

APPLICATION REPORT – 21/01255/FULMAJ

Validation Date: 3 December 2020

Ward: Chorley North West

Type of Application: Full Planning

Proposal: Erection of an inflatable multi-sport airdome, including a concrete ring beam for anchoring, resurfacing of tennis courts and other associated infrastructure and ancillary facilities

Location: Parklands High School, Southport Road, Chorley. PR7 1LL

Case Officer: Mr Iain Crossland

Applicant: Mr Rhenden Pillay, Athletico Buckshaw Futsal Ltd

Agent: Mr Russell Adams, Adams Planning + Development Ltd

Consultation expiry: 3 February 2021

Decision due by: 16 July 2021 (Extension of time agreed)

RECOMMENDATION

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site is located within the grounds of Parklands Academy, which is a Secondary School that lies approximately 1km north west of Chorley town centre, and is within the core settlement area of Chorley. The school campus is to the north of the A581 (Southport Road), and is positioned between this and Great Wood to the north through which the River Chor runs. These woods are designated ancient woodlands and form part of the parkland of Astley Hall and Park that lie beyond to the north and are designated as an Historic Park and Garden. To the east and west of the school campus are residential housing estates.
3. The school campus comprises an open area of grass playing fields on the western and central areas of the campus, an all-weather playing pitch located on the northern side of the campus and a cluster of school buildings and hard standings located in the south eastern area of the school campus.
4. The proposed new sports dome would be located on an existing macadam tennis court sports area that is located to the north eastern corner of the school campus and currently accommodates four hard surfaced tennis courts. The application site is adjacent to Great Wood, which lies to the north and east. To the south are the school buildings and to the west are the playing fields and all weather playing pitch. It is noted that there are residential dwellings beyond the school boundary to the south east of the application site.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

5. This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of an inflatable multi-sport airdome, including a concrete ring beam for anchoring the proposed dome, resurfacing of the tennis courts and other associated infrastructure and ancillary facilities including plant.

The proposed sports dome would cover the full extent of the macadam hardstanding tennis court area and would measure approximately 35 metres wide by 58 metres long and approximately 11 metres in height.

6. The proposed dome would consist of a translucent polyethylene canopy, which would be supported by a frame and anchored into the ground around the perimeter through a series of anchor points attached to a concrete ring beam. The ring beam is a concrete foundation that would be set within a trench around the perimeter of the playing surface. This would be dug within the existing area of tarmac. There would be two additional internal membranes on the inside of the dome and the dome would be internally lit. The dome would have a revolving door entrance and ventilation units to the west side and an emergency exit doorway in the south side elevation. The existing courts would be surfaced with an enclosed interlocking suspended flooring system to provide a suitable playing surface.

REPRESENTATIONS

7. Representations have been received from the occupiers of 35 addresses; Barton Wilmore on behalf of local residents; the Friends of Astley Park; Chorley and District Natural History Society; and Friends of Chorley Great Wood, citing the following grounds of objection:

- The scale of the structure is such that it would result in an adverse loss of light and outlook to neighbouring properties.
- The scale and design of the dome would be out of keeping with the character of the area and would be harmful to the landscape and its visual appearance.
- Parking and access are already a massive issue for local residents and the proposed development would exacerbate this situation.
- Lack of parking and impact on highway safety, capacity and amenity through users parking on surrounding streets.
- Would cause harm to the setting of listed buildings and an historic park and gardens.
- Lack of a heritage statement in what is a highly sensitive location.
- Noise and disturbance associated with a commercial venture in a quiet residential area.
- Wildlife and ecological impacts through light emissions and the blocking of daylight to the woodland.
- Harmful impact on trees and the ancient woodland at Great Wood.
- Light pollution affecting public and residential amenity.
- No tree survey has been submitted and trees within the site would clearly be impacted upon by the development.
- An ecological impact assessment should have been provided with the application.
- A bat survey is required.
- Carbon footprint analysis should have been provided.
- The proposal would likely add pressure from requests to prune trees within the ancient woodland.
- Increased flood risk from the development.
- There are already enough sports facilities in Chorley.
- Lack of notification.
- The development is not financially viable.
- The fee paid for the development has been incorrectly calculated.
- No information about the maximum capacity of the dome has been provided and so a fair assessment of the proposal is not possible.
- The Transport Assessment is unrealistic and has not properly considered the current parking / highway issues.
- Not enough data to fully understand the traffic that would be generated.
- Usage time would overlap and there would be more vehicles than predicted in the Transport Statement.
- The development would not meet with fire or disabled access regulations.
- Would attract antisocial behaviour.

8. Details of a petition against the development have been provided in the form of two PDF's which detail the following;

- 70 page list of 1,502 individual objectors, of which 659 (44%) are 'local' (Lancashire) and;
 - 10 page list of 120 individual comments, of which 65 (54%) are local (Lancashire).
9. Representations in support have been received from the occupiers of 189 addresses. These make the following comments:
- Provision of a facility that would be available all year round.
 - Would help improve people's health and fitness.
 - Would be an inclusive facility for all, not just the school.
 - The site is an existing playing facility.
 - The site is accessible to a large number of people and via public transport and walking.
 - There is plenty parking for users.
 - The site is such that there would be a limited impact on neighbouring occupiers.
 - Very little light would be emitted.
10. Supporting statements have also been received from pupil leaders at Parklands Academy.

