

APPLICATION REPORT – 19/00602/FUL

Validation Date: 10 September 2019

Ward: Wheelton And Withnell

Type of Application: Full Planning

Proposal: Re-modelling and landscaping of garden following the deposition of soil

Location: Prospect House Whins Lane Wheelton Chorley PR6 8HN

Case Officer: Mr Iain Crossland

Applicant: FI Real Estate Management Limited

Agent: Mr Andrew Piatt, Gateley Plc

Consultation expiry: 7 January 2020

Decision due by: 17 December 2020

UPDATE REPORT

1. The recommendation remains to approve the application subject to conditions.
 2. Members will recall that this application was deferred at the Planning Committee meeting held on 25 May 2021 to allow time for Members to visit the site. The original committee report from 25 May 2021 follows on below and has been updated to include the suggested conditions previously set out on the addendum.
 3. It is noted that in relation to paragraph 58 of the original report the Forestry Commission have confirmed that the tree felling works had been reported to them and are being investigated by their Woodland Officer and National Office.
-

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site is located in the Green Belt to the north of Wheelton and east of Whins Lane although it is not isolated. It occupies a higher land level relative to Whins Lane and rises steeply away from Whins Lane up to the platform of land that has been recently formed, which then rises more gently upwards towards Prospect House. Until recently there was dense vegetation with mature trees occupying the land between Whins Lane and the bottom of the slope that has been developed, however, the trees have recently been either felled or severely pollarded resulting in a more open aspect. It is noted that at the time the works were carried out to the land subject to this application and at the time the planning application was submitted the trees were not protected but remained in situ. It was not until over a year later that significant works to the trees were undertaken. Prior to the deposition of materials to create a level platform, the land to the east of Whins Lane sloped less steeply upwards from the lane and provided an attractive tree lined aspect along this highway with a dense canopy of trees that provided a high level of public amenity.

3. The character of the area is predominantly open agricultural land with sporadic dwellings and clusters of development, including small villages. It is noted that a public right of way runs to the south west boundary of the application site.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

4. This application seeks planning permission retrospectively for the re-modelling and landscaping of what is referred to by the applicant as a garden, following the deposition of soil. This has involved the importation of inert sub-soils (clay) via 20t road wagons to the site, and its deposition to the west of the site between the dwelling at Prospect House and the highway at Whins Lane to create a level platform area with a resulting slope of approximately 60 degrees close to the boundary with Whins Lane.
5. The platform extends approximately 9m in depth, whilst the slope is approximately 4m deep with a height of approximately 8m. The material has been spread and levelled over 300mm layers with a Tensar Geogrid (Ground stabilisation mesh) installed on the initial formation and then every 2nd layer at 0.600mm intervals totalling 20 layers. A 150mm perforated land drain has been installed across the width of the area.

REPRESENTATIONS

6. A total of 4no. representations have been received, one of which represents 4no. occupiers of different addresses, citing the following grounds of objection:
 - Impacts on surface water run off from the land and lack of adequate drainage.
 - Works to trees were carried out that affected the character of the site.
 - Impact from the deposited material on the trees through root compaction.
 - The application description refers to the land as garden, however, it is agricultural land. This would require a change of use of the land.
 - Ecological impacts and contravention of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).
 - Impact on the character of the area.
 - Instability of materials.
 - Disappointment with the carrying out works prior to seeking planning permission and subsequent inability to properly assess the impacts and methods of development before they took place.
 - The stated start date for the works is incorrect.
 - The amount of material deposited is claimed to be less than 1000 tonnes, but is estimated by residents as being in excess of this amount.
 - A tree survey has not been undertaken and should be required.
 - No forestry licence was applied for in respect of recent tree felling.
 - Nesting birds might have been affected by recent tree works.
 - The trees should have been protected with Tree Preservation Orders.
 - The application should have been dealt with by Lancashire County Council as the authority for waste and minerals in the area.
7. Cllr Margaret France has raised an objection and has commented that: There has been an enormous amount of work done to this property without any planning consent. Residents from Blackburn Road Whittle-le-Woods reported a constant stream of tractors and trailers moving earth from there to Whins Lane, over many months which was only halted when a temporary stop notice was issued.

