

Item 4c **11/00837/FULMAJ**

Case Officer **Mrs Nicola Hopkins**

Ward **Astley And Buckshaw**

Proposal **Erection of 2 no. distribution centre/industrial buildings (Use Class B1c, B2, B8) with ancillary office accommodation, service yard areas, car parking, access, internal circulation areas and landscaping.**

Location **Site 7 And 9 Buckshaw Avenue Buckshaw Village Lancashire**

Applicant **Evander Properties Ltd**

Consultation expiry: **4 April 2012**

Application expiry: **22 December 2011**

Summary of Planning Application

Members will recall that this application was due to be considered at DC Committee on 17 January 2012 however the application was withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant. At the time the applicants, Evander Properties, confirmed that discussions were at an advanced stage with a specialist parcel delivery organisation who had, in principle, committed to leasing a substantial part of the proposed development to provide a new mail distribution centre.

Following the withdrawal from the agenda the plans were substantially changed, when compared to the original submission, to accommodate Parcelforce, who have been identified as the named operator of Plot A, into the proposals.

All of the representations received in respect of the original proposals (including the amendments received in November/ December 2011) are listed in paragraphs 11-16. To assist in consideration of this application the following chronology of submissions is provided:

- 14 September 2011- application received
- 22 September 2011- application validated
- 17/ 25h November 2011- 1st set of amended plans received in respect of the landscaping along the western boundary
- 14 December 2011- 2nd set of amended plans received in respect of the landscaping along the western boundary and the siting of the building adjacent to the western boundary
- January 2012 application recommended for approval on the January DC Committee agenda
- 10 January 2012- Member Site Visit undertaken
- 17 January 2012- application withdrawn from the DC Committee agenda
- 27 January 2012- 3rd set of amended plans received incorporating Parcelforce into the scheme
- 5 March 2012- additional plans received in respect of the phasing of Plot A (Parcelforce premises)
- 12 March 2012- additional plans received in respect of the phasing of Plot A (Parcelforce premises)
- 13 April 2012- application included on the agenda for April DC Committee

Proposal

1. This application relates to the erection of 2 distribution centre/industrial buildings (Use Class B1c, B2, B8) with ancillary office accommodation, service yard areas, car parking, access, internal circulation areas and landscaping at the Strategic Regional Site, Buckshaw Village (now known as The Revolution).
2. The application occupies site 5, 7 and 9 which are the last remaining parcels of land at the Strategic Regional Site and occupy 10.20 hectares.
3. The smallest of the 2 buildings (Plot A) proposed occupies the eastern part of the site which covers approximately 5.82 hectares. The proposals incorporate the erection of a single distribution centre/ industrial unit (Use Class B1c, B2 or B8) extending to 11,610sqm in total. This floorspace is made up of 11,000sqm of distribution/ industrial space and 610 sqm of ancillary office accommodation. This building will be occupied by Parcellforce and built in two stages which is addressed below.
4. The larger proposed building (Plot B) occupies the western part of the site which covers approximately 4.08 hectares and incorporates the erection of a single distribution centre/ industrial unit (Use Class B1c, B2 or B8) extending to 17,086sqm in total. This floorspace is made up of 15,925sqm of distribution/ industrial space, 929 sqm of ancillary office accommodation and 232sqm of distribution offices. No end user for this unit has been identified.

Recommendation

5. It is recommended that this application is granted conditional planning approval

Main Issues

6. The main issues for consideration in respect of this planning application are:
 - Principle of the development
 - Background information
 - Green Belt
 - Levels
 - Design and Layout
 - Noise
 - Flood Risk and drainage
 - Traffic and Transport
 - Sustainability

Representations

7. This application has been subject to significant changes during the application process and the following representations have been received in respect of the proposals now under consideration:
8. 1 letter of objection has been received raising the following concerns:
 - Impact on the view and aesthetics of the new properties, directly affecting future sale.
 - Properties will be affected through loss of sunlight.
 - The structure is still too close and will impact on my immediate environment with negative effect.
9. **Cllr Perks** has raised the following objections
 - The scheme has been amended but unfortunately the amended proposals still do not accord with the Local Plan for the following reasons:-
 - 2 Policy EM1A criteria (d) requires industrial development to integrate with its surroundings and Policy GN5 seeks to ensure that the design of proposed developments is well related to their surroundings. The sheer scale, length and mass of unit B in very close proximity to relatively small 2 storey detached dwellings is such that the proposed industrial development cannot be considered to be well related or integrated to the adjacent housing and the surrounding Buckshaw Village streetscape.

