a sustainable transport benefit but will also have the potential to lessen the number of cars, and potential amenity impacts, using Carlton Lane.
	Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service were consulted on the application and had no objection to the application. The minimum width of 3.7m, required under Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document B, is met along Carlton Lane and the submitted Proposed Site Plan Fire Strategy demonstrates an emergency vehicle has the ability to reach and adequately turn around in the site. The improved, formal turning facility is also considered a benefit.
8.6.7	On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development will not result in unacceptable highway safety implications and would provide adequate levels of parking when considering the nature of the use, the level of parking provided within the site itself and at Bertram Drive, and the provision of cycle parking facilities. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with Wirral Local Plan Policy WS 9 and policy TR4 of the NPPF.

8.7 Other Matters	
8.7.1	Objections quoted a refused planning application for a dwelling on Carlton Lane which was dismissed at appeal. Direct comparisons cannot be made as this appeal decision is nearly 30 years old, determined under a different planning policy and was for a new house rather than the current proposal which relates to the re-use of a similar existing use. Similarly, reference was made to a recent refusal for a car park further down Carlton Lane – however, this proposed a completely new car park facility for 11 spaces, significantly more than the increase proposed under this application, which also relates to an established facility that already benefits from elements of parking. In any case, each application is assessed on its own merits and against current planning policy and the

	Council's Traffic and Transportation team are satisfied with the highway and parking implications of the scheme.
8.7.2	Objections were received citing the proposal may breach legal covenants and easements. This would be a separate matter and is not covered by planning remit. A neighbour notification was carried out in accordance with the Council's Guidance on Publicity for Applications (November 2023). Objections including suspected asbestos and insurance premiums rising do not fall within planning remit, whilst it is not anticipated that the proposal would result in an increase in litter.

9. Summary of Decision (Planning Balance)	
9.1	Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Having regards to the individual merits of this application this recommendation has been made having regards to the relevant Policies and Proposals in the Wirral Local Plan (Adopted 31st March 2025), Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside and Halton and all relevant material considerations including national policy advice. In reaching this decision the Local Planning Authority has considered the following: -
9.2	Weighing the planning balance, the scheme's social and economic benefits would be considerable and the proposal would broadly accord with policies in the Wirral Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework which promote healthy and active lifestyles. The proposal is acceptable in scale and as the overall character of the use will not significantly alter from the previous lawful use the impact on living conditions for residents of the properties on Carlton Lane would not significantly be affected. The proposal is in a sustainable location close to bus and rail links and sufficient parking is provided within the application site, together with cycle parking. The proposal therefore complies with the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31st March 2025) as a whole, including policies WS 7, WS 11, WD 10, WD 21, WD 22, WD 23 and Appendix 8, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Recommended Decision:	That the Assistant Director- Chief Planner be authorised to approve the application subject to the conditions set out below:
----------------------------------	--

Recommended Conditions and Reasons:
1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans received 20 June 2025 and the amended plans received by the local planning authority on 23 June and 15 July 2026 and the 10 September 2026 listed as follows:

25-019-01 Rev D Site Location Plan (dated 23-03-2026)

25-019-02 Rev A Existing Plans Office Block (dated 17-06-2025)

25-019-03 Rev A Existing Plans Swimming Pool (dated 17-06-2025)

25-019-04 Rev A Existing Roof Plan Swimming Pool (dated 17-06-2025)

25-019-05 Rev H Existing Site Plan (dated 18-05-2026)

25-019-06 Rev A Proposed Floor Plans Office and Studio (dated 17-06-2025)

25-019-07 Rev B Proposed Floor Plans Swimming Pool (dated 17-06-2025)

25-019-08 Rev N Proposed Site Plan (dated 03-08-2026)

25-019-09 Rev D Existing Site Plan Drainage (dated 18-05-2026)

25-019-10 Rev J Proposed Site Plan Refuse (dated 10-09-2026)

25-019-11 Rev H Proposed Site Plan Pedestrian Gate (dated 10-09-2026)

25-019-12 Rev C Existing Site Plan Fire Strategy (dated 23-03-2026)

25-019-13 Rev F Proposed Site Plan Fire Strategy (dated 10-09-2026)

25-019-14 Rev A Existing Site Plan Overall Site (dated 18-05-2026)

25-019-15 Rev D Proposed Site Plan Overall Site (dated 10-09-2026)

25-019-16 Rev D Proposed Site Plan Transport Routes (dated 10-09-2026)

25-019-17 Rev A Existing Site Plan Lighting and Security (dated 18-05-2026)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to define the permission

3. The use hereby permitted shall only take place between the following hours:

Monday – Saturday 08:00 – 21:00

Sundays and Bank Holidays 09:00 – 19:30

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity having regards to Policy WD 10 the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2025)

4. The proposed cafe shall not have a floorspace (including any areas used for tables for customers) greater than 26m²

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity to accord with Policy WD 10 the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2025)

5. The provisions of the Car Park Management Plan (amended version Rev C received 10 September 2026, or any revised version otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall be implemented and adhered to at all times when the proposed use is open to the public

Reason: In the interest of highway safety having regards to Policy WS 9 of the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31st March 2025)

6. The Bertram Drive Car Park and the pedestrian footpath between Carlton Lane and Bertram Drive (as shown on drawing 25-019-15 Rev D - Proposed Site Plan Overall Site) shall be made available for use prior to first use of the development permitted and at all times during the opening hours of the use thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of highway and pedestrian safety having regards to Policy WS 9 of the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2025)

7. The existing lighting and security shown on drawing no 25-019-17 Rev A Existing Site Plan Lighting and Security (dated 18-05-2026) shall be retained during the lifetime of the development hereby permitted

Reason: In the interest of highway and pedestrian safety having regards to Policy WS 9 of the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2025)

8. Prior to first use of the development hereby permitted full details of 11no. covered and secure cycle parking spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved cycle storage shall made available for use prior to first use of the development and retained for use at all times thereafter.

Reason: To promote alternative, sustainable forms of transport having regards to Policy WS 9 of the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2025)

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity Gain Plan Required

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are set out in paragraph 17 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

The biodiversity gain plan must include:

- Information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat;
- The pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
- The post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
- Any registered offsite biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity and the biodiversity value of that gain in relation to the development;
- Any biodiversity credits purchased for the development; and
- Any such other matters as the Secretary of State may by regulations specify.

Further information relating to Biodiversity Gain Plans can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/submit-a-biodiversity-gain-plan>

Commencing development which is subject to the biodiversity gain condition without an approved Biodiversity Gain Plan could result in enforcement action for breach of planning control.

Informative(s):

1. **Access for Fire Fighting**

Access for fire appliances should comply with the requirements of Section B5, Schedule 1 of the Building Regulations. Provisions for access will depend on the size and use of the building. The

design of the access route, for example minimum road widths and maximum reversing distances, should also be considered (Appendix A, attached).

In accordance with Section 55 of the County of Merseyside Act 1980, the position of the premises should not compromise or impede existing means of fire service access to a neighbouring building.

Water Provision

Water supplies for firefighting purposes should be risk assessed in accordance with the undermentioned guidance in liaison with the water undertakers (United Utilities - 0161 907 7351) with suitable and sufficient fire hydrants supplied.

Consideration should be given to the recommendations within the 'National guidance document on the provision of water for fire fighting', produced by the Local Government Association and Water UK, available for free download via: <https://www.water.org.uk/national-guidance-document-provision-water-firefighting> Further information regarding access requirements can be found in the current version of Approved Document B, which is available for free download via: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/fire-safety-approved-document-b>

Last Comments By:	20-07-2026
Expiry Date:	08-10-2026

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Planning Committee	7th October 2026
---------------------------	-------------------------

Reference:	PS Development Code	Case Officer:	Ward:
APP/26/00734	Q18 – Other minor development	Mr B Bechka	Heswall

Location:	GLEGG ARMS Chester Road, Gayton, Wirral, CH60 3SD
Proposal:	Demolition of Existing Hotel Restaurant and Replacement with New Building Providing Additional Hotel Bedrooms, Together with Alterations to the Car Park and all Associated Works.
Applicant:	Whitbread PLC
Agent:	Vicky Harper (Walsingham Planning)

Qualifying Petition	Yes
----------------------------	-----

An online petition has been received comprising 615 signatures (at the time of writing this report) which ask the application be refused on the following grounds:

- Does not preserve the historic façade of the heritage building; and
- No indication that alternative approaches to deliver the extra rooms that could retain the façade have been explored.

Reason for referral to Planning Committee	Councillor Kathy Hodson has called in this application to go before Wirral's Planning Committee on the grounds that it would result in the loss of a heritage asset.
--	--

Site Plan:



1. Development Plan designation:

Primarily Residential Area, (with a small corner of the site being within the Green Belt)

2. Relevant Planning History:

Application No: APP/24/01225

Location: Glegg Arms Chester Road, Gayton, Wirral, CH60 3SD

Proposal: Demolition of existing hotel restaurant and replacement with new building providing additional hotel bedrooms, together with alterations to the car park and all associated works

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Decision: Withdrawn

Application No APP/15/01277

Location: Glegg Arms, CHESTER ROAD, GAYTON, CH60 3SD

Proposal: Two storey side extension to existing hotel (Class C1) to create 24 additional new rooms (87 in total) and ancillary services, removal of one TPO tree (ref T1) and crown lifting to six no. TPO trees (ref A1)

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Decision: Approve

Application No: APP/14/00119

Location: The Glegg Arms, Chester Road, Gayton, CH60 3SD

Proposal: Application for flood lighting to the rear of the Restaurant

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Decision: Approve

Application No: APP/86/05017

Location: The Glegg Arms, Chester Road, Gayton, L60 3SD

Proposal: Single storey extension to restaurant.