Local residents of Whins Lane have had concerns about the change of use from agricultural land to garden curtilage, the stability of the resulting mass of earth against the natural slope of the hillside, and most recently, the considerable water run-off along the adjacent footpath, highway, and onto other properties.

This process has shown a lack of respect for neighbours' right to enjoy their own properties and, not least, for the proper planning procedures. At the very least, I would expect the site to be thoroughly investigated in terms of land stability and drainage of surface water, and any defects made good to allow the residents of Whins Lane to feel safe in their own homes.

All too often it would seem that the work is carried out first, and planning permission sought second, which flies in the face of planning legislation

CONSULTATIONS

8. Wheelton Parish Council: From the Parish Council's observations and local knowledge the Parish Council is fully supportive of the residents' issues raised and raise concerns about the amount of soil brought onto the site. Councillors are concerned about the way this application has been progressed and request that the application addresses the flooding issues. It was agreed that the area now requires a proper professional drainage scheme installing to mitigate the flooding that this work may have caused and a system of regular cleaning of the gullies on Whins Lane be implemented.
9. Waste & Contaminated Land: Have confirmed that they have no comments to make.
10. Lead Local Flood Authority: Have confirmed that they have no objection.
11. Environment Agency: No comments have been received.
12. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: Have commented that since the application is made retrospectively it is not possible to assess whether there were any ecological constraints.
13. Lancashire County Council Development Management: Have provided general advice and observations regarding the works carried out and details submitted.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

14. The application site is located in the Green Belt to the north of Wheelton and east of Whins Lane. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out at Chapter 13 that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence, and their purposes are set out as below:
 134. *Green Belt serves five purposes:*
 - a) *to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
 - b) *to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
 - c) *to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
 - d) *to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
 - e) *to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*
 15. Paragraph 143 sets out that "*Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.*"
 16. Paragraph 144 of the Framework goes on to state that:
"When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations."
 17. Deposition of material and the re-profiling and remodelling of land has been carried out between the dwelling at Prospect House and Whins Lane. This has involved the engineering of the land to create a platform and change the profile of the land. With regards to such works these are engineering operations within the Green Belt, and it is noted that paragraph 146 of the Framework states that:
"Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

- a) mineral extraction;
- b) engineering operations;
- c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
- e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
- f) development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.”

18. The reprofiling of the land through the deposition of inert materials is considered to be engineering operations in accordance with paragraph 146 b) of the Framework. Engineering operations are not necessarily inappropriate development within Green Belt locations providing that they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belt.
19. As such there are two considerations in respect of the proposal and the appropriateness of the development in the Green Belt as follows:
20. 1) Will the development preserve the openness of the Green Belt? Whilst the test for sites such as this relates to preserving openness it is important to note that the Framework contains no specific definition of ‘openness’. The works that have been carried out have resulted in a change to the slope profile resulting in a steeper bank that is visible from Whins Lane. Although this does have the appearance of an engineered operation rather than the natural profile of the land the reprofiling simply results in a different landform rather than a built development that would otherwise impact on openness. As such the land remains visually open, albeit with a different landform.
21. 2) Will the development conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt? Paragraph 134 of the Framework sets out the five Green Belt purposes, which the scheme is assessed against as below:
22. Purpose 1 (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas).
The proposal does not relate to a large built up area.
23. Purpose 2 (to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another)
The development has not led to the coalescence of neighbouring towns. In respect of the neighbouring villages, the development has not led to a coalescence of neighbouring villages.
24. Purpose 3 (to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;).
The development does not alter the status of the land or introduce any built form. It simply alters the profile of the land. Therefore, it is considered that the development does not represent encroachment into the countryside.
25. Purpose 4 (to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;).
This does not apply as the site is not located near a historical town
26. Purpose 5 (to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land).
It is not considered that the proposal conflicts with this purpose.
27. It is considered that the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt in this location and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt in accordance with paragraph 146 of the Framework. The proposal, therefore, does not represent inappropriate development within this Green Belt location.