- 2 Policy EM1A criterion (g) requires industrial development to have no significant adverse effect on the residential amenities of nearby residences and Policy EM2 criteria (c) seeks to avoid unacceptable harm to surrounding uses. The sheer scale, length and mass of unit B in close proximity to the rear gardens and real elevations of the adjacent dwellings are such that it would have an overbearing and dominant effect on the adjacent and surrounding residential development.
 - 2 Policy EM2 criterion (f) requires adequate screening to be provided to any unsightly features of the development. It is considered that the proposed landscape screening and mounding is insufficient to adequately screen the large and dominant façade. The conclusions of TBA and the Councils Landscape Architect reinforce this view.
 - 2 Furthermore, the shadowing effect of unit B is likely to have an adverse effect on the growth rate of any proposed planting.
- I therefore consider that the above policy conflicts and impacts on the residential development this could all be avoided if unit B had a further reduction in width in order to enable a greater distance to be achieved from the adjacent dwellings.
 - In this way a wider buffer strip would enable a higher mound of 4.0 – 4.5 metres to be achieved which would soften the overall effect of the scale and mass of the large western façade. The associated tree planting could then be located further from the housing and should also incorporate a greater degree of evergreen species so that the screening effect of the planting can be achieved throughout the year.
 - Furthermore, having a greater distance from unit B to the boundary with the adjacent residential site would more closely reflect the nature of the approved Master Plan which formed the basis of the original outline permission. That application shows a separation distance of between 55m and 65 metres from the boundary fence of Parcel L to the proposed industrial building.
 - Such amendments to the scheme would still enable a very large industrial building to be provided on the site for the economic benefit of the local economy but in a manner which more appropriately addressed its relationship to the adjoining dwellings as required by the relevant policies of the Local Plan.

10. **Stewart Milne Homes** have raised the following objections:

- Throughout the application the houses on Parcel L are referred to as under construction. This is not true. Can you please make members of the planning committee aware that the houses adjoining the boundary of the application site houses are built and occupied?
- The application site does not have an extant planning permission. Reference to the previous approval in the supporting documents continues to deliberately mislead members of the public and the planning committee.
- The applicant is using the expired outline approval as a fallback but yet is conveniently only selecting elements of the expired permission that suit the current application. For example there is no structural landscaping between the plot A and B; the buildings have been orientated to suit operator's requirements: and the applicant has chosen to ignore the stand off distance in the expired outline approval of 60-70 metres.
- Despite several requests since October 2011 the applicant has failed to provide images to support its own application. What will the building look like in context of the adjoining residential development? The Council are requesting that members of the planning committee make a decision on the application by reference to a simple cross section drawing. This is a major application and it appears unusual that this detail has not been provided by the applicant.
- There is no reference to phasing of the development. When will the landscaping be planted? How will the growth rates of trees be guaranteed by the applicant or secured by the Council?
- The change in the application is due to occupier interest in Plot B. We welcome the occupier interest in Chorley but we are concerned that the council are approving the whole site without thorough consideration to the context of the adjoining residential development. It appears from a review of the plans that the applicant has secured interest in Parcel B and has simply filled the land that is left with a large building to maximise the potential land value.

- It is our view that if the applicant believes a 45 metre stand off from the boundary of Parcel L is deemed appropriate then it should be applied throughout the scheme.
- Can the Council explain how it is acceptable in planning terms to submit a Design and Access statement four weeks after the revised plan was submitted? Surely the DAS should have been produced to inform the design process and not to retrofit to a design that has already been produced.

11. **The following representations were received in respect of the previous proposals at this site:**

- Scale- loss of light and loss of privacy
- Adjacent to houses that are currently being built- occupants cannot object
- Noise disruption
- Effect on local nature and trees
- Proposed offices and car park should be used as a buffer adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties
- Red cladding is out of place with all other units on development

12. **De Pol Planning & Development Consultants** submitted several letters on behalf of Barratt Homes & Stewart Milne Homes. The concerns are summarised as follows:

- No objection to the principle of the application site being developed for employment uses.
- The scale and bulk of the main industrial building relative to the dwellings under construction to the west is unacceptable
- The distance between the residential properties and the main industrial building is wholly inadequate.
- Noise: there is potential for the proposed B2 / B8 development to result in adverse noise impact on the amenity of the residents of the approved housing site.
- The proposals would not accord with the following policies: Policy EM1A , EM2, GN5 and EP20.
- A much greater separation distance between the very large plot 7/9 building and the adjacent residential development to the west is required.
- The currently proposed separation distance does not at all reflect that shown on the original Illustrative Masterplan (801/61).