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Decision: Approve

Application No: APP/82/20938

Location: Glegg Arms PH, Chester Road, Gayton, Wirral, L60 3SD

Proposal: Extensions to licensed premises to form restaurant with porch and fire escape staircase.

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Decision: Conditional Approval

ENF/25/00001

Possible demolition

Decision: No Decision

3. Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received:

3.1 Ward Member Comments	Councillor Kathy Hodson provided comments as reported above.
3.2 Summary of Representations	<u>REPRESENTATIONS</u> Having regard to the Council Guidance on Publicity for Applications and the Statement of Community Involvement, 55 no. notification letters were sent to neighbouring properties on (19-06-2026). A site notice was displayed on (02-07-2026). In response, a total of 12 representations to the application were also received, comprising 10 no. separate letters of objection, 1 no. letter of support and 1 no. neutral comment. Comments made within submitted representations are summarised below: <u>Object:</u> • Poor pastiche replica conflicts with NPPF; • Fails to carry on significance of landmark and local character; • Fails to continue to contribute and detrimental to the identity and life of Heswall; • Special historic relevance of building including Public Weighbridge office insufficiently recognised; • Missed opportunity; • Level of harm is high, and can be avoided without detriment to commercial aims; • Glegg Arms was approved for inclusion in a future Local List; • Have approached Historic England to revisit national listing status of Glegg Arms (and Public Weigh) and request no decision be made until HE have provided feedback; • Does not preserve the historic façade of the building; • Loss would cause unnecessary harm to character of area; • Justification is weak and public benefits are largely financial advantages rather than genuine community or heritage benefits; • Loss of prominent feature at gateway to Heswall; • Modern block bears no resemblance to its past history; • Pub has been intentionally underinvested in and ran down; • does not demonstrate that a viable conservation-led use or materially less harmful form of development is unavailable; • the specific public benefits attributable to demolition do not outweigh that total loss; • demolition is based on cost of addressing drainage and structural issues being unreasonable; • issue of flooding could be easily addressed by developer on site, whilst by Highways to public highway; • structural aspects of retaining façade could be dealt with by suitably addressed engineers; • lack of specialist advice should not justify loss of heritage asset; • concern as to the impact on PO-protected Horse Chestnut close to the Glegg arms and given the geology make up of the bedrock ridge that this building sits directly on, its roots will be spread across the very shallow feature and any excavating potentially into this tree's very shallow root system to dig foundations will damage the tree <u>Neutral:</u>

	• Prior to any excavation, appropriate and mandatory archaeological assessment and if necessary, a watching brief during groundworks so nothing of archaeological interest is overlooked; • very effort should be made to salvage and reuse historic elements (where practical) <u>Support:</u> • The revised proposals for the elevation of the heritage element of the plan are acceptable; • Proposal is a positive response to the objections in its previous submission.
	<u>Late representations were submitted outside the consultation period by WGSa and ITPAS reiterating the points already listed above.</u>

	<u>CONSULTATIONS</u> Trees – No objection subject to conditions Forward Planning – No objection MEAS – No objection subject to conditions Environmental Health – No objection BNG – No objection Heritage – No objection subject to conditions. Had originally objected on grounds that it had not been demonstrated through robust evidence that all viable options to retain or partially retain the asset had been explored which would justify the total loss of the Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). Further information was provided by applicant overcoming concern and which has subsequently led to Heritage removing their original objection. United Utilities – No objection subject to pre-commencement condition The Wirral Society – None received Heswall Society – Objection – • Loss and replacement of significant and much-loved local heritage asset with a very poor pastiche replica. • Glegg Arms has huge local historical significance due to its strategic location and the front façade has remained remarkably unchanged since the late 1800s. • Siting to major gateway into Heswall., provides very positive and mutually enhancing impression, loss would result in very negative impact on gateway. • Has strong significance to local community.
--	--

- Would result in loss of remaining office element associated with former public weighbridge which has great, but generally unrecognised, historical significance, and which are considered of great conservation importance by other regions and many being Grade II or II* listed.
- Glegg Arms was approved for inclusion in a future Local List. Heswall Society requested Historic England revisit the national listing status of the Glegg Arms given now recognised importance of the public weighing machine. The Request that no decision be made on this application until the feedback from HE has been obtained.
- Submitted Heritage Statement totally inadequate. No reference made to the public weighing machine, even though showing on OS map applicant included. The wider context of the listed Gayton Mill and the Toll Cottage, and their historical connection with the Glegg Arms not recognised.
- Despite Heritage Statement 2.28 recognises setting of Glegg Arms and its relationship with Chester Road as being positive, the positive benefit of the existing building is then totally ignored in the subsequent spurious analysis of its heritage value.
- The Society considers the quality of the heritage assessment submitted by the applicant to be to incomplete and totally inadequate. Its poor detail is not proportionate to the level of harm as required by Local Plan Policy WS 2 B.
- Local Plan Policy WS 2 C1 requires any development which adversely impacts a heritage asset to deliver a public benefit which clearly outweighs the harm or loss. The Society recognises the economic benefits hotel brings to community and supports provision of additional rooms, however, do not consider demolition of important heritage asset necessary with additional rooms being able to be provided elsewhere on this large site without demolition. Glegg Arms could be retained as restaurant which would align with NPPF 210 (a).
- Society would not object to retention of front façade with its upper side returns remaining from the original building before later extension, plus the structure of the weighing machine office.
- The proposed replacement building serves as a mere mockery of the destroyed heritage asset, a pastiche with none of the vintage character of the current building.
- Heritage Statement specifies that existing materials will be reused in the rebuild where possible, However, submitted elevations show the existing rough tooled sandstone blocks, to the proposed rebuilt upper storey replaced with smooth modern render; weathered mock Tudor timber framework replaced with modern fibre cement cladding; and reinstated external chimney stacks with glass-reinforced plastic fakes as opposed to original stone block stacks. The poorly designed pastiche clearly contravenes Policy WD 2 H due to a lack of respect of the key elements of the existing building which make it so attractive, poor detailing and the use of non-vernacular materials.
- Demolition followed by reconstruction is still total loss, and in no way mitigates the loss of a significant heritage asset.
- The application does not conform to Local Plan Policy WS 6 8, with the applicant using a poorly researched and deficient heritage assessment which totally underestimates the heritage value of the Glegg Arms to try to justify its demolition.

- The proposed development is of poor design and justification of its public benefit is at best weak and unconvincing, with no evidence that the same benefit could not be achieved by a smarter design which would preserve the key heritage elements of the Glegg Arms.

Updated comments from Heswall Society responding to additional supporting evidence submitted by applicant :

- Even with the additional material the applicant has not demonstrated to the level of detail required by the magnitude and significance of the loss that retention, conversion or another materially less harmful form of development is unavailable, or that the public benefits specifically attributable to demolition outweigh that loss.
- The applicant has not provided the robust, costed assessment of retention and conversion options needed to demonstrate that a materially less harmful scheme cannot deliver the identified public benefits.
- Heritage value of Glegg Arms evidenced by entry in the non-designated heritage assets heritage list and by the article published in the Heswall and District Magazine in February 2025; form a candidate for local listing which whilst not adopted should not diminish their special interest or local heritage significance
- Society's research of weighbridge and largely intact associated office is unique in Merseyside and Cheshire and makes a distinct contribution to the building's evidential and historic significance.
- It being rejected by Historic England for statutory listing does not determine whether the building is significant as a non-designated heritage asset at local level.
- The Glegg Arms has longstanding communal significance as a place of social interaction for generations of Heswall families, evidence by submitted petition.
- 2026 NPPF requires decision maker to identify the asset's significance, assess the effect of the proposal on that significance, consider whether harm can be avoided or minimised, and determine whether the relevant public benefits outweigh any justified harm.
- Application fails to meet requirements of NPPF policy HE4(1).
- Applicant's own assessment identifies both local significance and total loss and as such balancing test in HE7 applies.
- The applicant has only presented benefits which depend on demolition, not benefits which could be delivered by retaining and reusing the asset.
- Agrees Conservation officer's assessment that the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the historic environment and that the total loss has not been adequately justified and that further evidence demonstrating that all reasonable opportunities for retention and reuse have been fully explored is required.
- Against the national and local policies, the central issue is whether the applicant has demonstrated that the public benefits specifically attributable to demolition outweigh the total loss of the Glegg Arms as a non-designated heritage asset.
- Applicant has neither quantified benefits nor shown which of them depend on demolition rather than a retention scheme, or that

	comparable benefits could not be achieved through an alternative approach retaining the historic fabric of the Glegg Arms. • Applicant presents several options but concludes, without costings or detailed assessment, that none is viable apart from the current proposal. Conclusion is not adequately evidenced, and the assumptions used to assess the alternatives should therefore be given little weight. • Applicant states that existing restaurant operation is loss-making but has provided detailed evidence to support i.e. no trading accounts, no analysis of the proposed breakfast-room model, no assessment of profitability under an expanded room count, and no evidence of marketing the premises to an alternative hospitality or community operator. Policy HE4(1) requires consideration of a use consistent with the conservation of the asset before harm is accepted; that consideration has not been evidenced. Para 5.10 of the heritage addendum states that a benefit of the proposal is returning the building to an active and beneficial use, compared to the existing situation of vacancy and nil public or economic benefit. An inspection on 17th September indicated that the restaurant in the Glegg Arms was serving dinner to multiple tables, and there was a sign outside inviting non-resident guests to enter. • Option 3 “Extension into the car park” has been dismissed by applicant on the basis that it does not meet the parking standards which it erroneously claims to be minimum requirements. The standards in Appendix 8 of the Local Plan for non-residential development operate as maximum levels of provision, and WD22(A)(5) expressly permits lower provision where accessibility allows. A reduction in parking resulting from retention of the historic building in Option 3 would not therefore, by itself, breach policy, this is supported by the applicant’s Transport Statement. • Option 4B “Partial retention of restaurant with new extension to rear” warrants particular scrutiny due to lack of a properly evidenced appraisal of another option which preserves the heritage fabric of the Glegg Arms. The applicant dismisses it without full technical analysis or costings. The same evidential weakness appears to affect the other options, which should not be treated as non-viable on the material provided. Further, the applicant has not demonstrated that this work is necessary: 2.4m requirement is Premier Inn’s own bedroom brand standard, not a Building Regulations minimum (and is simply irrelevant to continued restaurant use). • Do not accept flooding constraints mandate a raising of ground floor level or grounds to reject Option 4B due to associated viability concerns, with the causes being an issue associated with public highway which could be rectified if appropriate works were carried out by Highway Authorities. • Removing the need to raise the ceiling and the ground floor level will materially lower the cost of conversion. This undermines the applicant’s assertion that Option 4B is non-viable, particularly because no supporting costings have been provided. • The applicant has not demonstrated that such measures approved method statements, temporary supports and protective measures secured by condition are unavailable here, and constructional difficulty alone cannot justify total loss.
--	--