Impact on the character of the area

28. The application site is located to the east of Whins Lane from which it is visible beyond the trees and boundary features. Whins Lane is used for recreational purposes by significant numbers of people connecting with routes along the canal and beyond and, therefore, the development occupies a relatively prominent position. The works that were carried out to reprofile the land resulted in a steeply sloping bank of material being created to the east of the lane. This has an unnatural man-made appearance that initially appeared rather stark in comparison with the dense border vegetation and more gentle slope that previously occupied the land.
29. Over 18 months after the works had been carried out to reprofile the land the mature trees along this boundary of the site were either felled or pollarded. This has exacerbated the appearance of the land, making the unnatural slope all the more visible and apparent in the landscape in this location along Whins Lane. The appearance of the reprofiled slope detracts from the visual appearance and character of Whins Lane, and more so following on from the recent tree works. This is particularly the case as prior to the works being carried out the land provided a high level of public amenity through the dense canopy of trees that overhung the lane. It should be noted, however, that the trees were not protected at the time the works took place and, therefore, there was no planning regulation in place to prevent their removal or pollarding.
30. Given the prominence of the location and the resultant stark unnatural landform, notwithstanding that trees have been recently removed to expose it more, it is recommended that a condition be attached to any grant of planning permission requiring a detailed landscaping plan for the site to be submitted to the local planning authority, with the specific intention of improving the landscaped buffer along the western edge of the site and between the top of the slope and boundary with Whins Lane. This should include native planting and the planting of trees of a type reflecting those that were previously present in this location.
31. On the basis that a landscaping scheme is provided to mitigate the harm to the character of the area it is considered that the development complies with policy BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.

Impact on neighbour amenity

32. The application site is located immediately to the east of dwellings at nos.6, 8 and 10 Whins Lane. These properties have always been at a lower level to the application site, with a steep change in levels between the dwellings and the application site. The works to reprofile the land have resulted in a steeper slope beyond the public right of way to the rear of these dwellings, however, the extent of the slope is lesser at this point and its presence and altered landform is no more harmful to the amenity of the occupiers than the historic situation. It is noted that during the engineering operations to reprofile the land the coming and going of heavy goods vehicles and operation of machinery would have impacted upon the amenity of nearby residents, however, this impact was a temporary one and ceased some time ago with the completion of the works.

Impacts from surface water drainage

33. It is noted that surface water run off has been an issue for residents of Whins Lane for some time now, however, a number of residents have identified concerns with changes in the way surface water drains from the application site and affects their properties, the local highway drains and the public right of way since the deposition of material has taken place.
34. The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 sets out the requirement for Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) to manage 'local' flood risk within their area. 'Local' flood risk refers to flooding or flood risk from surface water, groundwater or from ordinary watercourses. The LLFA, therefore, advise Chorley Council on technical matters relating to surface water runoff from development. They have considered the development carried out as part of this application and associated surface water drainage impacts and have identified that the development involved the deposition of soil and landscaping to level the sloping terrain that

falls east to west across the property. The land falls by approximately 15 metres across 140 metres in total from the eastern boundary of the property to Whins Lane.

35. Based on the evidence provided, the LLFA is satisfied that the development does not increase surface water runoff or alter flood risk at other locations. While the development on this site locally alters the terrain, the overall gradient of the slope (~5°) and broader terrain across the site is maintained. This development does not, therefore, increase surface water runoff or alter its direction of flow across the site. On the contrary, it is considered that the introduction of level terraces may in fact slow the flow of surface water. Furthermore, the landscaping in this development involves the deposition of additional topsoil, but does not involve the removal of any permeable surfaces. Once the new soil is fully revegetated, this will not inhibit infiltration across the site.
36. Residents on Whins Lane have raised concerns that the development at Prospect House is increasing surface water runoff, based on reported flooding incidents in September 2019. These flooding incidents occurred during a prolonged period of increased rainfall and where several storms impacted the region in succession between July 2019 and February 2020. This period of increased rainfall led to the saturation of the ground across the region. This flooding was likely, therefore, a consequence of increased surface water runoff due to limited infiltration as a result of the saturated ground. These conditions are comparable to Storm Desmond and the Boxing Day floods of December 2015, which predate the development in question and during which the properties on Whins Lane also reported flooding and property damage. The 2015 storms and the events in 2019/20 both led to pervasive saturation of the ground throughout the region, resulting in increased surface water runoff and property damage. As the LLFA has reports of pre development flooding it is very important that any proposed development does not make any existing situation worse. As detailed above, the LLFA is satisfied that this proposal does not increase flood risk within the site or elsewhere.
37. The LLFA raises no objection to the application and do not recommend any conditions, as the development is not considered to have resulted in any additional surface water run off, and it is considered that the development may offer some improvement.