13. **Stewart Milne Homes** appointed Hepworth Acoustics to comment on the submitted noise assessment. The comments are summarised as follows:

- There are no planning conditions requiring any noise mitigation measures on the residential development site, so it is incumbent upon the developer of the proposed industrial site to incorporate adequate noise mitigation on their development site.
- There is potential for the proposed B2/B8 development to result in adverse noise impact on the amenity of the residents of the approved housing site. Therefore, we recommend that the separation distance between the western boundary and the start of the development (i.e. the building and HGV area) should be increased, and the acoustic screening of the HGV area improved.

14. **Stewart Milne Homes** objected to the proposals which are summarised as follows:

- The Masterplan for Buckshaw Village is flawed in this area.
- The noise report is flawed and makes no reference to the completed houses or those under construction.
- There is no other relationship between commercial and residential development elsewhere on Buckshaw Village.
- The expired outline requires the provision of not less than 20 metres of structural landscaping and shows an indicative stand off distance from Parcel L of 50 to 60 metres.
- The proposed landscaping does not provide adequate screening of the proposed building.
- If the above application is approved it would threaten the delivery of this part of Buckshaw Village.

- We feel the full impact of the proposals on the 59 homes being built is not being fully considered and this application is being accelerated through the planning process.
 - The proposal results in an unsatisfactory relationship in planning terms between residential and commercial use.
 - We are also concerned that Evander Properties have not produced a Shadow Path Analysis of the proposed building and landscaping that will screen the building in accordance with British Standard 8206.
 - We are also not aware of any evidence that the current proposal meets the BRE tests for sunlight and shadowing in relation to the existing homes on Parcel L.
 - Can you please confirm if the Planning Committee will visit the site before the application is discussed at the Development Control Committee? I would also suggest it would be helpful for Members to visit the Waitrose Distribution site in South Ribble currently under construction by Evander Properties as the building is of similar size to the current proposal by Evander Properties.
15. Concerns have been raised by the property advisor for unit 3 (Wolseley) in respect of the impacts of a shared access on their clients operation.
16. **Stewart Milne Homes** have appointed Trevor Bridge Associates to comment on the submitted landscaping details. The concerns are summarised as follows:
- Concerns are raised about the effectiveness of the proposed screen planting between the residential development and the proposed units. The concerns are as follows:
 - 2 Suitability of species in relation to the residential development
 - 2 The real screening value in the early stages of establishment (first twenty years)
 - 2 Possible future maintenance issues
 - The landscape scheme, in its present form, will offer little screening benefit to occupants of the residential development. The residents will have a minimum ten year period until a reasonable screen is achieved by planting and twenty before full cover is established.
 - Recommend that the bund and structure planting is carried out prior to the remainder of the development and fenced off to protect it. Not only will this allow for early establishment of planting, but it will afford residents protection from the site operations.

Consultations

17. **Environmental Health (Noise)** have made several comments on the proposals which are addressed below
18. **The Environment Agency** have commented on all versions of this application. They have no objection to the proposed development but recommend that any subsequent approval is conditioned.
19. **The Architectural Design and Crime Reduction Advisor** has no objection and has met with the Security Officer from Parcel Force. It has been agreed that the scheme would be built to Secured By Design Standards.
20. **United Utilities** have no objection subject to various conditions/ informatives
21. **Lancashire County Council (Highways)** have no objection. Their specific comments are addressed below.
22. **Chorley's Waste & Contaminated Land Officer** has no objection.
23. **Parks and Open Spaces Officer** has commented on the proposed landscaping.

Applicants Case

24. Following the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework the agents for the application have made the following points:
- In considering the weight to be attached to NPPF in the decision making process, NPPF states that: *'Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'*. The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must reflect and where appropriate promote relevant EU and statutory requirements.'
 - The key policies and guidance provided within NPPF as relevant to the current application are considered below.