	• The applicant has not shown that the additional five bedrooms could not be accommodated through a variant of a retention scheme or quantified the benefits attributable to those five bedrooms, and as such has not met requirements of NPPF Policy HE4(1) to minimise harm. • Applicant not demonstrated that Options 3 and 4B are incapable of delivering the same benefits as proposal, failing to discharge the duty under HE4(1) to show that less harmful alternatives have been properly evaluated and are unavailable. The proposal fails HE4(1)(b) on minimising harm and HE7(3) on the balance. A shortfall in the applicant's evidence is not a neutral gap that the Council may fill with its own assumptions; it is a failure to discharge the policy burden. The appropriate consequence is refusal, rather than a favourable balance reached on the officer's own initiative. • Heritage significance derives from original physical fabric, construction techniques, longstanding community associations and chronological integrity. The front façade proposed for retention in Option 4B is essentially unchanged from photographs taken 150 years ago. The modern pastiche proposed in the application - including faux GRP chimneys and cement panels in place of timber framing - does not mitigate the loss of the heritage asset itself, which is the critical test under HE7. Local Plan WD2(H) states that poorly designed pastiche will not be permitted Conservation Areas Wirral – Objection – opposed to pastiche replica design, ignoring the significance of the public weigh bridge, loss of asset would not achieve any public benefit Green Belt – None received Traffic & Transportation - No Objection subject to conditions Highway Asset - No Objection subject to conditions
--	---

4. Site and Surroundings	
4.1	The application site ("Site") comprises the two-storey Premier Inn hotel and two-storey 'Glegg Arms'. The 'Glegg Arms' currently serves as an ancillary restaurant to the main hotel use. To the southeast stands a large area of shared hardstanding, whilst to the rear of the Glegg Arms and to the northern area of the Site is a grassed area, which previously functioned as a beer garden and children's play area.
4.2	Having previously operated as a public house, the Glegg Arms appears to have operated for more than 10 years up until mid-2024 as part of the Beefeater restaurant chain, and more recently under Premier Inn, operating as restaurant for hotel guests only. It has been extensively extended over the years, with single storey extensions to its rear and sides. Several first-floor extensions have also been carried out. The original part single part two storey building fronting onto Chester Road dates back to circa 1850's and is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

4.3	There are several mature trees within the Site, some of which are protected by tree preservation orders. The Site also sits partially within Green Belt land to its northeastern extent.
4.4	The Site is located to the corner of Chester Road and Brimstage Road and sits within a Primarily Residential Area in Heswall. There are a mix of uses surrounding the Site, including Heswall Football club, Heswall Squash and Racquets Club, housing, a petrol filling station and the Devon Doorway PH.

5. Proposed Development	
5.1	Permission is sought for the demolition of the building known as 'Glegg Arms' and for the erection of a new two-storey detached building forming an annexe extension to the existing Premier Inn Hotel (C1 Use Class). The proposed building would comprise 31 additional hotel bedrooms, however, with the changes also being proposed to the layout of the existing hotel building to accommodate breakfast facilities, it would only result in a net increase of 24 hotel bedrooms. Please note that the internal alterations to the existing hotel building do not require planning permission. Albeit physically detached from the existing hotel building, it is proposed that the proposed building and existing hotel will be operated and managed as one entity, utilising all existing internal operational infrastructure. Other works proposed comprise landscaping works and alterations to the existing car park.

6. Development Plan	
6.1	Under the provisions of section 70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the provisions of the NPPF (paragraph 3) applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
6.2	The statutory development plan at present consists of the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2025) and the Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside and Halton (adopted 18 July 2013).
6.3	The following Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31st March 2025) Policies are relevant to the determination of this planning application: Policy WD 1 Landscaping (Trees) Policy WD 2 Heritage Assets; Policy WD 3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity Policy WD 10 Development in Primarily Residential Areas; Policy WD 23 Design Details; Policy WS 6 Placemaking for Wirral Policy WS 7 Principles of Design; Policy WS 8 Strategy for Energy Use, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Policy WS 11 Strategy for Town and Local Centres Policy WD 22 Servicing and Parking in Development; and Policy WP 8 Policy for the Rural Area

6.4	The Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside and Halton (adopted 18th July 2013) is also applicable. Relevant policies are: • WM8 Waste Prevention and Resource Management • WM9 Sustainable Waste Management Design and Layout for New Development
-----	--

7. Other Material Planning Considerations	
7.1	<u>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</u> <u>The following NPPF chapters & policies are relevant to the application:</u> <u>Chapter 3- Decision making policies (policies DM3, DM6)</u> <u>Chapter 4 - Achieving sustainable development (policies S3 & S4)</u> <u>Chapter 8 – Ensuring the vitality of a town centre (policy TC3)</u> <u>Chapter 12 - Making effective use of land (policy L2)</u> <u>Chapter 13 – Protecting Green Belt land (policies GB6 & GB7)</u> <u>Chapter 14 - Achieving well-designed places (policy DP3)</u> <u>Chapter 15 - Promoting sustainable transport (policies TR3, TR4 & TR6)</u> <u>Chapter 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change (policy F8)</u> <u>Chapter 19 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (policies N2 & N3)</u> <u>Chapter 20 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (HE4, HE5, & HE7)</u>
7.2	<u>Wirral SPD (4) – Parking Standards (2007)</u> Chapter 4 sets out that lower levels of parking will be encouraged where alternative modes of transport are available that can meet the likely demand for travel generated by the development, whilst requiring that facilities for bicycles be provided.
7.3	Tree, Hedgerow and Woodland Strategy 2020-2030 (hereafter referred to as The Tree Strategy)

8. Assessment	
8.1.1	The main issues pertinent in the assessment of the proposal are: - Principle of development; - Design/Heritage; - Amenity; - Highways; and - Ecology/BNG - Trees/Landscaping - Other matters
8.2 Principle of Development	

8.2.1	NPPF policy T3 (1) states that 'a sequential test should be applied to proposals for main town centre uses for which planning permission is required, where these are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an allocation for that purpose in an up-to-date development plan'. Policy T3 (2) states 'that main town centre uses involving new development should be located within town centres identified in the development plan; then, if this is not feasible, in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre locations, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre by sustainable transport modes.'
8.2.2	The Site being located approximately 650m to the southeast of the Heswall Town Centre boundary is deemed to form an out of centre location (as defined within Annex B : Glossary of the NPPF).
8.2.3	Heswall Town Centre (TC-SA7.1) is identified both within Local Plan Policy WS 11 and on the Policies map. Policy WS 11 sets out that development proposals for main town centre uses that are edge of centre or outside a Town, Centres will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that no alternative, suitable sites are available, first within, and then at the edge of a Town Centre in line with the sequential test; the site is easily accessible by a choice of means of transport and is, or will be well-connected to a Town Centre; and they do not undermine the vitality and viability of existing centres.
8.2.4	The submitted sequential assessment sets out that proposed extension annex will not be a standalone development and will exist only because of its reliance on the existing operational infrastructure, with it relying on the existing hotel and its function to be viable and operational. As part of the sequential assessment all commercial property, as well as allocated sites within Heswall were investigated, of which none were found to be sequentially preferable. The assessment concludes that with the proposal being dependent on the existing hotel for its operation and that it cannot be disaggregated; it is therefore the most sequentially preferable site in the area. Furthermore, the proposal will not impact the viability of the Heswall town centre and is wholly appropriate in this location. The Council's Forward Planning team who were consulted as part of this application, raise no objection and are generally supportive of the findings of the submitted assessment, it being an extension of the existing business and operating as one unit.
8.2.5	Situated to Chester Road (A540), the Site is easily accessible by a choice of means of transport and is well-connected to the nearby Heswall Town Centre, which lies approximately 650m to its northwest.
8.2.6	The existing 'Glegg Arms' is also considered a main town centre use within Annex B: Glossary of the NPPF. It has been extended extensively over the years and when calculating its total combined floorspace, has an approximate gross internal area of 787 sqm. In comparison, the proposed new building which is to form an annexe extension to the hotel has an approximate 876 sqm gross internal floorspace. With both the existing and proposed uses forming main town centre uses, it is not deemed that the increase in floorspace to be so substantial as to have a significantly greater impact, so as to be harmful to the vitality and viability of the nearby Heswall Town Centre.

8.2.7	On the basis of the above, it is deemed that the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policy WS 11 and that of Policy T3 of the NPPF.
8.2.8	Although located within a Primarily residential area and forming a non-residential use, the development will form an extension to the existing well established Premier Inn. It is deemed to be of a scale and use appropriate to the surrounding neighbourhood, thus complying with Policy WD 10 (B)(1) of the Local Plan.
8.2.9	A very small area of the Site, to its eastern corners and sitting within its red edge, sits with the Green Belt. However, the proposed development works are sited considerably away to the opposite side and do not fall within Green Belt. On this basis it is considered that the Green Belt policies of the Framework are not applicable in this instance.
8.2.10	Located within the settlement of Heswall, NPPF Policy S4 (1) states that 'development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework'.
8.2.11	The principle of development is deemed acceptable subject to its compliance with Wirral's Local Plan policies and those of the Framework, and its impact on visual and residential amenity and to the local highway network.