Impact on ecology and trees

38. Policy BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 requires Biodiversity and Ecological Network resources to be protected, conserved, restored and enhanced. In particular regard to this application the policy requires the production of a net gain in biodiversity where possible by designing in wildlife and by ensuring that any adverse impacts are avoided or if unavoidable are reduced or appropriately mitigated and/or compensated; Development should also support enhancements that contribute to habitat restoration. Policy BNE10 provides more specific requirements in relation to trees and in particular requires replanting where development would take place that would result in the loss of, or inappropriate works to, trees.
39. The engineering operations to reprofile the land were carried out in advance of a planning application being submitted and, therefore, at the point of assessment any ecological impacts resulting from the development had already taken place. Despite the works having taken place already the Council's ecology advisors GMEU were consulted on the application. They noted that no ecological information had been supplied. However, as the application is retrospective and the works carried out, it was considered too late to check whether there were any ecological constraints that required mitigation.
40. It is unlikely there were any protected species issues associated with this development. There appear to be no ponds in close proximity to the site to provide great crested newt breeding habitat or bat roosting potential on the site prior to works. It is theoretically possible that a badger sett may have been present but the open nature of the field would make this a low risk site. It is not, therefore, likely that any respective mitigation measures would have been required.

41. It was claimed on the application form that no trees were lost as part of the development and that no tree removal was required. It is however likely that a standard bird nesting condition would have been required given the nature of the site. However, as the works have now been completed no such condition is necessary.
42. It is possible that species such as Himalayan balsam and Japanese knotweed were present around the boundary of the site and that the subsequent earthworks resulted in a spread of these species. Japanese knotweed roots spread several meters from the aerial part of the plant and balsam spreads are also dispersed several meters. It is, therefore, recommended that a survey of the boundaries for these species is carried out and if present a method statement produced to deal with any subsequent regrowth across the site.
43. Section 170 of the Framework states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. It appears that no nett loss of biodiversity is likely to occur with low ecological value grassland being replaced with low value ecological grassland. However, there has been an impact on existing trees and some trees have been removed at the time of the development. In particular a large amount of soil has been deposited on top of the rooting area of numerous mature trees, which could have a negative impact on the health of the trees through the suffocation of roots. Since there is some unquantified harm to the remaining trees and some trees have been lost as a result of the development then it is considered that suitable mitigation should be provided. This detail should be set out in a detailed landscaping plan and it is recommended that such a landscaping scheme involving the planning of trees, reflecting those species on the site, be required by condition.
44. On the basis that a landscaping scheme is provided to mitigate the harm to the remaining trees and habitat and loss of trees as a result of the development the application is considered to comply with policies BNE9 and BNE10 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.

Land stability

45. The Framework refers to preventing both new and existing development being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, land instability. The Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 seeks to manage development proposals so that development of any unstable land is suitably addressed. Policy BNE7 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 states:
- Applications for development on unstable or potentially unstable land must be accompanied by a stability report identifying the relevant issues and how they will be overcome and demonstrating all of the following:*
- a) *There is no unacceptable risk to the occupiers of the developing or neighbouring land;*
 - b) *There is no threat to the structural integrity of any building built, or to be built, on or adjacent to the site;*
 - c) *The development would not cause the instability of adjoining land or buildings;*
 - d) *That adequate measures to alleviate any gas emissions can be provided and that arrangements have been made for regular monitoring;*
 - e) *Before any work begins, a scheme of remedial work, and where appropriate of maintenance arrangements, has been approved by the planning authority in writing;*
 - f) *That all the remedial work proposed in a scheme approved by the planning authority has been completed before the development is first occupied.*
46. The development that has been carried out does not directly sit within this policy approach. The issue of stability in this instance is more in relation to the stability of the development itself rather than the effects of unstable land on a development to be carried out.
47. In seeking to demonstrate that works that have been carried out are structurally sound the applicant has submitted details of the method of works carried out in the deposition of the materials and reprofiling works. The applicant has confirmed that the materials imported to the site are inert non contaminated subsoils (clay). Compaction of the existing ground prior to receiving the subsoil layers was carried out. The imported subsoil was spread and levelled in 300mm layers utilising a D6 Komatsu Tracked Dozer compacted with a VIBROMAX VM65 SMOOTH/PADFOOT 6.3/6.5 TONNES vibrating roller, installing Tensar

Geogrid (Ground stabilisation mesh) on the formation and then every second layer at 0.600mm intervals totalling 20 layers, to prevent sinkage and slipping.