CONSULTATIONS

11. Regulatory Services - Environmental Health: Have no objection and comment that should the Council receive complaints regarding statutory nuisance if the proposed development is approved, then these will be investigated in accordance with the relevant procedures.
12. Lancashire County Council Highway Services: Comment that the proposal is acceptable from highway perspective.
13. United Utilities: Have no objection subject to conditions.
14. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: Have no objection.
15. Growth Lancashire (Heritage and conservation advice): Advise that the proposed scheme would meet the duty to 'preserve' as laid down by s.66 of the P(LBCA) Act 1990 and meet the objectives of Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy 16 of the Lancashire Core Strategy and policy BNE8 of the Chorley Local Plan (2012 – 2026).
16. Waste & Contaminated Land: No comments have been received.
17. Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside: Comment that the application site appears to be closer to the woodland edge than 15m. If that be so, they must raise an objection unless and until that is resolved.
18. Astley Village Parish Council: Comment that although the Parish Council is in favour of greater opportunities for sport and recreation for the people of Chorley and surrounding areas, Parish Councillors expressed a number of concerns as follows:
- The Astley Village Parish Council has been happy to support the development of the West Way Sports Hub and agreed to give financial support for the establishment of a play area for younger children. The proposed erection of an inflatable multi-sport airdome at Parklands High School does however create a number of difficulties.
 - This enormous dome, more than twice the height of a two storey house, will be adjacent to Astley Park and will have a detrimental environmental impact on the Park. The Park is used by hundreds of people every day as an opportunity to walk among the trees to get away from the 'concrete jungle'. The proposed dome will dominate the area and no doubt the noise of the pumps used to inflate the dome will be very intrusive. These pumps will be running 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Could the dome not be moved to the opposite side of the site, next to Southport Road, where it would have little impact on the peace of the woods?

- The Friends of Astley Park actively encourage wildlife in the area and have installed 90 bat-boxes, some of them very, very close to the proposed dome. The associated additional lighting will have a serious impact on the wildlife and particularly on the 9 species of bats known to inhabit the Park.
- Southport Road already has real problems regarding parking, especially at the end of the school day. The last thing we need is additional cars creating a real safety concern.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of the development

19. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.
20. Of particular relevance to the proposed development is paragraph 91 of Framework that states *Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.*
21. Paragraph 97 of the Framework goes on to state *“Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: [...] b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.”*
22. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy policy 24 covers sport and recreation and seeks to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to access good sport, physical activity and recreation facilities (including children’s play) by d) identifying sites for major new facilities where providers have evidence of need.
23. The application site is located in the settlement area of Chorley. The Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026 states that within the settlement areas excluded from the Green Belt, and identified on the Policies Map, there is a presumption in favour of appropriate sustainable development.
24. Policy HW2 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 seeks to protect existing open space and states that land and buildings currently or last used as, or ancillary to, open space or sports and recreational facilities will be protected unless certain criteria can be met. This approach is reflected and supported in the Framework.
25. The application site is an existing sports facility, however, the proposed development seeks to upgrade the sports facilities through the addition of the proposed dome and new surfacing, which would extend the availability of sports facilities into the evening and in all weather conditions. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal is more akin to the provision of new facilities that seek to make more effective use of the available area and is most appropriately assessed under policy HW1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026, which covers the provision of new open space, sport and recreational facilities.
26. Policy HW1 states that proposals for the provision of new open space, sport and recreational facilities or extensions to existing facilities will be permitted if all criteria of the policy are met. These are set out and addressed as follows:
27. *The development will not have an adverse impact on the local environment or visual character of the landscape;*

The application site is well contained within a wider, well defined, secondary school site. The wider school campus is positioned between Southport Road to the south, mature woodland to the north at Great Wood and residential development to the east and west. The application site itself is positioned to the north of the school buildings, between these and the woodland, which lies to the north and east, whilst open playing fields to the west provide a more open aspect. It is also noted that the site lies at a lower level relative to the school buildings and that there are houses on Hampton Close to the south east.

The proposed dome would be some 11m in height at its apex and would resemble a large smoothly curving white dome. No buildings of this type are in evidence in the locality, and so it would contrast with the buildings of modern design style that comprise the school buildings and are of a more angular form. Although its form would contrast with the school buildings the scale of the proposed dome would be comparable, particularly when accounting for levels differences, with the application site being at a lower level relative to the ground level of the existing school buildings. In this sense although it would introduce a new design feature to the area, it would not be of wholly unexpected appearance in the context of a modern secondary school grounds where buildings of similar scale are in evidence.

In terms of its positioning and prominence the most clear views of the proposed dome would be from distance across the playing fields from Southport Road, where it would lie beyond a fenced artificial pitch. It would be seen with the school buildings to the south, and would form part of this collection of built form. Some limited public views would be possible from Glamis Drive and Hampton Close to the south east between buildings, where it would be seen in the background. The proposed dome would be set far enough away from these view points that it would not be a domineering feature and would form a coherent part of the collection of buildings on the school site.

Views from the woodland footpaths within Astley Park would also be possible, particularly in winter, although even in winter these views would be filtered to an extent by the trees within the woodland. From the paths within Great Wood the proposed dome would be situated at a relatively higher level. At present the school buildings are seen through filtered views from these paths, and the proposed development would result in a smooth dome being positioned closer to the woodland and paths. Although visible through filtered views beyond the woodland the proposed dome would not be so prominent or unsightly that it would have an adverse impact on the local environment or visual character of the landscape from paths within Great Wood.

In all cases the proposed dome would be viewed in the context of adjacent buildings within a school site. A number of the school buildings would appear greater in height, due to the levels difference across the site and the proposed dome would not be out of scale by comparison. Although visible, and somewhat unusual in form, the proposed dome would not be overly prominent in the locality given the restricted public views available and distances involved, and would ultimately form a coherent part of the collection of school buildings on the school campus.

The proposed dome would be internally lit through LED lights hanging from within the dome from the roof structure. Given the translucent nature of the covering materials it would be visible in the evenings. A light assessment submitted with the application details that the lighting would be positioned directly above the pitch similar to that of a sports hall. This means that luminaires are not positioned around the pitch at angles creating glare, upward lighting, or overspill. The proposed dome itself is designed to prevent any internal light from escaping. The edges are sealed, and the material specifically chosen to reduce the transmission of light through it. The manufacturers have provided a technical data sheet, which identifies the light transmission factor of the material to be 6.13%, which is very low, and is considerably less than the floodlighting to the existing multi-use sports pitch at the centre of the school playing fields.

Although there would be some visual impact when in use, the lit dome would be seen within the context of a floodlit artificial pitch and public views would be from distance or would be restricted by existing buildings or filtered by mature woodland. Furthermore, the hours of use would be controlled by condition preventing prolonged use throughout the night, and the hours of use would reflect those of the floodlit artificial pitch. It is, therefore, considered that there would be no adverse impact on the local environment or visual character of the landscape, when the dome is lit.