8.3 Design/Heritage	
8.3.1	The existing building is sited in a prominent position along Chester Road (A540) and to the edge of a central roundabout with junctions to Brimstage Road (A5137), Telegraph Road (A540) and Well Lane The existing Glegg Arms building which is to be demolished as part of the proposal sitting close to the road therefore forms a prominent feature within the street scene. There are clear views onto its historic frontage when approaching it from the north-west along Telegraph Road, when navigating the roundabout, and when approaching it from the south-east along Chester Road.
8.3.2	<u>Character and Design</u> NPPF Policy DP3 states that '<i>development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets</i>'.
8.3.3	Local Plan policy WS7 requires development proposals ' <i>to demonstrate that the development has been planned so that its function and appearance will enhance the character of the area</i> ', that they 'be visually attractive and positively enhance the character, appearance and setting of the surrounding area'; ' <i>ensure that the density, height, scale, massing and siting is appropriate in context</i> '; whilst incorporating ' <i>high quality materials which complement and enhance surrounding areas and adjacent development</i> '.
8.3.4	The proposed development comprising a detached annexe extension to the existing Premier Inn would comprise of three distinct elements, a part single

	part two storey 'front element', a 'link element', and a two/three-storey 'rear element'.
8.3.5	<u>Front element:</u> The front element would be part single part two-storey in scale. It seeks to largely replicate the scale form and character of the original 1850s Glegg Arms building. However, it would have an increased height of approximately 7.5m compared to the 6.7m height of the original building it would replace. Despite its increased height, the proportions of the original building are respected and maintained.
8.3.6	It is proposed to retain and reuse, where possible many of the features, including materials from the original 1850s building which is to be demolished, such as the coursed rubble stone, cill and headstones to the openings. Where this is not possible, the development would look to match or replicate the materials and features, such as the timber openings and the mock Tudor decorative detail. The existing dragon finial would be reinstated to the top of the front gable end. In addition to this, the proposal seeks to further enhance the appearance of this front element by the introduction of natural blue/grey slate to the pitched roofs of the development. This would be a significant improvement compared to the concrete roof tiles on the existing building, and more akin to what would have originally covered the roof of the Glegg Arms.
8.3.7	Its facade would therefore retain much of the architectural character of the original building, continuing to form a prominent and visually pronounced feature within the street scene
8.3.8	From within the street scene, the openings give the appearance of an improved active frontage, even if the glazed timber door openings are faux door openings, serving instead as window openings to the hotel bedrooms.
8.3.9	The form, design and architectural character of this front ensure it is clearly distinguishable and visually separate from the other elements of the proposed build sited to its rear.
8.3.10	<u>Link element:</u> Sited immediately behind and stepped in from the sides of the main front element, the link element would both visually separate and physically connect both the main front and rear elements of the development. Its design would be of modern and light appearance, fully glazed to one side and would comprise a flat roof design in contrast to the pitched roof design of both the front and rear elements. At a height of approximately 5.8m, it would sit comfortably below the ridges of the front and rear elements. Materials would comprise through-coloured render in scraped finish (off-white in colour); Cedral Lap' Timber Effect Cladding board (steel grey in colour); and UPVC Triple glazed units with factory applied paint finish (Blue/Grey in colour).
8.3.11	<u>Rear element:</u> Extending to the rear of the link element, the rear element (along with the link element) would replace the extensive additions that had been carried out to the original Glegg Arms building over many years, with a more cohesive and compact design. This is evidenced by the fact the proposed development would have a reduced footprint of approximately 550 sqm, compared to the

	approximately 691 sqm footprint of the existing Glegg Arms. Whilst modern in design, it would still have a traditional form and would comprise a pitched roof design. It would be two-storey in scale to its front end (southwestern), increasing to three-storey in scale to its rear (northeastern), where the existing land levels to the Site sit lower down. Its ridge would rise approximately 0.8m above that of the main front element. However, this increase would have little visual impact from within the street scene to Chester Road or upon the appearance of the proposed front element, given it being stepped in and set back. Furthermore, only the top of its gable ends would be visible above the ridge line of the front element, whilst it also sitting below the chimney line of the proposed front element. Despite its increased scale the rear element would have a much tidier and more cohesive appearance than the busy and sprawling extensions of the existing Glegg Arms. As above, the materials of this rear element would comprise through-coloured render in scraped finish (off-white in colour); Cedral Lap' Timber Effect Cladding board (steel grey in colour); and UPVC Triple glazed units with factory applied paint finish (Blue/Grey in colour).
8.3.12	Any planning approval will include a condition requiring details of materials be submitted for approval for all three elements.
8.3.13	Where presently it is hard to distinguish between the differing elements of the Glegg Arms, with the original historical element being obscured by the piecemeal alterations and extensions that have taken place over the years, the development would comprise of three distinct and defined elements i.e. the traditional front element, smaller link element and the modern rear element. Both the link and rear elements would be set in from the sides of the front element, with the main rear element achieving a minimum of approximately 25m to the boundary with back of the pavement to Barnston Road and Brimstage Road. Within the wider setting of the Site, the development would appear appropriate both in terms of its scale and appearance, with the proposed development not rising above the existing hotel building.
8.3.14	It is deemed that the proposal would accord with Local Plan policy WS 7 with the development appearing visually attractive and positively enhancing the character, appearance and setting of the surrounding area'. Furthermore, its height, scale, massing and siting would be appropriate in context, whilst the development would incorporate high-quality materials which complement and enhance surrounding areas and adjacent development. The proposed development would also accord with NPPF policy DP3 in that it would respond positively to its context, both integrating with and enhance its surroundings.
8.3.15	<u>Heritage:</u> The existing building which is proposed to be demolished as part of the works is considered a non-designated heritage asset. Although extensively extended over the years, the earliest portion of the building dates back to circa 1850. The earliest and most significant elements comprise the principal range fronting Chester Road and the adjoining single-storey projecting range to the north.
8.3.16	Despite the later additions, the original building holds a degree of architectural interest in its construction materials and details. Most notably it being of a coursed, rubble stone construction, which remains visible to the present

	day. Importantly, it is one of the last remaining properties of this age to be found in the locality, with the building now surrounded by much more modern development and infrastructure.
8.3.17	There is also a degree of historic interest with the building, given its connection to the Glegg family with it having been owned by John Bakervyle Glegg Esquire, and after who the original pub is named. The Glegg family resided at nearby Gayton Hall (NHLE: 1184100) a Grade II* listed country house, which the family constructed in the late 17th century and continued to occupy until the 20th century.
8.3.18	Policy HE4 of the NPPF sets out that <i>'heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:</i> <i>a) Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; and</i> <i>b) Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance'.</i>
8.3.19	Policy HE5 of the NPPF requires that <i>'development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance'.</i>
8.3.20	Policy HE7 of the NPPF states that <i>'where a development proposal would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset'.</i> It also sets out that <i>'where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, it should only be supported where the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, having regard to the scale of the harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset'.</i>
8.3.21	Policy WD 2 (E) of Wirral's Local Plan sets out that <i>'where harm would result to a non-designated asset a balanced judgement will be taken having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.</i> Criterion (C) and (D) of policy WD2 apply only to designated heritage assets and are not relevant to this proposal.
8.3.22	Consultation has been undertaken with the Council's Heritage team, and their comments are considered as part of the assessment below.

8.3.23	Also considered as part of the assessment below are representations received from interested parties objecting to the proposal, as summarised in Section 3 of this report. In the representations received, many consider the Glegg Arms to form an integral and prominent feature at the gateway to Heswall; to be of specific historical relevance; an important local heritage asset of architectural, historic, evidential and communal significance, and which provides an important contribution to the area's identity. Its loss causing unnecessary harm to the character of the area. Some of the representations acknowledge the harm to the heritage asset from numerous additions and alterations to the property and would not object to its demolition, were the original front façade, upper side returns and the structure of the weighing machine office, to be retained. Councillor Kathy Hodson in her reasoning as to why this application be removed from under delegation voiced concern as to the proposed development resulting in the loss of a heritage asset.
8.3.24	With this proposal seeking to demolish the building in its entirety, it would result in the total loss of the existing non-designated heritage asset and therefore cause harm. This point is not only acknowledged within the applicant's submitted heritage statement but is agreed by both the case officer and by Heritage.
8.3.25	Paragraph 38 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) <i>advises 'non-designated heritage assets as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets'.</i>
8.3.26	In understanding the level of significance that can be assigned to a heritage asset, NPPF Annex B defines 'significance' as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting'.
8.3.27	In the assessment carried out by the applicant in their Heritage Statement, as required by NPPF Policy HE5, and having regard the above definition, it describes the significance of the asset holding some historical interest which derive from its likely early to mid -19 th century origins and from its connection to the Glegg family. It is also acknowledged that the heritage asset holds some architectural interest in the construction materials and details of the original building, however, the subsequent numerous extensions to the rear and southeast side of the property have adversely affected the limited architectural interest held. With regard to its setting, the statement states that 'the significance the building derives from its setting is limited', however, goes on to say that 'in the consideration of the contribution made to an appreciation of the heritage interests held by the building by the existing setting, the relationship with Chester Road is considered to be positive'.
8.3.28	In carrying out their assessment as to the impact of the proposed development on the non-designated heritage asset, the Heritage Statement concludes that the overall significance of the building to be low, having due regard to the heritage interest it holds. This is not only attributed to it having been extensively extended, but also to the internal and external alterations carried out to the original part, which has diminished its heritage significance. In light of the low significance of the heritage asset, the statement sets out that the weight attributed to the loss of significance resulting from the total loss of the heritage asset should also be low.