48. The banking / batter at the rear of the garden was left on a 15% vertical batter with an additional layer of vertical erosion protection. In addition to this a 150mm perforated land drain was installed across the width of the area to remove excess water excess surface / groundwater from the area to prevent flooding below and fill slippage.
49. Evidence of a warranty covering any defects in material and installation has been provided by ECE Contractors Limited covering the works for a period of 25 years. The profiled slope has already proven to be stable over the two years in which it has been in situ and its stability should become even more established over time.
50. This method of works and guarantee provide an adequate level of information such that the Local Planning Authority have some level of assurance that the works that have been carried out are in line with a recognised specification and that the developer has sought to ensure that the works are stable and robust.
51. Ultimately the responsibility for the safe development, which in this case relates to the stability of the slope, rests with the developer. The Local Planning Authority can only determine the application on the basis of the information submitted, however, this does not mean that the land is free from instability. This is a matter for the landowner to ensure from a public safety perspective and in relation to other surrounding land and assets that may be affected.

Other matters

52. The application description refers to the land as garden, however, it is agricultural land. This would require a change of use of the land: The current application is for the engineering operations to reprofile the land and is not seeking a determination as to the status of the land in planning terms.
53. Ecological impacts and contravention of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981): As the development took place without any opportunity to assess the ecological conditions of the site it is not known for certain whether there has been any infringement of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), and the Council has no evidence of such a contravention having taken place, or of the parties involved.
54. Disappointment with the carrying out works prior to seeking planning permission and subsequent inability to properly assess the impacts and methods of development before they took place: It is highly regrettable that the development was carried out without planning permission, thus preventing a full assessment of the site and potential impacts before any work took place.
55. The stated start date for the works is incorrect: This is noted. For the purposes of the assessment it was clear from various site visits following the receipt of the application that the development applied for had been completed.
56. The amount of material deposited is claimed to be less than 1000 tonnes, but is estimated by residents as being in excess of this amount: Through site visits it was established that the development had been completed and the associated material is in situ. As such the extent of the development within the landscape is apparent enabling a visual assessment to be carried out. Any vehicle journeys and associated highway impacts resulting from the importation of the volume of material deposited on site has already taken place and ceased. It is not, therefore, necessary to carry out any assessment of the highway impacts involved in transporting material to the site.
57. A tree survey has not been undertaken and should be required: The impact of the development work on the trees had already taken place at the point the application was received, and the development had since been completed. The impact on the trees is assessed above.

58. No forestry licence was applied for in respect of recent tree felling: This is a matter for the Forestry Commission and such a licence is not issued by Chorley Council, nor is this a matter against which Chorley Council has powers to enforce.
59. The trees should have been protected with Tree Preservation Orders: It is unfortunate that the trees were not protected by Tree Preservation Orders, however, up until the point at which the development had been carried out the trees were not under threat and the development works could not have been anticipated. The trees were largely unaffected at the time of the development other than through the compaction of roots from the deposited material. Further works to the trees were then carried out over 18 months later.
60. The application should have been dealt with by Lancashire County Council as the authority for waste and minerals in the area: It is understood that at the time the Council was alerted of engineering works taking place on the site a site visit was carried out by officers of Chorley Council and Lancashire County Council. Lancashire County Council officers identified that the material being transported and deposited on the site was inert subsoil, which was not considered waste. As a result the County Council officers considered that this was not a waste and minerals operation, and as such deferred the matter to Chorley Council.