The site is situated in an urban context in an undesignated landscape and away from the main public road and/or any listed buildings and heritage assets (although there are heritage assets to the north that are considered in detail below). The site is generally well screened given the existing mature trees to the north and the school buildings to the south that are sited at a higher level relative to the location of the proposed dome. The height and massing of the proposed dome would be compatible in height and scale to the height and massing of the main school buildings, and the sky glow impact would be considerably less than the existing floodlit artificial pitch to the west. On this basis it is not considered that the proposed dome would result in any harmful adverse impact on the local environment or visual character of the landscape in the context of this largely urban environment.

28. *The development will not result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3);*

No agricultural land would be lost as a result of the proposed development.

29. *The development will not cause harm to a site of nature conservation value;*

The proposal has been assessed by Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU), who confirm that the site does not have any nature conservation designations, legal or otherwise, nor does it meet the description of proposed works for Natural England's Impact Risk Zone in relation to the West Pennine Moors (SSSI) or Charnock Richard Pasture (SSSI).

From examining the available ecological records and the aerial photographs of the site GMEU do not envisage that there would be a reasonable likelihood of protected species being present as the application site comprises hard standing.

It is acknowledged that the site is adjacent to ancient woodland, and while the development would not encroach into this woodland area, it would fall within the identified buffer zone. Development within the buffer zone is not necessarily unacceptable and its acceptability or otherwise depends upon the specific circumstances of each case and the impact on the woodland assets that the buffer zone is designed to protect. The Framework specifically sets out at paragraph 175.c) that *development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.*

The proposed development would involve digging a 1m deep and 0.4m wide trench around the inner perimeter of the macadam tennis courts in order to create a ring beam that would be used to anchor the proposed dome. Outside of this there would be a shallow drainage channel to catch the surface water run-off, which would also be set within the existing hardstanding area. As such all excavations would be within the existing area of hard surfacing, which is approximately 7m from the boundary of the school grounds with Great Wood to the east.

Notwithstanding this an examination of the site by the Council's tree officer has identified that the development would most likely fall outside the root protection areas (RPA) of any trees that lie within the ancient woodland, due to the distance and the change in levels. However, given that the site does fall within the buffer zone of the ancient woodland and is in close proximity to it, it is recommended that a condition be attached to any grant of planning permission requiring that the development is carried out in line with a method statement setting out tree protection measures for the ring beam installation, to ensure that the ancient woodland trees are protected from any adverse impacts. A method statement has been advanced by the applicant and is considered suitable by the Council's tree officer.

This would provide the opportunity to dig trial pits under the supervision of an arboricultural supervisor and a meeting held with Chorley's tree officer to ensure that the tree protection measures set out in the method statement are appropriate and/or necessary. Amongst other things this would include the installation of an impermeable geotextile membrane around the concrete ring beam in the northern and eastern sections in order to safeguard against the leaking of any toxins that might give rise to the damage of trees.

Although no trees are identified for removal by the applicant it is noted that some younger trees within the school grounds may be affected. These are self seeded trees to the northern side of the site, which may be affected at root level, however, the level of visual amenity provided by these trees is limited in the context of the ancient woodland beyond, and their protection is not considered to be essential. Nevertheless the tree protection measures set out on the method statement would help to safeguard these trees in any event. In the north east corner of the site there are some slightly older trees, which demonstrate evidence of roots underneath the tarmac surface, though only a small percentage of the RPA to these trees is likely to be disturbed given the methods of development proposed, which again would have added protections through the proposed methods.

It is noted that the proposed dome would be lit and would be adjacent to woodland where bats are known to be active. The applicant has provided a light spill report so that the resultant impact on bats and other nocturnal wildlife can be considered. The report demonstrates that there would be minimal light spillage from the site and zero light spillage beyond 2.5m of the site. The light spill report has been assessed by GMEU, who confirm that they are satisfied that details demonstrate a low enough lux level that would not impact on any nocturnal animals, such as bats that may be using the woodland edge, and no further information is required in relation to bats.

On the basis of the above it is not considered that the development would cause harm to a site of nature conservation value, and would also be in line with policies BNE9 and BNE11 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026, which seeks to protect and conserve biodiversity and ecological networks.

30. *The development will not harm the amenities of local residents;*
The proposal is for the redevelopment of an existing sports facility within an established secondary school grounds. As such there is already a degree of impact from noise and disturbance in relation to nearby residential occupiers. It is noted, however, that the proposed development would introduce a physical structure to the site and would extend the availability of this part of the site for use and activity beyond school hours. The impact of the development on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers is assessed below.
31. *The site is accessible by a choice of means of transport other than the private car and the traffic generated would not have a severe impact on the highway network.*
The application site is within walking/cycling distance of a wide catchment of residents of Chorley and Astley Village and pedestrian and cycle links are good. The site is also located within walking distance of Chorley town centre where there are excellent links to public transport. As such the development would be located in a highly sustainable location accessible by a choice of means of transport other than the private car. The impact of the development on the local highway network is covered below.
32. Overall, it is considered that this proposal would improve access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and physical activity through the comprehensive upgrade of an existing facility in line with the Framework, policy 24 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and policy HW1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 and is, therefore, acceptable in principle subject to matters of neighbour amenity and highway safety covered in detail below.