Sustainable Development

- Contributing to the achievement of sustainable development is established as the primary purpose of the planning system through NPPF, of which there are three dimensions, as follows:
 - 2 An economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy;
 - 2 A social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities
 - 2 An environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment
- At the heart of NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development which is established as the golden thread running through the plan and decision making processes. For decision making this means:
 - 2 Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
 - 2 Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting planning permission unless:
 - Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or
 - Specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.
- Paragraph 197 of NPPF confirms that Local Authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development in determining planning applications.

Core Planning Principles

- NPPF also establishes a set of core planning principles, sitting below the overarching objectives of the planning system, which should underpin plan and decision making. The core principles state that planning should:
 - 2 Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development;
 - 2 Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed;
 - 2 Promote mixed use development;
 - 2 Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

Building a strong and competitive economy

- Achieving economic growth is established as one of the cornerstones of the delivery of sustainable development through NPPF. On this matter NPPF states that: *'The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system. To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.'*

Protecting Green Belt land

- NPPF provides similar protection to Green Belt land as that provided through PPG2. Most notably, the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt remain unchanged, namely:
 - 2 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - 2 To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - 2 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - 2 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
 - 2 To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- As with PPG2, the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt is considered to be inappropriate development such that very special circumstances will need to be demonstrated for planning permission to be approved. Exceptions to this which would not require very special circumstances do not need to be demonstrated, include: *'Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development'*
- This exception is broadly consistent with the 'Major Developed Site' exception contained within PPG2 which permitted the redevelopment of designated Major Developed Sites within the Green Belt provided that this would:
 - 2 Have no greater impact than the existing development on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it, and where possible have less;
 - 2 Contribute to the achievement of the objectives for the use of land in Green Belts.

Chorley Local Plan Review (2003)

- As set out above, there is an ongoing requirement that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. NPPF is a material consideration which may justify determining an application against the provisions of the development plan, depending on the extent to which the plan is inconsistent with NPPF. For the first 12 months following the publication of NPPF, this applies only to those development plan policies adopted before 2004 (as is the case with the Chorley Local Plan). The implication of this provision is that reduced weight may be given to a development plan where it is inconsistent with NPPF.
- Conversely where a development plan is consistent with NPPF (even where adopted before 2004), it follows that applications should continue to be determined in accordance with the development plan.
- In respect of the current application, the following key policies of the Chorley Local Plan are most relevant:
 - 2 Policy GN2: Royal Ordnance Site, Euxton
 - 2 Policy DC6: Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt
 - 2 Policy EM1A: Regional Investment Site at Royal Ordnance
- It has been demonstrated through the submission that the application fully accords with the above development plan policies. In addition, a range of detailed technical policies relating to matters such as design, flood risk, protection of residential amenity and highway impact are also relevant to the determination of the application.
- It is considered that significant weight should continue to be attached to the above development plan policies and that, in this instance, the publication of NPPF does not reduce the weight to be attached on the basis that they are in general conformity with NPPF. In reaching this conclusion, the following points should be noted:
 - 2 Policy GN2 supports the core planning principles set out in NPPF, including in respect of support sustainable economic growth, promoting mixed use development, supporting development within sustainable locations and supporting the efficient reuse of land;
 - 2 Policy DC6 is consistent with green belt policy within NPPF and particularly the criteria which must be satisfied in respect of the redevelopment of previously developed sites (designated Major Developed Sites) within the Green Belt;

- 2 Policy EM1A is consistent with green belt policy within NPPF and particularly the criteria which must be satisfied in respect of the redevelopment of previously developed sites (Major Developed Sites) within the Green Belt. Policy EM1A also supports the core planning principles set out in NPPF, including in respect of support sustainable economic growth, promoting mixed use development, supporting development within sustainable locations and supporting the efficient reuse of land.