8.3.29	It is recognised that there is a difference of opinion between the representations received and the applicant regarding the significance of the Glegg Arms. However, based on the evidence before us, Heritage do not consider there to be a robust basis for attributing a higher level of significance to the building than that identified in the applicant's submitted heritage assessment, which was prepared by suitably qualified consultants. Heritage undertook their own assessment and reached a similar conclusion, that while the building retains some local historic interest, extensive alterations have substantially reduced its evidential, architectural and historic significance. Heritage therefore agree that any heritage significance which remains is limited and that the asset should be afforded the level of weight appropriate to a non-designated heritage asset of low significance. This view is further supported by Historic England , which assessed the building and concluded that it did not meet the criteria for statutory listing. It is also noted that more recently, Historic England has confirmed that it would not revisit that decision, reinforcing the position that the building does not possess heritage significance of national importance. With respect to the communal interest, evidenced by the representations (including the online petition received), this alone does not necessarily equate to a high level of heritage significance. The key issue is the degree of heritage significance that survives today, having regard to the asset's condition, integrity and historic fabric. On balance, it is considered that the surviving significance is limited.
8.3.30	Heswall Society in objecting to the proposal voice concern as to the applicant's submitted Heritage Statement being incomplete and totally inadequate, failing to consider the office relating to public weighbridge or the wider context of the listed Gayton Mill and the Toll Cottage. That contrary to Local Policy WD 2 (B), the statement fails to provide evidence proportionate to the level of harm i.e. total loss of heritage asset. That within their statement the applicant has provided no evidence as to why the building cannot be retained either in part or in full and fails to comply with NPPF paragraph 203 (d), which emphasises the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation. [The case officer notes that any reference Para 203 (d) within the December 2024 NPPF has subsequently been removed from within the new revised NPPF (2026)].
8.3.31	Within a national context, and as above, Historic England having inspected the property in 2025 did not consider it worthy of statutory listing. Heswall Society more recently requested Historic England to revisit the listing of the Glegg Arms on the basis of the importance of the office that once served the weighbridge, however, the request has subsequently been rejected by Historic England, who have confirmed they will not be reviewing their earlier decision.
8.3.32	Having regard to the design of the proposal, the Council's Heritage team have been largely supportive of it throughout. However, they initially raised an objection to the development, given the failure by the applicant to provide any robust evidence justifying the demolition of a non-designated heritage asset. The applicant was therefore required to demonstrate, proportional to it being a non-designated heritage asset and given its low significance, that all reasonable opportunities for retention and reuse had been fully explored, that the building could not be retained and adapted for an alternative or complementary use. Similar concerns were raised by the Heswall Society, and in other representations received.

8.3.33	The applicant has since submitted additional information, comprising an options appraisal document, which also includes a development options study, and structural appraisal. Within this document 6 no options are explored in addition to the full demolition. These include retaining the site as existing; converting existing restaurant to hotel rooms; extending into the car park and retaining existing building; façade retention; partial retention of restaurant with new extension to rear; and extension into garden area. Having explored these options, it is concluded that due to significant structural, financial, design and amenity constraints, the options had to be disregarded, leaving the only option open to the applicant, which could secure the long-term viability of the site being the one put forward under this current application.
8.3.34	A Heritage addendum has also been submitted by the applicant which in response to criticism by Heswall Society that their submitted Heritage statement was incomplete and totally inadequate. Within this addendum, its assessment of the significance of the Glegg Arms as a non-designated heritage asset now takes into consideration of the weighing office and weighbridge, whilst also assessing the potential effect of the proposal on the significance of the nearby Grade II listed windmill as a consequence of introducing change within its setting. With respect to the weighing office, the addendum acknowledges their historical interest but recognises that the significance of the Glegg Arms is principally derived from the surviving external fabric of the historic building. Heswall Society in their updated comments reiterate that it on the basis of their research the weighbridge and associate office make a distinct contribution to the building's evidential and historic significance. Whilst not dismissing the Society's research and conclusion, only very limited weight can be given to their contribution to this non-designated heritage asset. Particularly given that on the Merseyside HER record for Glegg Arms, they do not reference or consider the Weighbridge or associated office. Furthermore, that despite the Glegg Arms being nominated for inclusion within in Wirral's Local List, details relating to the Weighbridge were not included, and that the fact remains that the Local List is yet to be adopted. Also following Heswall Society having recently approached Historic England for status of Glegg Arms to be considered in light of the Weighbridge and associated office, in response Historic England do not consider them significant it enough to revisit listing of the Glegg Arms.
8.3.35	With regard to the Grade II listed Windmill the addendum sets out that <i>'the significance of the windmill is assessed to stem from its form and former milling function, and from its own immediate curtilage, rather than from a functional or visual relationship with the Glegg Arms site specifically which does not make a meaningful contribution towards the experience of the windmill building.'</i> In assessing the potential effect of the proposal on the significance of the listed building, it concludes that <i>'the proposals at the Glegg Arms would not affect any of the key qualities of special architectural or historic interest held by the windmill nor would it affect any of the key aspects of the current setting of the windmill which contribute towards an understanding and appreciation of its significance'</i> and are therefore <i>'judged to have no effect on the significance of the windmill'</i>.
8.3.36	The submitted Heritage Statement, coupled with the Heritage Addendum, is deemed acceptable with respect to its assessment of the non-designated

	heritage asset and the impact of the proposed development. Although the Council's Heritage team continue to have some concerns regarding the degree of detailed viability evidence submitted by the applicant, they are satisfied that the additional evidence collectively demonstrates that a range of retention, conversion and partial-retention options have been explored. Further, Heritage officers are satisfied that reasonable opportunities for retention and reuse have now been investigated to a proportionate level having regard to the status of the building as a non-designated heritage asset, and that of its low significance. Furthermore, complying with NPPF policy HE5 and Local Plan policy WD 2.
8.3.37	Heswall Society in their updated comments continue to question the level of evidence provided by the applicant in their submitted options appraisal document, commenting on the individual options presented within and subsequently discounted by the applicant within their appraisal. The Heswall Society finding in many instances that the level of evidence, in terms of its depth and detail to be inadequate to meet the requirements of the Heritage policies set out both within the Wirral's Local Plan and the NPPF. With only a degree of significance being attributed to non-designated heritage assets within the NPPF, there is a lower bar for non-designated heritage assets, not affording the same level of protection as designated heritage assets. The submitted Heritage Statement defines the Glegg Arms as having low significance, the Council's Heritage team, having carried out their own assessment of the significance of this heritage asset, have also come to the same conclusions. The findings of both are contained within this report. In line with Policy HE5(1) the level of detail provided by the applicant is deemed proportionate to the asset's importance and deemed sufficient enough to understand the potential effect of the proposal on its significance. It should be noted that the updated NPPF no longer makes reference to securing an optimum viable use, and whilst Local Plan policy WD 2 (D) makes reference to 'where appropriate securing optimum viable use' this relates to designated heritage assets only and is based on the 2021 NPPF. There is no requirement under NPPF policy HE7 to do so. Whereas NPPF Policy HE4 (2) requires 'any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification', there is no such requirement for non-designated heritage assets to do so. As such, requiring such a forensic level of detail and evidence be provided by applicant would go far beyond what is required by policy and is therefore deemed unreasonable, given both the status and significance of this heritage asset.
8.3.38	<u>Design approach and mitigation of total loss -</u> The proposed development is for the demolition and reconstruction of the former Glegg Arms. This approach has been advanced in response to the applicant's stated operational and viability requirements for the proposed hotel use, alongside recognition that the building is a non-designated heritage asset rather than a designated heritage asset. As above, this approach is accepted. The scheme therefore seeks to balance the retention of the building's most significant architectural characteristics with the functional requirements of the proposed development.

8.3.39	In recognition of the building's heritage value and status as a local landmark, the replacement building has been designed to reflect the scale, form and architectural character of the existing structure, with the reuse of salvaged materials incorporated where practicable.
8.3.40	Following earlier pre-application discussions and a previous submission, the current proposal has been amended to provide for the careful demolition of the existing building whilst retaining and reusing historic materials wherever practicable. The scheme proposes the reconstruction of the principal elevation facing Chester Road so that it closely replicates its existing appearance. This elevation is understood to represent the earliest surviving part of the building and is considered to be of greatest heritage significance.
8.3.41	The proposal also includes a number of enhancements, notably the reinstatement of a natural slate roof in place of the existing concrete tiles, together with the restoration of lost architectural features and decorative detailing. It is deemed that these measures would improve the overall appearance of the building and better reflect its historic character.
8.3.42	In Heswall Society's comments and other representations received from the public objecting to the scheme, they voice concern as to the proposal in failing to preserve the historic facade, the proposal instead introduces a poor pastiche replica with none of the vintage character of the current building, conflicting with Local Plan policy WD 2 (H), thus harmful to the identity and character of the area, and failing to carry on significance of landmark and local character. Concerns are also voiced as to the proposed materials to be used in the rebuild and showing on the submitted elevations, contrary to what is stated in the Heritage Statement, fail to respect of the key elements of the existing building which make it so attractive, poor detailing and the use of non-vernacular materials. Attention is drawn to the fact elevations show the existing rough tooled sandstone blocks, to the proposed rebuilt upper storey replaced with smooth modern render; weathered mock Tudor timber framework replaced with modern fibre cement cladding; and reinstated external chimney stacks with glass-reinforced plastic fakes as opposed to original stone block stacks.
8.3.43	It is accepted that the proposal would result in the total loss of the existing non-designated heritage asset and therefore the total loss of the significance of the heritage asset causes harm.
8.3.44	Whilst the reinstatement of a replica frontage would constitute a pastiche reconstruction rather than a genuinely historic elevation, it is deemed that the reconstruction of the principal historic frontage, reuse of historic fabric, reinstatement of lost historic features and use of more appropriate traditional materials would provide a tangible link to the building's historic character. This element of the proposal therefore, to some extent, helps mitigate the impact of the total loss that would otherwise result to this non-designated heritage asset.
8.3.45	Mitigation for the total loss of the non-designated heritage asset is reliant upon the faithful reconstruction of its most significant architectural elements. It is considered that the concerns raised in the objections received can be dealt with by a series of comprehensive materials conditions which are to be attached to any decision notice. These include full details and samples of all external materials, including walling materials, stone type, coursing and mortar, joinery, glazing, rainwater goods, mock timber framing, finials, roofing

	materials and chimney stacks be submitted for approval; a detailed stone salvage and reuse methodology be submitted identifying all historic fabric to be retained, salvaged and reincorporated within the development; that in the interests of authenticity and to ensure the historic character of the former Glegg Arms is appropriately reflected, that all reinstated chimney stacks be constructed in traditional stonework, as opposed to GRP, faux chimney structures or other synthetic replica materials. Finally, that prior to demolition, a programme of historic building recording to Historic England Level 2 standard is required and to be deposited with the Merseyside Historic Environment Record.
8.3.46	<u>Benefits of development</u> Having regard to the benefits set out within applicant's submitted Heritage Statement, it is considered that several benefits arise from the proposed development, which moderate weight should be afforded to. These include: • the proposal's contribution to the local visitor economy and the sustainable reuse of the site; • the development would increase the provision and diversity of visitor accommodation within Wirral, thereby supporting the area's tourism offer and generating associated visitor expenditure in the area, which has the potential to contribute positively to local economic growth and the vitality and viability of surrounding businesses; and • the development would facilitate the continuation of the site's longstanding hospitality function, ensuring that its established use is retained into the future, as opposed to a situation in which no meaningful social or economic benefits would be realised were the development not to proceed on the basis of viability concerns and become vacant.
8.3.47	Several representations received objecting to the development consider the justification given by the applicant to be weak and that public benefits are largely financial advantages rather than genuine community or heritage benefits; and that the specific public benefits attributable to demolition do not outweigh that total loss.
8.3.48	The case officer notes that, whilst Local Plan policy WD 2(D) makes reference to 'public benefits', criterion D of the policy relates to designated heritage assets and should be read in conjunction with the preceding criterion (C) of Policy WD 2. This is further confirmed by the fact that the NPPF also only makes reference to weighing against 'public benefits' in Policy HE6, which relates solely to designated heritage assets. The application property being a non-designated heritage asset, NPPF policy HE7 (2) only references weighing the harm against 'benefits'.
8.3.49	<u>Balanced judgement</u> The significance of the non-designated heritage asset has been assessed as being low, with there being insufficient evidence provided to justify treating the asset as one of greater significance for the purposes of this balancing exercise. Whilst accepting the development would result in the total loss of

	the non-designated heritage asset, the proposed mitigation would to some degree preserve an element of the heritage asset's significance, through the reconstruction of the principal historic frontage, reuse of historic fabric, reinstatement of lost historic features and use of more appropriate traditional materials, thus to some extent mitigating the impact resulting from the total loss of the non-designated heritage asset. Furthermore, these proposed measures being secured through a comprehensive set of conditions would ensure that the significance of the non-designated heritage asset was appropriately recorded, conserved and reflected within the redevelopment. It is considered that overall, the proposed mitigation would represent a proportionate heritage mitigation strategy having regard to the 'low' significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
8.3.50	Having regard to the social and economic benefits, as set out at paragraph 8.3.46 above, which will arise as a result of the proposed development, moderate weight has been afforded to them.
8.3.51	In making the balanced judgement, taking into consideration the non-designated heritage asset's low significance, the benefits arising from the development are considered to outweigh the harm resulting from the loss of the heritage asset. The scheme is deemed to represent an acceptable balance between heritage conservation and redevelopment, according with both the requirements of Policy WD2 of the Wirral Local Plan and Policies HE4, HE5 and HE7 of the NPPF.

8.4 Amenity	
8.4.1	Policy WD 10 of Wirral's Local Plan sets out that proposals for non-residential uses within Primarily Residential Areas should ' <i>not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents, including privacy</i> ', whilst ' <i>not result in unacceptable impact on neighbouring uses, such as noise and disturbance, on-street parking and deliveries by vehicle use and other outdoor activities</i> '
8.4.2	Policy P3 of the NPPF requires that ' <i>development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area...</i> '
8.4.3	Policy L2 of the NPPF states that ' <i>substantial weight should be given to the benefits where a development proposal would...maintain safe access and egress for occupiers and users, and acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space</i> '.
8.4.4	The nearest residential property is sited approximately 44m to the southwest of the proposed hotel annexe extension, to No. 1 Dunster Grove, with the property backing onto Chester Road. After this, the nearest residential properties are Nos 1 and 3 Barnston Road, sited approximately 60m to the northeast.

8.4.5	The application site is a well-established commercial site and the development would be replacing a long-established commercial business, roughly taking up a smaller footprint on site. Forming an annexe extension to the existing Premier Inn Hotel, it would result in a net increase of 24 hotel rooms.
8.4.6	As part of their submission, the applicant has provided an Acoustic report. Within this report it assesses the impact of the development i.e. noise emanating from operation of proposed plant equipment on noise sensitive receptors i.e. neighbouring residential properties and upon the occupants of the proposed Premier Inn bedrooms. Having regard to its impact upon neighbouring residential properties, it is concluded that given the distance to the nearest residential properties, coupled with the plant's housing which uses 'hit and miss' timber fencing, and the existing acoustic environment i.e. being located to a busy junction that it would not lead to result in any adverse noise disturbance to those properties. Having regard to the proposed bedrooms within the development, that given the 5m separation from those bedrooms, the 'hit and miss' screening and the bedrooms being mechanically ventilated, and the appropriate level of glazing within the bedrooms that the noise ingress into those bedrooms would be acceptable. As part of any planning approval, it is therefore recommended that the recommendations set out within Section 4.2 of the report be implemented.
8.4.7	Environmental Health having been consulted as part of this application have raised no objection to the proposed development.
8.4.8	<u>Conclusion</u> It is considered that the development would accord with Wirral Local Plan Policy WD 10, In addition, it would comply with Policies P3 and L2 of the NPPF, in terms of living conditions and pollution and ensuring the development does not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of noise.

8.5 Highways	
8.5.1	This section seeks to assess the impacts that the proposal may have on the surrounding Highways Network, of which key issues tend to be Highway Safety, Access, Car Parking and Sustainable Transport Options. Policy WS 9 of the Wirral Local Plan is relevant in relation to this section. SPD4 is also relevant to this application, which sets out the Parking Standards. Also relevant are NPPF policies TR3, TR4 and TR6.
8.5.2	A Transport Assessment and Refuse Management Strategy have been submitted by the applicant in support of this application.
8.5.3	The existing provision of 126 parking spaces currently serves the 87 no room hotel, as well as the restaurant to the Glegg Arms. Whilst the development would see a total net increase of 24. no hotel rooms, bringing the total number of hotel rooms on site to 111, it does not propose to increase the existing provision of 126 parking spaces. The statement sets out were it to strictly follow the parking standards contained within the SPD4 document, it could result in an additional 24 car parking spaces. However, it deems that any increased parking demand would be offset by the removal of the restaurant to Glegg Arms and the subsequent reduction in restaurant parking demand.
8.5.4	The Local Highway Authority raise no objection, however, given the existing car park pre-dates current Wirral standard, request a number of changes be

	made to update and bring the car park in line with current standards. These include: - the introduction of 0.5m kerbed footway to segregate the end bays entry and exit from the live carriageway. This is present for the dual row of island bays but often not elsewhere. - all disabled bays be hatched and dimensioned in accordance with Appendix 8 of the Local Plan, providing direct level access to the pedestrian areas without having to wheel across the carriageway to the main entrance. - the main entrance bollard arrangement should account for how pedestrians and wheelchair users will enter the building without having to enter the carriageway.
8.5.6	Table A8.2 of the Local Plan lays out the maximal parking standards: 1 bay per room for baseline parking. 10% of capacity for disabled bays. 1 space per 25 rooms for two-wheelers. 1 space per 10 rooms for bicycles. The proposal includes 111 hotel rooms with 122 parking spaces, 4 disabled bays with no specific two-wheeler area. It is recommended that the number of baseline bays be reduced to provide an increase in the underserved alternative spaces. This is further supported by the Transport Statement which lays out the good connectivity of the site for both active travel and public transport.
8.5.7	The allowance of bicycle parking in guest rooms as per the Premier Inn's 'cycle friendly' policy is an accepted alternative to external parking for guests. Whilst the four external bicycle spaces showing on the submitted Proposed Site Plan are deemed sufficient in number for staff, they should be covered.
8.5.8	In addition to the above requirements which are to be conditioned as part of any approval, Highways have asked for the inclusion of a pre-commencement condition, requiring a Construction Management Plan be submitted for approval. The applicant has confirmed their agreement to the pre-commencement condition.
8.5.9	It is considered that the development would accord with Local Plan Policy WS 9 and SPD4. In addition, it would comply with Policies TR3, TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF in respect to the development being located in a sustainable location, access and parking and in the assessment of transport impacts.
8.6 Ecology/BNG/	
8.6.1	This section seeks to appraise the proposal and protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the Borough, particularly in relation to its impact on habitats and protected species and, especially those areas

	designated as of international, national, and local importance. Policy WD 3 of the Local Plan and is relevant to this section.
	Policy NP2 of the NPPF seeks to improve the natural environment, taking suitable opportunities to connect to and strengthen ecological networks that extend beyond the site, whilst minimising any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species.
8.6.2	<u>Bats</u> MEAS who were consulted as part of this application, have reviewing the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Preliminary Roost Assessment' commented that Glegg Arms (Building B2), which is to be demolished, was categorised low suitability for roosting bats and therefore required emergence bat survey be carried out prior to determination. The applicant has subsequently submitted a Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Survey report, in which the findings concluded that with no emergences by bats were recorded and there was no evidence of bat roosting. As the submitted surveys confirm there is no evidence of bat roosting, there is no requirement to consider the proposal against the three tests (Habitats Regulations).
8.6.3	<u>Breeding Birds</u> Built features or vegetation on site may provide nesting opportunities for breeding birds, which are protected and therefore a condition has been attached relating to timing of any tree felling, hedgerow removal or other vegetation management. In addition, as the proposed development will result in the loss of bird breeding habitat, a condition has also been attached to secure bird nesting boxes within the new development.
8.6.4	<u>Amphibian/Reptiles</u> Surveys carried out found the Site provides limited suitable terrestrial habitat for amphibians given the lack of optimal habitat, whilst the removal of grassland and introduced shrubs during construction would likely to be inconsequential to local reptile populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally. However, it is recommended that Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) during the construction phase be conditioned as part of any planning approval.
8.6.5	<u>Terrestrial Land Mammals</u> The habitats on site are suitable for Priority Species. It is deemed that a condition requiring Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) be put in place during the construction phase be attached as part of any planning approval.in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on the priority species.
8.6.6	<u>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</u> This development is subject to mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. In terms of BNG the applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation, and GIS files for baseline and post-development habitats.
8.6.7	Existing habitats on site amount to 2.93 units and the development would result in the loss of 0.01 habitat units. The retained habitat would comprise of grassland, individual trees and heathland and shrub (ranging from poor to

	good condition), and non-native ornamental hedgerow and native hedgerow (poor condition).
8.6.8	The development would see the creation of an additional 0.30 (10.38%) habitat units and 0.02 (10.34%) hedgerow units, through the creation of low-medium distinctiveness units. These habitats would include 6no. scattered trees, modified grassland, ornamental hedgerows and introduced shrubs. The development would achieve the mandatory 10% requirement for both area- and linear-based habitat units.
8.6.9	The Council's Biodiversity Net Gain Coordinator, having been consulted, has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.
8.6.10	Whilst the applicant has not submitted a Draft Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan, the information that has been submitted in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain is acceptable in this instance. A landscaping plan was provided, and its implementation is to be conditioned as part of any approval to secure the above uplift in BNG.
8.6.11	It is considered that the development would accord with Local Plan Policy WD 3. In addition, it would comply with Policy NP2 of the NPPF in respect to the contributing positively to the natural environment, identifying opportunities for the environmental qualities of the development land to be conserved or enhanced; taking suitable opportunities to connect to and strengthen ecological networks that extend beyond the site; and minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species.

8.7 Trees/Landscaping	
8.7.1	An Arboricultural Tree Protection Plan (TPP), Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), and Arboricultural Method Statement have been submitted in support of the application.
8.7.2	Whilst there are several mature trees within the Site, some of which are protected by tree preservation orders, the proposal does not propose any tree removal or pruning. The Council's Tree officer raises no objection to the proposed development, subject to a condition being attached to any planning approval requiring that the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and the Tree Protection plan be adhered to in full.
8.7.3	In one of the objections received, concern was raised that the development would harmfully impact upon a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) protected Horse Chestnut tree (WR0270T001) which stands in close proximity to the Glegg arms and the existing Hotel extension. That given the specific geological features which affect the site, it is likely that the tree's roots would be spread thinly across the shallow geological feature and excavating potentially into the trees shallow root system to dig foundations would likely damage the tree.
8.7.4	Policy compliance It is considered that the development would accord with Local Plan Policy WD 1 and the Tree Strategy, In addition, it would comply

	with Policy NP3 of the NPPF in recognition of the benefits which trees can provide for biodiversity.
--	--

8.8 Other matters	
8.8.1	<u>Energy Efficiency</u> The development has been designed to follow the energy efficiency hierarchy. Its design adopts a Passivhaus influenced fabric first design philosophy to limit heat loss through the design of the building fabric, limiting thermal bridging and cold bridging, whilst ensuring a high-level of airtightness to the building. In terms of mechanical ventilation, the development will use the Vectaire heat recovery ventilation unit to ensure the heat remains in the building. The development also proposes the use low energy lighting which incorporates controls to limit unnecessary waste. Other design measures proposed to be incorporated within the design of the hotel annexe extension, include the use solar photovoltaic panels and air source heat pump system. With no details having been provided, either within other documentation or on the submitted drawings, the installation of any photovoltaic panels to the development will require the applicant to follow the permitted development route by submitting the relevant prior approval application, else applying for a separate planning permission for any photovoltaic panels. In providing these elements, amongst other measures set out within the submitted Energy Strategy document, the application would broadly accord with the provisions of Policy WS 8 of the Wirral Local Plan and will be conditioned as part of any planning approval.
8.8.2	<u>Drainage</u> NPPF Policy F8 requires development proposals which could affect drainage on or around the development site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, in ways which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal. Following a review of the submitted drainage documents United Utilities who were consulted as part of the application require that robust evidence be provided to demonstrate the drainage hierarchy has been thoroughly investigated and that the proposals are in line with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025). In light of this and to ensure compliance with NPPF policy F8 they have requested that as part of any planning approval a pre-commencement condition be attached requiring details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme be submitted. The applicant has confirmed their agreement to this pre-commencement condition.
8.8.3	<u>Digital Connectivity</u> A Digital Connectivity Statement was submitted by the applicant, which demonstrates how the proposed development will satisfy all digital connectivity requirements and that the proposed development will provide the necessary infrastructure to provide high-quality communications. A condition will be attached to any planning approval to ensure the implementation of the details contained within the statement, thus satisfying the requirements of Local Plan policy WS10 (K).
8.8.4	<u>Archaeology</u>

	MEAS consider the proposed development site to have negligible archaeological potential.
8.8.5	<u>Site Waste Management</u> In order to minimise waste production and maximise re-use, recycling of materials on-site and minimise off-site disposal where practicable during demolition and construction and to accord with Policy WM8 of the Merseyside and Halton Joint Waste Local Plan (WLP), a pre-commencement condition has been agreed to by the applicant requiring that they submit a Site Waste Management Plan.
8.8.6	The applicant has submitted a Refuse and Recycling Management Strategy This states that a servicing vehicle will be able to access and egress the site in forward gear being able to manoeuvre on site. The Strategy also calculates the amount of waste likely to be generated based on industry standards and indicates the types of waste that will be generated and segregated for recycling along with the number of bins required for each waste stream. This is all welcomed and accepted and demonstrates compliance with policy WM9 of the JWLP. A condition is, however, is required that an updated proposed site plan be provided indicating the location of the bin store.
8.8.7	<u>Use of Site</u> The submission documents indicate that the Glegg Arms has been in use as restaurant for a period exceeding 10 years. On this basis it is deemed that NPPF policy HC6 would not apply. Even in the event it was later found not to be the case and that this policy would be applicable, it is considered that there exist sufficient alternative provision i.e. public houses in the local area, thus complying with the requirements of policy HC6 (c).

9. Summary of Decision (planning Balance)	
9.1	Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Having regards to the individual merits of this application this recommendation has been made having regards to the relevant policies and proposals in the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2025), Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside and Halton and all relevant material considerations including national policy advice and the National Decision Making Policies contained within the NPPF. In reaching this decision the Local Planning Authority has determined the proposal in accordance with Policy DM3 of the NPPF and used Planning Conditions and Obligations in accordance with Policy DM6 of the NPPF and considered the following: -

9.2	The proposed new building forming an annexe extension to an existing well-established business. Given its out of centre location and forming a main town centre use and in line with Local Plan policy WS 11, a sequential assessment was carried out which successfully demonstrates that the proposal will not impact the viability of the Heswall town centre and is wholly appropriate in this location. Whilst forming a non-residential use within a Primarily Residential Area, the development forms an extension to an existing business and is deemed to be of a scale and use appropriate to the surrounding neighbourhood. The principle of development is therefore deemed acceptable. Having regard to NPPF Policy HE7, a balanced judgement has been carried out with respect to the resulting harm to the significance of the heritage asset, weighing it against the benefits of the proposal, having regard to the scale of loss and the significance of the asset. Whilst the proposal would result in the 'total loss' of the non-designated heritage asset, it would be moderated by the reconstruction of the principal historic frontage, reuse of historic fabric, reinstatement of lost historic features and use of more appropriate traditional materials, which are to be secured by a comprehensive set of conditions. It would also provide a tangible link to the building's historic character, therefore reducing, to some extent, the impact of the total loss of this non-designated heritage asset. It is considered that that the total loss of the significance of the heritage asset resulting from the demolition of the Glegg Arms, which was assessed as having low significance would be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme, which include contribution to the local visitor economy; sustainable reuse of the site; increased provision and diversity of visitor accommodation within Wirral; potential to contribute positively to local economic growth and the vitality and viability of surrounding businesses; and facilitate the continuation of the site's longstanding hospitality function are afforded moderate weight. On balance it is therefore concluded that loss of the heritage asset is acceptable on this occasion. The development would achieve the mandatory 10% requirement for both area- and linear-based habitat units. It is considered that its scale and operation would not harm the character of the area or the amenities of nearby receptors. The impact on the local highway network is also considered acceptable.
9.3	The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31st March 2025), as a whole, including Policies WD 1, WD 2, WD 10, WD 22, WD 23, WS 6, WS 7, WS 8, WS 11 and WP 82; Chapter 4 of the, Supplementary Planning Document 4; and policies S3 & S4, TC3, L2, GB6, GB7, DP3) TR3, TR4, TR6, F8, N2, N3, HE4, HE5, & HE7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Recommended Decision:	That the Assistant Director- Chief Planner be authorised to approve the application subject to the conditions set out below:
----------------------------------	--

Recommended Conditions and Reasons:

1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans received by the local planning authority and listed as follows:

Proposed Elevations Sheet 1 South West And North East Elevations Option E, PI1064/AP12/D, received 24th September 2026;

Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 North West And South East Elevations Option E, PI1064/AP13/D, received 22nd September 2026;

Detailed Landscape Proposals – 1 of 2, 1186-SW-01/B, received 12th June 2026;

Detailed Landscape Proposals – 2 of 2, 1186-SW-02/B, received 12th June 2026;

Existing And Proposed Hotel Alteration To Form Breakfast Room.PI1064/AP03, received 12th June 2026;

Proposed Site Plan Option E,.PI1064/AP10/A, received 12th June 2026;

Proposed Floor Plans Option E,.PI1064/AP11, received 12th June 2026; and

Proposed Site Roof Layout Option E,.PI1064/AP14, received 12th June 2026

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to define the permission

3 No above ground works shall take place until full details and samples of all external materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include walling materials, stone type, coursing and mortar, joinery, glazing, rainwater goods, mock timber framing, finials, roofing materials and chimney stacks. The development shall be carried out using the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: These measures are necessary to ensure the significance of the non-designated heritage asset is appropriately recorded, conserved and reflected within the redevelopment, having regard to Policy WD2 of the Wirral Local Plan and Policy HE7 of the NPPF.