Impact on designated heritage assets

33. The application site comprises an existing tennis court/hard surfaced play area at the rear (northern part) of the Parklands School site, which has its access off Southport Road, Chorley. To the north of the site are the following heritage assets;
- Astley Hall (Grade 1)
 - The stable block to Astley Hall (Grade 2)
 - Drinking fountain 50 m south of Stable Block (Grade 2)
 - Ackhurst Lodge – Gate Lodge (Grade 2)
 - Astley Hall - Historic Park and Garden (Grade 2)
34. The principal statutory duty under the P(LBCA) Act 1990 is to preserve the special character of heritage assets, which includes their setting. Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should in coming to decisions consider the principle act which states the following;
35. Listed Buildings - Section 66(1) in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
36. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) at Chapter 16 deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It sets out that in determining planning applications LPAs should take account of;
- a. The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - b. The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
 - c. The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
36. Paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of proposals on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be applied. This is irrespective of whether any harm is identified as being substantial, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
37. Paragraph 194 states that any harm or loss of significance to a designated heritage asset (from alteration or destruction or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.
38. Paragraph 196 states that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
39. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy policy 16 and policy BNE8 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 reflect this approach and support the protection of designated heritage assets.
40. The application relates to the erection of an inflatable air-dome, which would enclose the existing hard-standing tennis court area. The proposed dome would measure 57.75m long by 34.25m wide and would have a domed height of 11m. The structure would be encased in translucent polyethylene. The proposed dome would be anchored in place by the construction of a sunken concrete foundation (ring-beam), which would provide metal anchor fixing points. The proposed dome would be maintained/heated by a fan and would provide a new multi-use sports area/pitches. It is noted that a Planning Design and Heritage Statement dated November 2020 produced by Adams Planning and Development has been submitted in support of the proposed development.
41. The key heritage issue for the Local Planning Authority to consider, in relation to proposed development is the impact of the proposal on the significance of the setting to the nearby designated heritage assets.

42. Historic England's advice on setting issues is contained in its Planning Note 3 (second edition) entitled The Setting of Heritage Assets. This describes the setting as being the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced and explains that this may be more extensive than its immediate curtilage and need not be confined to areas which have public access. Whilst setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations it is also influenced by the historic relationships between buildings and places and how views allow the significance of the asset to be appreciated.
43. It is important to stress that the setting to a heritage asset is not a designation in its own right. Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to the ability to appreciate the assets significance.
44. In relation to Astley Hall (and adjacent stables and fountain) the site is separated by a substantial woodland area, which runs along the Chor valley. This woodland forms the southern extent to Astley Park and forms the northern backdrop to the proposed site. Astley Hall Lies approximately 265m north of the site. More than half that distance is woodland. The drinking fountain and stables lie further still.
45. The application site lies behind the main school 'teaching' blocks and currently is largely unseen. The proposed dome would be a sizeable new addition to the school complex and would be noticeable when approaching eastwards into Chorley along Southport Road. However Astley Hall and the other associated adjacent listed buildings are located some way north of the school and are screened by the mature woodland. Even during winter, with the absence of leaves on the trees, the extent of the woodland provides adequate cover making it difficult to identify individual parts of the school buildings/grounds, other than from much closer within the Chor valley itself. From Astley Hall the site and proposed development would be essentially unseen.
46. Astley Hall including the stables lies within an extensive parkland setting, which contributes positively to how the building can be viewed. Pathways run through the parkland and approaching from the east visitors are rewarded with excellent views of the south facade to the Hall. These important views of the listed buildings would not be altered by the proposal.
47. Historic mapping shows that the Parklands School site lies outside the planned parkland setting to the Hall and the school site, including the tennis court area, and has no historic relevance nor adds any significance to the qualities of the setting within the Park. In this respect it is not considered that the proposal would affect how the Hall, stables or drinking fountain would be experienced. The proposal is not, therefore, considered to harm the contribution made by the setting to the significance of those important heritage assets.
48. Ackhurst Lodge is located in the Chor Valley to the west of the school site close to Southport Road. The Lodge lies at an historic entrance into Astley Park and a former carriage drive route to Astley Hall. A modern housing development lies to the east (Ackhurst Lodge Drive) and the school site is not associated to the development of the Lodge. The proposed site/development is visually detached from the former Lodge and its historic setting is not affected by the proposal.
49. Astley Park Historic Park and Garden is a designation based upon the layout of the historic parkland and was passed onto Chorley Council in 1922, and remains a public park. Its significance is derived from its historic association with Astley Hall and in particular the Towneley-Parkers in the late C18 and C19. Parklands School and proposed site lie outside the parkland area. Whilst the proposed dome structure would be visible in the context of the area of woodland running along the southern boundary to the park, this boundary runs alongside and is largely enclosed by mixed style residential development and the school buildings. The extensive views of the woodland across the school playing fields remains unaltered.
50. Whilst the large structure would be glimpsed at through the trees when walking along the woodland paths along the River Chor, these views would be heavily filtered and would not

detract from the significance of the park. It is, therefore, concluded that the proposal would cause no discernible harm on the setting to the Historic Park and Garden.

51. Whilst it is noted that the Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment contained in the submission is concise Paragraph 189 of the Framework requires applicants to provide only a level of detail that is sufficient to understand the potential impact. Given the context and the clear visual separation the statement is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
52. On the evidence provided and advice provided by the Council's heritage advisor it is concluded that the proposed development, by reason of the fact that the site is clearly visibly divorced from those heritage assets and has no associated historic significance, would not cause any identifiable harm to the significance provided by the setting to Astley Hall or the adjacent stable block, drinking fountain or Ackhurst Lodge.
53. For the same reasons the scheme causes no harm to the setting of Astley Park as an Historic Park and Garden.
54. In this regard the proposed scheme would meet the duty to 'preserve' as laid down by s.66 of the P(LBCA) Act 1990 and meet the objectives of Chapter 16 of the Framework and Policy 16 of the Lancashire Core Strategy and Policy BNE8 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026.

Impact on residential amenity

55. The proposed dome would be located to the north west of the nearest residential properties on Hampton Close. Although the proposed dome would not be directly to the rear of any properties it would be visible at an angle from the rear windows and gardens at 1 and 3 Hampton Close and 1 Glamis Drive, with glimpses between buildings possible from other properties. The nearest dwelling at no.3 Hampton Close would be located over 20m away at the nearest point, with the proposed dome being approximately 8m from the rear garden associated with this dwelling. The proposed dome would be approximately 11m in height at its apex height towards the centre of the dome, sloping away toward the ends. It would be sited at a lower level relative to no.3 Hampton Close and the other properties on this street. Given the relative positioning, degree of separation, site levels and form of development it is considered that although the proposed dome would be visible it would not be an overly obtrusive or oppressive feature when viewed from within the nearby dwellings and their associated gardens and would have no unacceptable detrimental impact on outlook given the relative siting and degree of separation. The position of the proposed dome to the north west of these properties and their gardens combined with the lower site levels are also such that there would be no unacceptable loss of light as a result of the proposed development.
56. It is noted that the proposed dome would be internally lit, although there would be no external lighting. However, as the proposed dome would be translucent it would emit some light. A light assessment submitted with the application details that the lighting would be positioned directly above the pitch similar to that of a sports hall. This means that luminaires are not positioned around the pitch at angles creating glare, upward lighting, or overspill. The dome itself is designed to prevent any internal light from escaping, with the edges sealed, and material specifically chosen to reduce the transmission of light through it. The manufacturers have provided a technical data sheet, which identifies the light transmission factor of the material to be 6.13%, which is very low with an internal reflection of 79.96%. This results in the majority of light hitting the dome internal walls being reflected back onto the pitch, while only a small amount of the remaining light would be transmitted through the structure.
57. The location of the luminaires within the proposed dome would prevent light spillage onto the dome structure, while the dome material would disperse any light from within and avoid transfer of light to the outside environment. The level of actual light transfer through the structure would therefore be minimal.
58. In assessing the light emissions from the proposed dome the lighting design has been reproduced to calculate the overspill lighting from the site. The assessment identifies

minimal light spillage from the proposed dome with levels of 2lux immediately beyond the dome surface with no overspill 2.5m beyond the dome. The nearest gardens are 8m away, with dwellings being a further distance.

59. In order to have an adverse impact the light emitted from the site must be brighter than the surrounding environment at a time that disrupts activities. In this case the existing floodlit pitch and existing lighting to the school during the proposed hours must be considered and the proposed dome would generate lesser light emissions, whilst it is likely to provide some additional shielding to properties on Hampton Close from the existing floodlights. On this basis it is anticipated that the levels of light emission would be very low, such that there would be no unacceptable impact on amenity through light nuisance.
60. The site itself is already in use as an area for outdoor sport and recreation and, therefore, already has some impact through noise and disturbance to nearby properties from its use. It is recognised, however, that the intensity of the use would most likely increase as a result of the introduction of the proposed dome and playing surface, which would allow it to be used more extensively into the evenings. The proposed dome would also require plant in the form of ventilation units, which also have the potential to emit some noise.
61. The applicant has submitted an acoustic report in support of the proposed development that provides a review of the potential noise issues surrounding the installation and operation of an inflatable multi-sport airdome. The report identifies that the ventilation units would be positioned approximately 87m away from the nearest dwellings on Hampton Close and on the opposite side of the proposed dome to these properties, whilst the dome itself would be over 20m from these properties. The report has assessed other similar examples of air domes in residential areas and concludes that neither the operation of the fans associated with the proposed dome or the playing of sports within the dome are likely to give rise to any disturbance to residents at Hampton Close and that there are unlikely to be grounds for a Statutory Nuisance to be identified.
62. The Council's environmental health officer has considered the proposal and reviewed the acoustic report, and considers that the report clearly indicates that the proposed development is unlikely to cause disturbance to local noise sensitive properties and have no further evidence that would suggest otherwise. Should the Council receive complaints regarding statutory nuisance if the proposed development is approved, then these would be investigated in accordance with the relevant procedures.
63. As has been noted there is a floodlit artificial pitch facility already within the school grounds that results in unmitigated noise from activity when in use. The proposed dome itself would provide a level of sound insulation from the activities carried out within, whilst it would also provide some sound insulation on this part of the site from the activities carried out on the artificial pitch, where currently there is none. As such it is not considered that the effects of noise and disturbance would be unacceptable in the context of the existing circumstances. Given the background noise and disturbance associated with the floodlit artificial pitch it is considered appropriate that the hours of use should be aligned and it is recommended that an hours condition is attached to any grant of planning permission to ensure this.
64. On the basis of the above it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any harmful impacts to neighbour amenity and, therefore, complies with the relevant parts of policies HW1 and BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.

Highway safety

65. The proposed development would result in the erection of an air dome over an existing sports facility within a school grounds. It is intended that the facilities provided as a result of the proposed development would be accessible to the wider community beyond that of the school, outside of school hours only. External access would take place outside of school hours and would not, therefore, coincide to increase levels of parking demand during school times.

66. A Transport Statement (TS) has been submitted in support of the proposed development, which has been reviewed by Lancashire County Council (LCC) as Local Highway Authority and statutory consultee to the Local Planning Authority. The TS sets out that the site for the proposed dome is the existing tennis courts at the north east corner of the Parklands High School site, which is located north of the A581 Southport Road in Chorley and has a student population of about 1100. The proposed development would make use of the existing school accesses from Southport Road and Glamis Drive. There are existing waiting restrictions on sections of Southport Road and Glamis Drive as part of highway safety measures.
67. LCC in their response to the TS request that the applicant's review of traffic accidents, which concludes there were no personal injury accidents on Southport Road within 200m in each direction of the School access apart from its junctions with Belvedere Drive and Ackhurst Road must be revisited as it is inaccurate. LCC Highways analysis of the most recent 5-year history shows personal injury accidents on this section Southport Road, and therefore considers that the applicant should reassess the accident record of roads in the vicinity of the school, particularly for Southport Road from Windsor Road in the east to Ackhurst Road in the west to include both junctions. LCC consider that the accident analysis should identify any significant highway safety issues and determine if the proposed development would exacerbate such existing problems and propose highway mitigation measures towards alleviating them.
68. LCC confirm that the school is in a sustainable location with good quality footways, well-lit roads, infrastructure for safe crossing, within an acceptable walking distance of Chorley Town Centre and accessible by cycling in all directions (east and south to Chorley, north to Astley Village, and west to Euxton). The site is also well served by public transport with at least four bus stops located in front of the school on Southport Road where day and evening public services are provided by Services 109, 119, 337 and 347 to various destinations Mondays-Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays. Various school services are available at these stops with additional services at other stops within acceptable walking distance of the site to the east on St Thomas's Road Street and west on Southport Road.
69. None of the four bus stops closest to the school access are to the high quality standard required to ensure they are disability compliant, safe, attractive and convenient to encourage use of public transport as an alternative to the car as required by the Framework. As such, LCC considers that the applicant should carry out improvements to the two bus stops east and west of Southport Road/Glamis Drive. The bus stop improvements should be to quality disability compliant standards with raised kerbs and boarding areas; bus stop bay and worded markings, clearways etc. The existing shelter at the bus stop to the west of the junction should be replaced with new, while a new shelter is provided for that to the east. Such improvements would be undertaken through the section 278 agreement of the Highway Act 1980 with all costs borne by the applicant, and LCC recommends that conditions are attached to any grant of planning permission to secure this.
70. The applicant has indicated in paragraphs 1.5 and 5.5 of the TS, that the proposed dome would be used by the school up to 5pm and will only be available to the public from then till 10pm. It is estimated that the school currently generates in the region 314 two-way traffic movements in the AM peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 194 two-way movements in the PM peak of 15:00-16:00. However, when the proposed dome is opened for public use after 5:00pm, only 45 two-way trips will be generated during the busiest hours of 18:00-19:00, which is outside the peak hours of traffic on the highway network. While this level of traffic generation will lead to higher flows on the highway network, it is not considered that the impact of the flows would adversely affect the safety and smooth functioning of the network.
71. The existing 60 space capacity car park and the 25 spaces referred to in paragraph 7.4 of the TS is considered adequate for the proposed scale of development and should not result in adverse impacts on residential amenity in the area. Overall LCC considers that the proposal is acceptable, however, subject to the applicant submitting the above requested traffic accident analysis.