CONCLUSION

61. The proposed development does not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the openness of the area is preserved along with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. There would be no unacceptable harm to the character of the area subject to the provision of an appropriate landscaping scheme. There is no neighbour amenity impact over and above the historic situation. There is no unacceptable or identifiable harm to ecology, drainage, or land stability subject to the provision of a landscaping scheme. As such the proposed development is, therefore, considered to be acceptable and as such is recommended for approval.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

- Ref:** 5/5/10377 **Decision:** CLO **Decision Date:** 22 January 1974
Description: Site and Detail Demolition of Prospect House and Erection of Bungalow
- Ref:** 74/00049/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 8 July 1974
Description: Bungalow
- Ref:** 06/01384/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 6 March 2007
Description: Demolition of existing attached and detached garages followed by rebuilding at a lower slab level with minor changes to design and scale, lower the level of the existing parking area to the front of the house and provide retaining walls where necessary, two single storey extensions to house one including a conservatory and retrospective application for blockwork retaining walls to tennis court and the rear of the house
- Ref:** 07/00896/FUL **Decision:** REFFPP **Decision Date:** 17 October 2007
Description: Proposed revised garage layout for approved application ref 06/01384/FUL
- Ref:** 07/01217/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 12 December 2007
Description: Proposed revised garage layout for approved application ref. 06/01384/FUL
- Ref:** 14/00603/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 1 March 2016
Description: 1) Proposed change of use and extension of existing garage block to form garage and new live/work unit and 2) Demolition of existing outbuilding

RELEVANT POLICIES: In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted

Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

Suggested conditions

| No. | Condition | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1. | <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Title</th><th>Drawing Reference</th><th>Received date</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Location plan</td><td>TQRQM19196142653644</td><td>15 July 2019</td></tr> <tr> <td>Topographical Land Survey (Re Level Survey 10.07.19) Sheet 2 of 4</td><td>LOR.TS.01 Rev.C</td><td>15 January 2020</td></tr> <tr> <td>Topographical Land Survey (OGL – Re Level Overlay) Sheet 3 of 4</td><td>LOR.TS.01 Rev.C</td><td>15 January 2020</td></tr> <tr> <td>Topographical Land Survey (OGL – Re Level Live Sections) Sheet 4 of 4</td><td>LOR.TS.01 Rev.C</td><td>15 January 2020</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</i></p> | Title | Drawing Reference | Received date | Location plan | TQRQM19196142653644 | 15 July 2019 | Topographical Land Survey (Re Level Survey 10.07.19) Sheet 2 of 4 | LOR.TS.01 Rev.C | 15 January 2020 | Topographical Land Survey (OGL – Re Level Overlay) Sheet 3 of 4 | LOR.TS.01 Rev.C | 15 January 2020 | Topographical Land Survey (OGL – Re Level Live Sections) Sheet 4 of 4 | LOR.TS.01 Rev.C | 15 January 2020 |
| Title | Drawing Reference | Received date | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Location plan | TQRQM19196142653644 | 15 July 2019 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Topographical Land Survey (Re Level Survey 10.07.19) Sheet 2 of 4 | LOR.TS.01 Rev.C | 15 January 2020 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Topographical Land Survey (OGL – Re Level Overlay) Sheet 3 of 4 | LOR.TS.01 Rev.C | 15 January 2020 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Topographical Land Survey (OGL – Re Level Live Sections) Sheet 4 of 4 | LOR.TS.01 Rev.C | 15 January 2020 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | <p>A scheme for the landscaping of the development shall be submitted to the local planning authority within six weeks from the grant of planning permission. These details shall include all existing trees and hedgerows on the land; indicate the types and numbers of trees, shrubs and wildflower to be planted, and their distribution on site. The scheme should include a landscaping/habitat creation and management plan, which should aim to contribute to targets specified in the UK and Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plans. Landscaping proposals should comprise only native plant communities appropriate to the natural area.</p> <p>All landscaping works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details within the first planting and seeding seasons after planning permission has been granted, and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the grant of planning permission die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.</p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out to mitigate the impact of the development.</i></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | <p>Within six weeks from the grant of planning permission an invasive species survey of the area of the site within which the deposition of soils has taken place shall be carried out and a report submitted to the local planning authority. Should any such species be identified within the report then a method statement detailing eradication and/or control measures for those invasive species shall be included within the survey report for agreement in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed method statement shall thereafter be implemented in full unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p><i>Reason: Due to the potential presence of invasive plant species.</i></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |