

Item **10/00647/FUL**

Case Officer **Liz Beard**

Ward **Lostock**

Proposal **Relocation of plant to treat waste water from dry pet food production process**

Location **Golden Acres Ltd Plocks Farm Liverpool Road Bretherton Leyland**

Applicant **Golden Acres Group**

Consultation expiry: 7 October 2010

Application expiry: 22 September 2010

Proposal

1. The application is a full planning application for the relocation of plant to treat waste water from the dry pet food production process at Plocks Farm, known as Golden Acres Ltd, at Bretherton. The site area is 0.149 hectares.
2. It is proposed to relocate the principle biological treatment part of the process. The existing waste water effluent plant would then be retained and modified to undertake primary treatment of effluent, being the removal of solids from the primary water effluent, and removal of water from the sludge arising by use of a centrifuge, leaving only a dry solid to be used as a fertilizer for agriculture.
3. The facility will be located in the optimum site relative to the waste water process. This is immediately adjacent to the wet scrubbers and the surface water run-off lagoon. The development takes the form of a functional response to the treatment process comprising of:
 - i) Three tanks-wet scrubber holding tank (6m diam x 4.9m high); balance tank (7.6m diam x 7m high); divert tank 12.8m diam x 7m high)
 - ii) Control room and store, housed in a building 13.6m x 6m x 5.7m high.
 - iii) Associated pumps and circulation equipment in ancillary buildings.
4. The control buildings are steel framed buildings, clad with an insulated olive green composite panel. The main tanks are constructed of in-situ cast concrete. The balance tanks are of glass coated steel panel construction, painted in a matching olive green colour. Materials for the elevations contribute to the mitigation of visual impacts, by being muted colour (olive green), which will blend with the generally wooded backdrop.

Recommendation

5. It is recommended that this application is

Main Issues

6. The main issues for consideration in respect of this planning application are:
 - Principle of Development
 - Design Issues
 - Flood Risk

Representations

7. No letters of objection have been received raising the following points:
8. Bretherton Parish Council state that the proposed development is in a flood area yet no flood risk assessment has been supplied.

Consultations

9. The Environment Agency have not provided any comments. However, any comments received will be provided on the addendum.
10. Chorley's Conservation Officer has examined the application in terms of the impact it may have on the Grade II Listed Bank Mill (windmill) on Liverpool Road, Bretherton. Due to the position within the application site there will be considerable separation distance between it and the listed building. Furthermore there is screening of trees between the two which means one cannot be seen from the other. The impact on the listed building and its setting are unchanged and the status quo in terms of the relationship between the two sites will be retained. The significance of the designated heritage asset and its setting will be sustained.
11. United Utilities have no objections in principle, no surface water allowed to be discharged into the system.
12. Lancashire County Council (Highways) have not provided any comments. However, any comments received will be reported on the addendum.
13. Planning Policy comments are that previous planning permissions granted, with a number of conditions in relation to 09/00738/FULMAJ. Primarily the premises should only be used for the extrusion of agricultural produce for the purposes of animal and pet food production only and for not other purpose. This is due to the site being located within Green Belt and subject to strict controls. Also, prior to the commencement of development of each phase of the development, samples of all external facing materials to the proposed buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This is to ensure that the materials used are visually appropriate to the locality. The original development Masterplan was approved in March 2010. Concerns were raised over the original location of the effluent treatment plant and its resultant 'sensitive' visual impact upon traffic heading north on Bank Bridge. The revised location would reduce the visual impact and potential odour complaints, due to the advanced planting already carried out during the first phase of development acting as a screen. This is in accordance with the principles of Policy no.GN5 of the Chorley Borough Local Plan Review. With regards to building materials, both the control buildings and balance tanks will be painted in a muted olive green in order to blend with the surrounding environment. This is also in general conformity with Policy GN5 of the Chorley Local Plan Review.
14. Environmental Health have not provided any comments. However, if any are received the these will be reported on the addendum.
15. West Lancashire Borough Council have been consulted as the application lies on the boundary between the two authorities. No comments have been received from them, however, should any be sent in then these will be reported on the addendum.

Assessment

Principle of Development

16. There was an original application approved in 2003 (ref. 9/03/00528/FULMAJ) which provided a Masterplan for the site with a view to increase the output of production to 60,000 tonnes per annum, including an increase in 220 people, employed on a shift pattern. Subsequently an application was approved in ??? for the extensions and alterations to the pet food manufacturing facility (ref. 09/00738/FULMAJ) which has shown the implementation of that Masterplan.
17. The site is located in Green Belt. Within the Green Belt development will only be permitted if it falls to be considered appropriate development or where very special circumstances can be demonstrated, which outweigh the harm the development will have on the openness and character of the Green Belt.
18. The original scheme was accepted by the applicant that the development was inappropriate development within the Green Belt. However, it was demonstrated that the very special

circumstances outweigh the harm the development will have and very special circumstances outweigh the harm. The very special circumstances include:

- Development proposed relates to an existing enterprise with a strong affinity with agriculture. The proposals will enable an existing business which provides an important source of local employment to compete within the market and continue to the local, regional and national economy.
- The main impact on the Green Belt is the limited reduction in the openness resulting from the erection of new buildings and further expansion in the Green Belt. The proposals, however, are designed to minimise the impact on the local character of the Green Belt and the screening proposed will protect the character of the area. This will ensure the harm caused to Green Belt policy (in principle) will be minimised.
- The development proposed may be inappropriate by definition but will not in itself undermine the purposes of Green Belt or achievement of the objectives for it given the particulars and context.
- The proposals have significant benefits which include ecological enhancements, reduction in waste being transported from the site, improved noise mitigation, reductions in odour annoyance to neighbours, additional screening, a significant reduction in vehicle movements generated at the site and a reduction in energy consumption through renewable sources.
- The design of the buildings is sensitive to the context.

Notwithstanding the above, each application has to be treated on its own merits. Whilst this proposal conforms to the requirements for the functioning of the site, and the principle has been accepted on developing the site, this application still needs to be looked at in design terms and whether there will be any impact on the openness of the Green Belt. This is discussed below.

Design Issues

19. This proposal is for the relocation of the principle biological treatment part of the process. This includes the following:
 - iv) Three tanks-wet scrubber holding tank (6m diam x 4.9m high); balance tank (7.6m diam x 7m high); divert tank 12.8m diam x 7m high)
 - v) Control room and store, housed in a building 13.6m x 6m x 5.7m high.
 - vi) Associated pumps and circulation equipment in ancillary buildings.
20. The plant will treat waste water from the production process, particularly from the odour scrubbers and from high risk run-off from the yard areas. The requirement for a larger treatment plant are due to the increased volumes coming from the yard areas, allowing the capacity to be increased from 150 cubic metres a day to 450 cubic metres a day. Once treated, the water is recycled for re-use in the production process with surplus being discharged to the River Douglas, in line with the companies sustainability objectives. Surplus bacteria used in the effluent treatment process to treat the effluent to a water quality suitable to be discharged is then dewatered through a centrifuge, at the existing plant and reused as a fertilizer on agricultural land. The operation, control and management of the site is controlled through other legislation by the Environment Agency through the site's Environmental Permit.
21. The facility is located in the optimum site relative to the waste water treatment process. This is immediately adjacent to the wet scrubbers (biofilters) and the surface run-off lagoon. The layout of the development is dictated by the production process.
22. The control buildings are steel framed buildings clad with olive green composite panel. The principal tanks are constructed of in-situ cast concrete. The balance tanks are of glass coated steel panel construction, painted in a matching olive green colour. The buildings have been clad in this colour to blend with the generally wooded backdrop, and to contribute to the mitigation of the visual impacts

23. In relation to what has already been built on site, this element is relatively small. The masterplan has been approved within the previous application and it was known that there was a requirement to increase the capacity from 150 cubic metres a day to 450 cubic metres a day. Concerns were raised over the original location of the effluent treatment plant and its resultant 'sensitive' visual impact upon traffic heading north on Bank Bridge. The revised location would reduce the visual impact due to the advanced planting already carried out during the first phase of development acting as a screen, therefore the proposal is acceptable in design terms and would not have a detrimental visual impact on the Green Belt.

Flood Risk

24. The site is at risk of flooding, particularly if the flood defences were to fail. The previous application (ref 09/00738/FULMAJ) was accompanied by an Environmental Statement and include a Flood Risk Assessment. The relocation of the effluent treatment plant, within the site boundaries, should have no further impact upon flood risk.

25. The Environment Agency have been consulted on this scheme, however, they have not sent any comments. If any comments are received then these will be reported on the addendum.

Overall Conclusion

26. The original scheme and masterplan were approved in March 2010. As part of the masterplan there was a requirement to increase the capacity, which has resulted in this scheme. Also, the previous location of the effluent treatment plant raised concerns in relation to the visual impact upon traffic heading north on Bank Bridge. It is considered that the proposal is acceptable in this location and will have a reduced visual impact on the surrounding area, and is therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Planning Policies

National Planning Policies:

PPS1 and Climate Change Supplement and PPG2.

Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review

Policies:GN5, and DC1.

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

- Statement of Community Involvement
- Design Guide

Chorley's Local Development Framework

- Policy SR1: Incorporating Sustainable Resources into New Development
- Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document
- Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document

Planning History

03/00390/SCREEN: Screening report into whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required for a proposed development,

Decision: SCREEN Decision Date: 8 May 2003

94/00968/FUL: Erection of General Purpose Agricultural Building,
Decision: PERFPP Decision Date: 15 March 1995

94/00969/FUL: Extension to existing building housing Extrusion Plant to accommodate Bio
Filter Plant,
Decision: PERFPP Decision Date: 15 March 1995

95/00279/FUL: Alteration of existing roofline to accommodate mixing bin,
Decision: PERFPP Decision Date: 6 June 1995

96/00044/FUL: Widening of the existing driveway and improvements to the access,

Decision:	PERFPP	Decision Date:	1 May 1996
-----------	--------	----------------	------------

96/00320/FUL: Extension of existing mill building over existing yard area incorporating raising of roof height,

Decision:	PERFPP	Decision Date:	28 August 1996
-----------	--------	----------------	----------------

99/00132/FUL: Demolition of outbuildings, construction of bin storage building together with canteen shower block, garage, stables and stores,

Decision:	PERFPP	Decision Date:	7 July 1999
-----------	--------	----------------	-------------

03/00528/FULMAJ: Extension to buildings to form produce store, tractor store, administrative and staff accommodation, raw materials store, new entrance control, landscaping and waste water treatment area,

Decision:	PERFPP	Decision Date:	26 September 2003
-----------	--------	----------------	-------------------

05/01170/FUL: Construction of effluent treatment plant, including sedimentation pit, water balance tank, biological filters, reed beds and recycling lagoons, to treat the waste arising from the extrusion of agricultural produce for the purposes of animal and pet food production and the recycling of water back into the process (Site Area 0.65ha),

Decision:	INSFEE	Decision Date:	6 January 2006
-----------	--------	----------------	----------------

07/00843/FUL: Proposed installation of a sprinkler tank and associated pump house

Decision:	PERFPP	Decision Date:	5 October 2007
-----------	--------	----------------	----------------

08/00364/FUL: Installation of fan house, three activated carbon filters and flue to control odour emissions at Plocks Farm

Decision:	PERFPP	Decision Date:	15 August 2008
-----------	--------	----------------	----------------

09/00078/SCE: EIA Screening Opinion for Plocks Farm, Liverpool Road, Bretherton

Decision:	RESCEZ	Decision Date:	23 February 2009
-----------	--------	----------------	------------------

2009/00167/PREAPP:Chimney

Decision:	CLO	Decision Date:	
-----------	-----	----------------	--

09/00236/SCOPE: Scoping Opinion for the Environmental Impact Assessment at Plock farm, Liverpool Road, Bretherton.

Decision:	PESCOZ	Decision Date:	23 April 2009
-----------	--------	----------------	---------------

09/00738/FULMAJ: Extensions and alterations to pet food manufacturing facility including an automated finished product store (AFPS); upgraded and new extrusion process lines including a sunken mill; raw material storage; odour abatement (a roofed pine bark based biological filter system including venting chimneys, one 30 metres high); waste water treatment; additional capacity of waste recovery and recycling facilities; landscaping including earth excavation and mounding; related infrastructure.

Decision:	PERFPP	Decision Date:	25 March 2010
-----------	--------	----------------	---------------

10/00572/DIS: Extensions and alterations to pet food manufacturing facility including an automated finished product store (AFPS); upgraded and new extrusion process lines including a sunken mill;raw material storage;odour abatement (a roofed pine bark based biological filter system including venting chimneys, one 30m high);waste water treatment;additional capacity of waste recovery and recycling facilities;landscaping including earth excavation and mounding; related infrastructure.

Decision:	PCO	Decision Date:	No Decision
-----------	-----	----------------	-------------

**Recommendation: Permit Full Planning Permission
Conditions**

1. The proposed development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. Prior to the commencement of development details of the external facing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*Reason: To ensure that the materials used are visually appropriate to the locality and in accordance with Saved Policy GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Local Plan Review.*
3. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, except as may otherwise be specifically required by any other condition of this permission or unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*Reason: To define the permission and in the interests of the proper development of the site.*
4. Surface water must drain separate from the foul and no surface water will be permitted to discharge to the foul sewerage system.*Reason: To secure proper drainage and in accordance with Saved Policies EP17 and EM2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.*
5. Prior to the commencement of development full details of the existing and proposed slab levels (all relative to ground levels adjoining the site) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in conformity with the approved details.*Reason: As the site is within a Flood Risk Area and in accordance with Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 25: Development and Flood Risk.*