72. In response to the request for further traffic accident analysis the applicant's highway consultant has revisited the analysis and confirmed that there have been no accidents within 200m of the site access, other than at Belvedere Drive, and therefore the proposed development does not require any highway mitigation measures. They consider that there is no clear link between the proposal and accidents at other more remote junctions to justify any wider analysis or associated highway mitigation measures. It is also noted that LCC in their response state that *'While this level of traffic generation will lead to higher flows on the highway network [45 vehicle movements in the period 6:00-7:00pm], it is not considered the impact of the flows will adversely affect the safety and smooth functioning of the network'*. On this basis it would not be reasonable to require highway safety mitigation measures as a result of the development, as the necessity could not be justified on the basis of the impact of the proposed development.
73. In relation to the request for bus stop upgrades / improvements it is not considered that this development proposal for an air dome on an existing sports area within a school grounds could justify bus stop improvements, with external use restricted to times outside of school hours. This particularly so in consideration that the existing bus stops are outside of an existing secondary school, which generate a far greater demand already in relation to the level of daily usage. It is not therefore considered necessary or reasonable to request contributions for bus stop upgrades / improvements on the basis of the proposed development.
74. Overall the number of vehicles accessing the site outside of school hours would be at a far lower level than takes place during school hours, whilst use by the school during school hours would have no impact on parking demand and vehicular access. LCC highways have considered the proposed development and anticipate that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity in the immediate vicinity of the site over and above the existing situation. On this basis it is not considered that the traffic generated by the development would have a severe impact on the highway network and therefore complies with the relevant parts of policies HW1 and BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.

Drainage

75. The application site is not located in an area that is at risk of flooding from pluvial or fluvial sources, according to Environment Agency mapping data. In accordance with the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way.
76. The application site currently comprises impermeable hardstanding. The proposed development would not increase the area of impermeable surface, and as such the volume of surface water run-off would be no greater. It is proposed that water would be collected by a linear drainage channel that would run around the perimeter of the proposed dome. The new drainage would discharge into an existing 275mm surface water sewer via a 'catchpit', which is an arrangement that currently provides the drainage for the development area. The sewer runs in a northerly direction and discharges into the River Chor (main river).
77. United Utilities have reviewed the proposed drainage arrangements and have confirmed that they do not have any comments to make on the proposals as the drainage would not communicate with the public sewer.
78. A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been submitted in support of the proposed development, which undertook storm modelling using the rainfall run off from the M10-15 storm (15-minute rainfall event that can be expected to happen once within a 10 year period). This storm model is the preferred calculation for surface water runoff and is a nationally recognised standard for planning authorities. This modelling confirms that the site is not in an area of flood risk and confirms that the new drainage design for the proposed dome can cope with M10-15 rainfall events. This development therefore poses no increase in flood risk to the Parklands Academy or neighbouring property on this basis.

79. Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is the responsible 'risk management authority' for managing 'local' flood risk which refers to flood risk from surface water, groundwater or from ordinary watercourses. The LLFA is a statutory consultee for major developments with surface water drainage, under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. It is in this capacity that the LLFA have reviewed the FRA and raise no objection to the proposed development subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the FRA. The LLFA also require final details of a sustainable drainage strategy, construction phase surface water management plan and a verification report and operation and maintenance plan to be submitted for approval. It is therefore recommended that conditions requiring these details are attached to any grant of planning permission.

Other matters

80. No tree survey has been submitted and trees within the site would clearly be impacted upon by the development: No trees are identified for removal as part of the development, and none of the trees within the application site are protected or warrant specific protection. The Council's tree officer has visited the site and identified that the digging of a trench within the concrete court area to construct a ring beam would have some impact on trees in the school grounds but that risks to the trees in the ancient woodland are low, and mitigated further by the provision of tree protection measures. As such adequate information is available to understand the impacts and risks from development on trees.

81. An ecological impact assessment / bat survey should have been provided with the application: The application has been assessed by the Council's ecology advisors GMEU, who have been able to assess the risks from development upon wildlife through the information available to them.

82. Carbon footprint analysis should have been provided: This is not a requirement of the development type proposed, and energy efficiency standards cannot be applied to a development of this type and it is not the Council's practice and procedure to do so.

83. The proposal would likely add pressure from requests to prune trees within the ancient woodland: The trees in Great Wood belong to Chorley Council and so the management of these trees is within the control of the Council.

84. There are already enough sports facilities in Chorley: The assessment requirements for new sports facilities contains no criteria or requirements relating to the need for such facilities.

85. Lack of notification: Notification has been carried out in line with normal procedures.

86. The development is not financially viable: This is a matter for the applicant / developer to consider.

87. The fee paid for the development has been incorrectly calculated: The fee paid for the application was £468 based on £234 per 0.1 hectare for the engineering operation of inserting the ring beam (i.e. £468) plus an additional £462 for the new plant totalling £930. No reductions or exemptions were applied. Local Planning Authorities have discretion over the way in which fees are applied for development, and on the basis of the information provided by the applicant at the outset this fee was accepted as being correct. Following receipt of representations during the assessment of the application the development type was reconsidered and it was determined that the application should be considered on the basis that it comprises a building. Clearly this would have impacted on the fee charged for the application at the outset, however, fees cannot be adjusted once paid and where the local planning authority has validated the application. Therefore, the application could not be made invalid on this basis, although the application type was changed to that of a building and categorised as 'major development'.

88. No information about the maximum capacity of the dome has been provided and so a fair assessment of the proposal is not possible: The capacity of the dome for activities is not a planning matter in itself. Although this could relate to the way in which parking requirements

and traffic generation are calculated the Local Highway Authority are satisfied with the information provided in the Transport Statement in assessing these impacts.

89. The Transport Assessment is unrealistic and has not properly considered the current parking / highway issues: The Local Highway Authority has considered the content of the Transport Statement and raises no objection to the proposed development on this basis.
90. Not enough data to fully understand the traffic that will be generated: The Local Highway Authority has considered the content of the Transport Statement and raises no objection to the proposed development on this basis.
91. Usage time will overlap and there would be more vehicles than predicted in the Transport Statement: The Local Highway Authority has considered the content of the Transport Statement and raises no objection to the proposed development on this basis.
92. The development would not meet with fire or disabled access regulations: This is a matter for building regulations compliance.
93. Will attract anti-social behaviour: There is no evidence to suggest that the development would result in anti-social behaviour and would be contained within the school grounds, which would be secured outside of the hours of usage.

CONCLUSION

94. The proposed development would enhance the recreational potential of the existing sports playing facility, and the social benefits in terms of increasing opportunities for sport and recreation in supporting healthy lifestyles are clear. The development would not impact unacceptably on the overall appearance and character of the area and there would be no harmful impact on neighbour amenity over and above the current situation. Nor would there be any harmful impact on highway safety, ecology and ancient woodland or surface water drainage that cannot be addressed through appropriate conditions. On this basis it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

- Ref:** 5/1/02711 **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 8 July 1970
Description: Reservation of land for Chorley grammar School
- Ref:** 95/00361/LCC **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 5 July 1995
Description: Lancashire County Council Regulation 3 application for the provision of new sports hall linked to existing pavilion
- Ref:** 00/00525/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 3 August 2000
Description: Extension to form new Entrance Lobby, Disabled WC, Admin Office and Secure Store
- Ref:** 00/00583/CTY **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 27 September 2000
Description: Proposed colour-coated, profiled, metal-clad sports hall, store and link to school
- Ref:** 01/00121/CTY **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 20 March 2001
Description: Variation of conditions 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D of planning permission 9/00/583 relating to access and highway matters
- Ref:** 01/00301/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 18 May 2001
Description: Conversion of covered way into internal link corridor
- Ref:** 01/00783/LCC **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 31 October 2001
Description: Construction of new sports hall. Erection of new two-storey block and single storey office block

Ref: 03/01054/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 24 December 2003
Description: Retrospective application for the erection of fence

Ref: 04/00461/LCC **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 9 September 2004
Description: Construction of new two storey classroom block extension

Ref: 04/00785/LCC **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 26 July 2004
Description: Remodelling of entrance to provide a new reception office

Ref: 09/00144/CTY **Decision:** PERMIT **Decision Date:** 26 March 2009
Description: Erection of a two storey front extension. Erection of a 2.4m high and a 3m high weld mesh security fencing and gates to part of school boundary and a 3.6m high free standing canopy

Ref: 13/00683/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 16 September 2013
Description: Erection of two single storey extensions for storage purposes, linking existing gymnasium/changing rooms to sports hall

Ref: 13/01039/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 25 February 2014
Description: Erection a new music studio attached to the existing music room

Ref: 13/01054/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 2 January 2014
Description: Proposed refurbishment and extension to the existing pavilion and the formation of additional car parking spaces

Ref: 14/00460/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 20 June 2014
Description: Construction of a new synthetic multi use sports pitch with associated features including new perimeter fencing, lighting and access arrangements

Ref: 14/00775/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 3 September 2014
Description: Proposed refurbishment and extension to the existing pavilion and the formation of 20 additional car parking spaces (Re- submission of 13/01054/FUL)

Ref: 14/00902/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 13 October 2014
Description: Construction of a new synthetic multi use sports pitch with associated features including new perimeter fencing, lighting and pedestrian access path

Ref: 15/00616/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 19 August 2015
Description: Erection of 2 no. single storey temporary buildings to provide classroom accommodation

Ref: 16/00299/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 17 May 2016
Description: Extension to the existing public entrance

Ref: 16/00555/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 10 August 2016
Description: Extension to Existing Hall

Ref: 17/00196/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 28 April 2017
Description: Two single-storey extensions to the east and west elevations of science block

Ref: 17/00637/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 30 August 2017
Description: Erection of new 2.4m fencing and gates to secure boundary of Parklands High School

Ref: 18/00580/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 8 August 2018
Description: Erection of extension to sports hall to house multi-gym

Ref: 19/00549/FUL **Decision:** PERFPP **Decision Date:** 8 August 2019
Description: First floor extension to an existing single storey school building