Implications for the current application

- Due to the degree of consistency between NPPF and the above policies, it is concluded that an up to date set of 'in principle' development plan policies exists against which the application will be determined. The publication of NPPF does not therefore lessen the weight which should be afforded to these policies. The requirement that the application be determined in accordance with the development plan therefore remains and as a material consideration, NPPF does not justify deviating from this approach in respect of the current application.
- The submitted Planning Statement (September 2011) and Supplementary Planning Statement (24th February 2012) have demonstrated that the proposed development complies with the development plan and should therefore be approved. In view of this and the conclusions reached above, it follows that the publication of NPPF does not alter the conclusion that the application should be approved.
- Importantly, NPPF adds additional weight towards the material considerations for the granting of planning permission. The following points are particularly relevant in drawing this conclusion:
 - 2 The development will contribute to the achievement of economic growth, providing several hundred new jobs for the Borough; (Para 17 and 20 NPPF);
 - 2 The development will utilise a sustainably located site, forming part of a wider mixed use development area (including residential, employment and retail uses) and close to public transport services (including a new train station at Buckshaw Village and bus services operating along the A6) (Para 17 NPPF);
 - 2 The site will utilise previously developed land thereby making efficient use of land resources (Para 17 NPPF);
 - 2 The development will support the promotion of mixed use development forming part of a larger site developed for a wide range of uses (Para 17 NPPF)
 - 2 The development will satisfy the requirements of Green Belt policy (by virtue of compliance with Local Plan Policy GN2) (Para 79 to 92 NPPF)
- Finally, the Council's attention is also drawn to the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within NPPF, which requires Local Authorities to approve developments which accord with the development plan without delay. Compliance with the development plan has been demonstrated throughout the submission, including through various planning and technical assessments submitted. The 'presumption in favour' contained within NPPF therefore adds further weight to the conclusion that the application should be approved at the forthcoming planning committee meeting.

Planning Policy

National Planning Policy:

25. The relevant national planning policy guidance is as follows:
 - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
26. The NPPF confirms that for 12 months from the day of publication (27th March 2012), decision-takers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework.
27. In other cases and following this 12-month period, due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
28. From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
 - the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
 - the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
29. In respect of the Green Belt the NPPF states within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles include *take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it*;
30. 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. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
31. The NPPF goes on to state that the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:
- buildings for agriculture and forestry;
 - provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
 - the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
 - the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
 - limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or
 - limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

The Development Plan

32. The development plan comprises the saved policies of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review 2003, the Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document 2008 and the North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy 2008 (RSS).
33. The starting point for assessment of the application is Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that states if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

34. At the current time the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the North West is still in force. The Secretary of State's intention to revoke RSS, and how that intention should be considered has been a matter for the courts, with the outcome that RSS remains part of the development plan, and that the intention to revoke can be regarded as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
35. Section 109 of the Localism Act has already come into force which gives the Secretary of State the power to revoke the whole or part of any Regional Spatial Strategy. Consultation on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) which considers the environmental impacts of

revocation expired on 20 January 2012. The Government has indicated that it intends to revoke RSS by April 2012.

36. The relevant policies of the RSS are as follows:
- **Policy DP1 – Spatial Principles:** This policy outlines broad spatial sustainability principles that should be adhered to.
 - **Policy DP2 – Promote Sustainable Communities:** This policy sets out principles that should be followed to create sustainable communities.
 - **Policy DP4 – Make the Best Use of Existing Resources and Infrastructure:** This policy seeks to make the best use of existing infrastructure.
 - **Policy DP5 – Manage Travel Demand; Reduce the Need to Travel, and Increase Accessibility:** This policy seeks to ensure that development is located so as to reduce the need to travel and that there should be safe and sustainable for all. It highlights that all new development should be genuinely accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and that priority should be given to locations where such access is already available.
 - **Policy DP7 – Promote Environmental Quality:** This policy outlines criteria that seek to protect and enhance environmental quality.
 - **Policy DP9 – Reduce Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change:** This policy seeks to ensure that new development reduces emissions and is adaptable to climate change. The Chorley Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document expands upon these principles and is outlined later.

Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review

37. The NPPF confirms that for 12 months from the day of publication of the NPPF (27th March 2012), decision-takers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework. The Local Plan Policies were adopted in 2003 and saved by the Secretary of State in 2007 which was in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The NPPF also confirms that from the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans. The emerging plan is addressed below.
38. The relevant policies of the Local Plan are as follows:
- GN5-** Building Design and Retaining Existing Landscape Features and Natural Habitats
 - DC6-** Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt
 - EM1A-** Regional Investment Site at Royal Ordnance
 - EM2-** Development Criteria for Industrial/Business Development
 - EP18-** Surface Water Run-off
 - EP20-** Noise
 - EP21A-** Light Pollution
 - TR4-** Highway Development Control Criteria
 - TR11-** Bus Services
 - TR18-** Provision for Pedestrians and Cyclists in New Developments