4 A detailed stone salvage and reuse methodology shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any above ground works taking place, identifying all historic fabric to be retained, salvaged and reincorporated within the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: These measures are necessary to ensure the significance of the non-designated heritage asset is appropriately recorded, conserved and reflected within the redevelopment, having regard to Policy WD2 of the Wirral Local Plan and Policy HE7 of the NPPF.

5 In the interests of authenticity and to ensure the historic character of the former Glegg Arms is appropriately reflected, all reinstated chimney stacks shall be constructed in traditional stonework and shall not comprise GRP, faux chimney structures or other synthetic replica materials.

Reason: These measures are necessary to ensure the significance of the non-designated heritage asset is appropriately recorded, conserved and reflected within the redevelopment, having regard to Policy WD2 of the Wirral Local Plan and Policy HE7 of the NPPF.

6 Prior to any demolition works commencing on site, a programme of historic building recording to Historic England Level 2 standard shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified heritage professional, with the completed report deposited with the Merseyside Historic Environment Record.

Reason: These measures are necessary to ensure the significance of the non-designated heritage asset is appropriately recorded, conserved and reflected within the redevelopment, having regard to Policy WD2 of the Wirral Local Plan and Policy HE7 of the NPPF.

7 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, the details relating to the proposed digital infrastructure as set out within the submitted Digital Connectivity Statement must be implemented in full and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides required digital infrastructure having regards to the National Planning Policy Framework

8 Prior to the commencement of development, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include:

- (i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water;
- (ii) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations);
- (iii) Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD;
- (iv) Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable;
- (v) Details of points of discharge for foul and surface water; and
- (vi) Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems. The approved schemes shall be in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025) or any subsequent replacement national standards.

Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the drainage schemes shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.

9 No tree felling, scrub clearance, hedgerow removal, vegetation management and ground clearance is to take place during the period 1 March to 31 August inclusive. If it is necessary to undertake works during the bird breeding season then all trees, scrub, hedgerows and vegetation are to be checked first by an appropriately experienced ecologist to ensure no breeding birds are present. If present, details of how they will be protected are required to be submitted for approval.

Reason: In the interests of protected species having regard to Local Plan policy WD 3 and NPPF Policy N2.

10 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of integrated nest boxes ('swift bricks') within the new building to include type and location on an appropriately scaled plan as well as timing of installation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with those details. The integrated nest boxes shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect priority and threatened species, having regard to Local Plan policy WD 3 and NPPF Policy N2.

11 The following Reasonable Avoidance Measures shall be put in place at all times during all construction works:

Terrestrial mammals:

- A pre-commencement check for badger and/or hedgehog;
- All trenches and excavations should have a means of escape (e.g. a ramp);
- Any exposed open pipe systems should be capped to prevent mammals gaining access;
- Appropriate storage of materials to ensure that mammals do not use them;

Amphibians/Reptiles:

- Existing vegetation on the site will be gradually cut and removed under ecological supervision to encourage any amphibians / reptiles present to move away from the affected areas;
- The working area, together with any storage areas, will be kept clear of debris, and any stored materials will be kept off the ground on pallets so as to prevent amphibians / reptiles from seeking shelter or protection within them; and
- Any open excavations (e.g. foundations / footings / service trenches etc) will be covered with plywood sheeting (or similar) at the end of each working day. The edges of these sheets will be covered with a thick layer of topsoil or similar) to prevent amphibians / reptiles from seeking shelter beneath them. Any excavation must be in-filled and made good to ground level with compacted stone or similar at the earliest opportunity, so as to remove any hazard to amphibians / reptiles.

Reason: In the interests of protected species having regards having regard to Local Plan policy WD 3 and NPPF Policy N2.

12. Within the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building or the substantial completion of the development hereby approved, whichever is sooner, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved 'Detailed Landscape Proposals – 1 of 2, drawing 1186-SW-01/B and 'Detailed Landscape Proposals – 2 of 2, drawing 1186-SW-02/B.

Should any plants, trees or hedges die or be removed within 5 years of their planting then they shall be replaced by a plant, tree or hedge of a similar species and size no later than the first planting season following its death/removal.

Reason: To secure the delivery, implementation and management of the created habitats and their contribution to biodiversity and the local environment.

13 The Arboricultural Method Statement and the Tree Protection plan submitted in support of the application shall be adhered to in full, subject to the pre-arranged tree protection monitoring and site supervision, detailed in the report, by a suitably qualified tree specialist.

Reason: Required to safeguard and enhance the character and amenity of the site and locality and to avoid any irreversible damage to retained trees pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in accordance Policy WD1 of the Local plan.

14 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of improved parking facilities shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details will include:

- the introduction of 0.5m kerbed footway to segregate the end bays entry and exit from the live carriageway;
- all disabled bays be hatched and dimensioned in accordance with Appendix 8 of the Local Plan, providing direct level access to the pedestrian areas without having to wheel across the carriageway to the main entrance;
- an updated main entrance bollard arrangement, which shall successfully demonstrate how pedestrians and wheelchair users will enter the building without having to enter the carriageway.
- Dd

The approved details shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development and thereafter retained,

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and accessibility

15 The measures set out within the submitted 'Energy Strategy' report (Ref:C8970-TLP-00-XX-XX-BP-100 P02, Thornley & Lumb Partnership Ltd, 01/04/2026) shall be implemented in full during the lifetime of the development hereby approved. The measures shall include, but are not limited to, the provision of air source heat pumps; and rooftop photovoltaic arrays

Reason: To ensure the energy hierarchy is followed throughout the new development having regards to Policy WS 8 of the Wirral Local Plan (adopted 31st March 2025)

16 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, the recommendations set out in Section 4.2 of the 'Acoustics Report', (Environoise, ref: 22056R01bMWSW, 29/04/2026) shall be implemented in full and thereafter retained.

Reason: In the interests of amenity

17 Prior to commencement development, other than site preparation works, a Materials Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MMP shall detail how excavated/imported soils shall be managed during the construction process and shall be adhered to at all times during the construction phase of the development hereby permitted

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would include for the re-use of limited resources and to ensure that the amount of waste for landfill is reduced, to accord with Policy WM8 of the Waste Local Plan
18 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved an updated site plan showing details of a bin store, including location, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by The Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would facilitate efficient waste storage and collection to accord with Policy WM9 of the Joint Waste Local Plan

Biodiversity Net Gain Biodiversity Gain Plan Required

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply.

These are set out in paragraph 17 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

Further information relating to Biodiversity Gain Plans can be found here:
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/submit-a-biodiversity-gain-plan>

Commencing development which is subject to the biodiversity gain condition without an approved Biodiversity Gain Plan could result in enforcement action for breach of planning control.

Last Comments By:	24-07-2026
Expiry Date:	09-October-2026

Planning Committee – Terms of Reference:

The principal role of the Planning Committee is to act as the administrative committee responsible for making decisions as local planning authority on planning applications, development control and similar regulatory matters, which are more particularly described as *Functions relating to town and country planning and development control* and related matters as set out at Schedule 1 of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended).

The Committee is charged by full Council to fulfil those functions:

- (a) to consider and determine applications submitted under the Planning Acts for planning permission, listed building consent, and reserved matters pursuant to major planning applications;
- (b) to consider and determine applications for the display of advertisements submitted under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations;
- (c) to determine whether prior approval applications for the construction, installation, alteration or replacement of telecommunications masts submitted under Part 24 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 should be granted or refused;
- (d) related matters including but not limited to:
 - (i) applications for 'hedgerow removal' (Hedgerow Regulations 1997, as amended);
 - (ii) applications to undertake works to trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order or within a Conservation Area (Town and Country Planning Trees Regulations 1999, as amended);
 - (iii) applications for remedial notices in respect of high hedges (Anti Social Behaviour Act 2003, as amended);
 - (iv) applications for Hazardous Substances Consent (Planning Hazardous Substances Act, 1990, as amended);
 - (v) the obtaining of particulars of persons interested in land under Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976;
 - (vi) powers related to Commons Registration;
 - (vii) functions relating to public rights of way;
 - (viii) the licensing and registration functions relating to the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Highways Act 1980; and
 - (ix) functions relating to Town and Village Greens;

- (e) to exercise any other function of the Council under the Planning Acts and related legislation, whether as a local planning authority or otherwise, which may be referred to it by the Director for Economic and Housing Growth or other officer authorised by him/her.