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 proposed development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p><i>Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004</i></p>																								
2.	<p>The development hereby permitted for one dwelling shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Title</th> <th>Reference</th> <th>Received date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Site Location Plan</td> <td>D2R - PKD – 02 Rev.B</td> <td>02 December 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Site Plan</td> <td>D2R - PKD – 03 Rev.B</td> <td>24 November 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Dome Layout</td> <td>D2R - PKD – 04 Rev.B</td> <td>24 November 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed Dome Elevations</td> <td>D2R - PKD – 05 Rev.B</td> <td>24 November 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Air supported structure</td> <td>PRO-7131</td> <td>05 July 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CROSS SECTION OF FOUNDATION WITH ANCHORING AND DRAINAGE</td> <td>PRO-7131</td> <td>24 November 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Floor Standing Air Heater Specification</td> <td>PKE420SPECFULL</td> <td>24 November 2020</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</i></p>	Title	Reference	Received date	Site Location Plan	D2R - PKD – 02 Rev.B	02 December 2020	Proposed Site Plan	D2R - PKD – 03 Rev.B	24 November 2020	Proposed Dome Layout	D2R - PKD – 04 Rev.B	24 November 2020	Proposed Dome Elevations	D2R - PKD – 05 Rev.B	24 November 2020	Air supported structure	PRO-7131	05 July 2021	CROSS SECTION OF FOUNDATION WITH ANCHORING AND DRAINAGE	PRO-7131	24 November 2020	Floor Standing Air Heater Specification	PKE420SPECFULL	24 November 2020
Title	Reference	Received date																							
Site Location Plan	D2R - PKD – 02 Rev.B	02 December 2020																							
Proposed Site Plan	D2R - PKD – 03 Rev.B	24 November 2020																							
Proposed Dome Layout	D2R - PKD – 04 Rev.B	24 November 2020																							
Proposed Dome Elevations	D2R - PKD – 05 Rev.B	24 November 2020																							
Air supported structure	PRO-7131	05 July 2021																							
CROSS SECTION OF FOUNDATION WITH ANCHORING AND DRAINAGE	PRO-7131	24 November 2020																							
Floor Standing Air Heater Specification	PKE420SPECFULL	24 November 2020																							
3.	<p>The external facing materials, detailed on the approved plans, shall be used and no others substituted unless alternatives are first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, when the development shall then be carried out in accordance with the alternatives approved.</p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that the materials used are visually appropriate to the locality.</i></p>																								
4.	<p>The airdome facility hereby permitted shall only be used between 09:00 and 22:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays and between 09:00 and 18:00 hours on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p> <p><i>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of local residents.</i></p>																								
5.	<p>During the construction period, all trees to be retained shall be protected in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012 or any subsequent amendment to the British Standards.</p> <p><i>Reason: To safeguard the trees to be retained.</i></p>																								
6.	<p>The development hereby approved shall be implemented in full accordance with the Tree Protection Measures for Ringbeam Installation submitted on 01 July 2021, and specifically an impermeable geotextile membrane shall be installed around the concrete ring beam in the northern and eastern sections.</p>																								

	<i>Reason: Due to the proximity of the development to Ancient Woodland.</i>
7.	No source of external illumination shall be installed on the development hereby permitted. Reason: Due to the presence of bats in the adjacent woodland.
8.	All internal lighting shall be switched off when the airdome facility is not in use. <i>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of local residents.</i>
9.	The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the principles set out within the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Report (Orchard Developments & consultancy). The measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of any dwelling and in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority in consultation with the lead local flood authority. <i>Reason: To ensure satisfactory sustainable drainage facilities are provided to serve the site in accordance with the Paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.</i>
10.	No development shall commence until a detailed, final surface water sustainable drainage strategy for the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The detailed sustainable drainage strategy shall be based upon the site-specific flood risk assessment submitted and sustainable drainage principles and requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems and no surface water shall be allowed to discharge to the public foul sewer(s), directly or indirectly. Those details shall include, as a minimum: a) Sustainable drainage calculations for peak flow control and volume control (1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 + 40% climate change), with allowance for urban creep. b) Final sustainable drainage plans appropriately labelled to include, as a minimum: i. Plan identifying areas contributing to the drainage network, including surface water flows from outside the curtilage as necessary; ii. Sustainable drainage system layout showing all pipe and structure references, dimensions, design levels; iii. Details of all sustainable drainage components, including landscape drawings showing topography and slope gradient as appropriate; iv. Flood water exceedance routes in accordance with Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems; v. Finished Floor Levels (FFL) in AOD with adjacent ground levels for all sides of each plot to confirm minimum 150mm+ difference for FFL. c) Measures taken to manage the quality of the surface water runoff to prevent pollution, protects groundwater and surface waters, and delivers suitably clean water to sustainable drainage components; The sustainable drainage strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. <i>Reason: To ensure satisfactory sustainable drainage facilities are provided to serve the site in accordance with the Paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and Defra Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.</i>

11.	<p>No development shall commence until details of how surface water and pollution prevention will be managed during each construction phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Those details shall include for each phase, as a minimum:</p> <p>a) Measures taken to ensure surface water flows are retained on-site during construction phase(s) and, if surface water flows are to be discharged, they are done so at a restricted rate to be agreed with the Lancashire County Council LLFA.</p> <p>b) Measures taken to prevent siltation and pollutants from the site into any receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses, with reference to published guidance.</p> <p>The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p><i>Reasons:</i></p> <p><i>1. To ensure the development is served by satisfactory arrangements for the disposal of surface water during each construction phase(s) so it does not pose an undue flood risk on site or elsewhere;</i></p> <p><i>2. To ensure that any pollution arising from the development as a result of the construction works does not adversely impact on existing or proposed ecological or geomorphic condition of water bodies.</i></p>
12.	<p>Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted a Verification Report and Operation and Maintenance Plan for the lifetime of the development, pertaining to the surface water drainage system and prepared by a suitably competent person, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The Verification Report must demonstrate that the sustainable drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), and contain information and evidence (including photographs) of details and locations (including national grid reference) of inlets, outlets and control structures; landscape plans; full as built drawings; information pertinent to the installation of those items identified on the critical drainage assets drawing; and, the submission of a final 'operation and maintenance manual' for the sustainable drainage scheme as constructed.</p> <p>Details of appropriate operational, maintenance and access requirements for each sustainable drainage component are to be provided, with reference to published guidance, through an appropriate Operation and Maintenance Plan for the lifetime of the development as constructed. This shall include arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, and/or management and maintenance by a Management Company and any means of access for maintenance and easements, where applicable. Thereafter the drainage system shall be retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that flood risks from development to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those risks to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development as constructed is compliant with and subsequently maintained pursuant to the requirements of Paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</i></p>