Sustainable Resources DPD:

- Policy SR1 – Incorporating Sustainable Resources into New Development

Emerging Policy Considerations

Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Core Strategy

39. Central Lancashire Core Strategy – Publication Version December 2010: Chorley Council is preparing a Core Strategy jointly with Preston City and South Ribble Councils which was submitted for examination in March 2011 and an Examination in Public took place in June 2011. In July 2011, the examining Inspector expressed doubts whether the document in its December 2010 published form could be found sound in providing for sufficient new housing (Policy 4). The examination was suspended and in November 2011 the three Councils produced a Proposed Housing Related Changes document. This was subject to public consultation during November and December 2011. The consultation period ended on 13th December 2011. The examination re-open and closed on 6th March 2012.
40. As a whole the Core Strategy as a document is at an advanced stage.

41. The following Core Strategy Policies are of relevance to this application:

- **Policy 1:** Locating Growth
- **Policy 2:** Infrastructure
- **Policy 3:** Travel
- **Policy 9:** Economic Growth and Employment

Economic growth and employment will be provided for in the following ways:

- (a) The identification of 501 hectares of land for employment development between 2009 and 2026.
 - (b) Regional and sub-regional office developments will be located in Preston City Centre including the Central Business District area and the Tithebarn Regeneration Area, with more local office schemes in Chorley and Leyland town centres.
 - (c) Other major developments for employment will be located in the Preston/South Ribble urban area, Leyland and Farington, and Chorley Town with regionally significant schemes at:
 - i. Samlesbury
 - ii. Cuerden (Lancashire Central)
 - iii. Buckshaw Village
 - iv. Central Preston
- **Policy 27:** Sustainable Resources and New Developments

Site Allocations & Development Management Policies DPD (Preferred Option Paper)

42. Local Development Framework: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document. The Council has recently completed consultation on the Preferred Option Paper for the Chorley Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). This document will accord with the broad content of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy but will provide more site-specific and policy details. The purpose of this document is to help deliver the aims of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy by setting out development management policies and allocating or protecting land for specific uses. This DPD is at a relatively early stage of preparation, and can be afforded limited weight.

Assessment

Principle of the development

43. The site constitutes plots 5, 7 and 9 on the Regional Investment Site (RIS) identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West. This designation was carried through into Policy 15 of the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan which is not a saved Policy and forms no part of the Development Plan.

44. Policy EM1A of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review reserves the land for strategic investment of regional significance, and lists a number of criteria that proposal should comply with including the scale of development, impact on surroundings and nearby occupiers, satisfactory vehicular access, occupation by a limited number of occupiers, comprehensive planning for the site as a whole, and safe links for pedestrians and cyclists.

45. This site constitutes 10.20 ha which equates to approximately 47% of the RIS.

Background Information

46. Reserved matters approval has already been granted at this site however this was never implemented and the permission has now expired. When outline planning permission was originally granted for the development the associated Section 106 required not less than 40% of the overall site to be used for High Quality Generic Manufacturing uses and Knowledge Based Industry. Sites 2, 3, 4 and 6/8 were granted reserved matters approval on a speculative basis including B8 uses and are all now occupied by B8 uses. The Council's aims for the site included a mixed use B2/ B8 site and as such when reserved matters approval was granted on this site previously it was for B2 (High Quality Generic Manufacturing uses and Knowledge Based Industry) use only.

47. This 60/40% split was dictated by the associated S106 Agreement. The agreement stated: The Owner hereby covenants with the Council that not less than 40% of the site shall be used for High Quality Generic Manufacturing Uses and Knowledge Based Industry provided that:
- the Owner will use reasonable endeavours to secure that a greater percentage of the Site is used for such uses and industry;
 - if the Site has been marketed in accordance with the approved marketing strategy for a period of 5 years to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council in writing then the Owner shall be entitled to market the Site for uses not falling within the definition of High Quality Generic Manufacturing Uses and Knowledge Based Industry.
48. The marketing, referred to above, began in 2005 and as such from 1st October 2010 the site, including plots 5, 7 and 9, could be marketed and occupied for uses other than High Quality Generic Manufacturing and Knowledge Based Industry.
49. This application is not a reserved matters application as the time period for submitting reserved matters, in accordance with the original outline permission, has expired. However the principle of considering alternative industrial uses, other than B2, on the site has now been established.
50. The proposed building on Plot A will be occupied by Parcelforce, which is part of the Royal Mail Group, and is a courier and logistics company. Parcelforce opened a new operational hub in Coventry in 2000 and as the business continues to grow they have a requirement for a new regional facility within the north to provide capacity for planned expansion of the business and in response to growing demand for its services.
51. Parcelforce are seeking to develop Plot A as a new distribution warehouse. The facility will work alongside the existing Parcelforce operation located in Coventry to facilitate expansion of the business. The facility will be used to handle, sort and distribute parcels to destinations across a large geographical area from the north Midlands to Scotland. No customer collection facility will be provide at this site.

Green Belt

52. This site is located within the Green Belt which is covered by Policy DC1 of the Chorley Borough Local Plan Review. Policy DC1 advises that planning permission will not be granted, except in very special circumstances, for development other than agriculture, forestry, recreational facilities, cemeteries, the re-use of buildings, replacement dwellings and affordable housing in certain circumstances, and the redevelopment of Major Developed Sites in accordance with Policy DC6. Policy DC1 is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF.
53. The application site is within the Major Developed Site designation. Policy DC6 states: The re-use, infilling or redevelopment of major developed sites in the Green Belt, as shown on the Proposals Map, will be permitted providing all the following criteria are met:
- (a) the proposal does not have a materially greater impact than the existing use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it;
 - (b) the development is in scale and keeping with the main features of the landscape and has regard to the need to integrate the development with its surroundings, and will not be of significant detriment to features of historical or ecological importance;
 - (c) the development does not exceed the height of the existing buildings;
- and in the case of infill
- (d) the proposal does not lead to a major increase in the developed portion of the site, result in a significant additional impact on the surrounding countryside or give rise to off-site infrastructure requirements;
- in the case of redevelopment
- (e) the proposal contributes to the achievement of the objectives for the use of land in Green Belts;

- (f) the appearance of the site as a whole is maintained or enhanced and that all proposals, including those for partial redevelopment, are put forward in the context of a comprehensive long term plan for the site as a whole;
 - (g) the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction if this is appropriate;
 - (h) the new buildings do not occupy a larger area than the buildings they replace nor result in a significant additional impact on the surrounding countryside.
54. It is noted that Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 which related to Green Belt has been replaced by the NPPF which does not refer to major developed sites in the Green Belt. The NPPF does however state that redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development is appropriate development.
55. The landscape of the Royal Ordnance site is essentially a very artificial one, having been subject to massive earth movements to form underground bunkers and blast mounds with a variety of buildings and infrastructure. The application site is now a levelled formed building platform with access laid out in accordance with the outline application.
56. When outline planning permission was originally granted the artificial landscape of the area was taken into consideration and the parameters of building heights were identified to be 12-16m. The other approved buildings on The Revolution have been built in accordance with the Masterplan and are approximately 14 metres high. The proposed buildings are 15.6 metres high (plot A) and 14.5 metres high (Plot B)
57. Although this application is a full application which is not related directly to the original outline approval the original design concepts are still applicable. This application cannot be viewed in isolation in respect of this site as it would not achieve *a comprehensive long term plan for the site as a whole*. Concerns were originally raised that the scheme did not accord with the original Masterplan for the site as it did not incorporate a 20 metre structural landscape strip along the western boundary. However the plans have been amended to incorporate a buffer landscaping strip and mound (which extends from 23 metres at the narrowest point to 45 metres at its deepest point adjacent to the proposed building), a drainage ditch and a turf laid fire path along the western boundary. This results in the building being sited further away from the common boundary than originally proposed.
58. It is considered that the amended proposals reflect the originally envisaged design principles for the whole site in accordance with the original Masterplan and will not have a greater impact on the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF.

Levels

59. The proposed finished floor levels (FFL) are 68.51 for the building on Plot A and 65.7 for the building on Plot B. This reflects the fact that the site steps up. Plot B is adjacent to the residential parcel L of Buckshaw Village. This site is currently under construction by Stewart Milne Homes (11/00149/REMAJ) and Barratts Homes (10/00792/FULMAJ) with some units completed and occupied. The FFLs of the dwellings along the common boundary range from 65.00 to 66.25 (at the north west corner of the site) which ensures that the maximum difference between the dwellings and the building on Plot B is 0.7 metres however they are proposed to be separated by a landscape strip which is addressed below and as such it is not considered that the level difference will adversely impact on the neighbours amenities.
60. The site has been remediated and levelled and there is a significant level step change on the application site where Plot A will be sited. To address the level changes currently present on the site the Royal Mail will be carrying out a cut and fill exercise to minimise the amount of material to be imported to or exported from the site whilst forming a level plateau around the proposed building.
61. The highest level of the site will be the existing access point adjacent to Plot 3 (Wolseley Plumb Centre Distribution Unit). The levels will then run gradually down to the north west bounding respecting the existing levels along Buckshaw Avenue and the northern boundary

of the site. It is proposed that the finished floor level of the distribution centre will be 68.51m and that the external yards to both major elevations where the vehicle docks are sited will be approximately 1.2m below this level.

Design and Layout

62. When outline planning permission was originally approved for the whole Strategic Regional Site there was accompanying S106 which incorporated several clauses. Clause 5 of this agreement incorporated the design principles which were required to be incorporated into the reserved matters approvals for the site. these included:
- i) The provision of not less than 20m depth of structural landscaping between the edge of the road corridor and the front elevation of any building which may include staff and customer car parking with each phase of the Development;
 - ii) The provision of not less than 20m depth of structural landscaping between the boundaries of each plot within each phase of the Development;
 - iii) The provision of not less than 15m depth of structural landscaping between the rear elevation of the buildings and the boundary of each plot with the railway line within each phase of the development;
 - iv) The design of each of the buildings shall accord with the following principles:
 - the main front façade will incorporate windows and doors, the main entrance reception and offices
 - profiled and flat metal panels will be the main cladding materials for the warehouse and factory elements with curtain wall glazing and flat metal panels for the office and reception elements
 - elevation treatments will include cladding in light colours and large areas of the same colour and profile of cladding will be avoided
 - window and door frames will be anodized or powder coated aluminium
 - the roof will be shallow pitched with ridges running east-west or a parapet to give a horizontal profile to the link road.
63. Additionally the S106 included a Masterplan which indicatively detailed the layout of the buildings and the proposed landscaping. This Masterplan was subsequently amended removing the landscape strip between site 7 and 9 to allow more flexibility within the layout.
64. These design principles have been established across the remainder of the site and as such are the starting point for the consideration of this application.

Plot A

65. The building on plot A will be occupied by Parcelforce (part of the Royal Mail Group) who will utilise the premises as a new distribution centre which will serve a wide geographic area from the Midlands to Scotland complementing their existing operation in Coventry. Due to the operational requirements of Royal Mail the building incorporates loading docks on both the northern and southern elevation and the loading docks on the south elevation face Buckshaw Avenue which differs to the other buildings present at The Revolution in that they include office accommodation facing Buckshaw Avenue. From a design perspective this represents a new design concept on this site however it is not considered that this is unacceptable on this site as the majority of the other buildings were built on a speculative basis and this building has an identified end user. Varying the design of this building ensures that a fully operational building is achieved on the site.
66. As stated earlier Royal Mail intend to construct this building in two phases and plans have been provided detailing phase 1 and the completed building. The reason for this phased approach is to reduce the build timescales and so enable Parcelforce to meet their immediate business requirement for a new regional facility by September 2013.
67. The phased approach will allow the development to commence at the earliest opportunity with an estimated requirement for 139 new staff for opening in September 2013. Following this, the second phase of development will consist of the development of the remaining 5,000 sq m of warehouse building with associated car parking, extended circulation route and servicing arrangements. Phase 2 can be delivered while Phase 1 is operational and will be constructed in line with growth targets projected by Parcelforce.

68. Phase 1 proposes the erection of a 6,000sqm of operational warehouse space and 580sqm of administration offices. Parking will be provided as part of phase 1 for 50 lorries, 30 tractor units, 7 shunters, 2 Long Wheel Base Vans, 87 private cars, 15 motorcyces and 15 cycles.
69. The agent for the application has confirmed that prior to the construction of Phase 1, the entire site is to be levelled with a cut and fill exercise to form a level plateau. It is not intended to landscape the Phase 2 land in the interim period as this would be an inappropriate use of resources given the intention to develop the site in the immediate future. This land will remain its current pre-development condition and will therefore be similar in appearance to other development plots in the wider Buckshaw area awaiting development.
70. Phase 2 will incorporate the erection of the remaining 5000sqm of operational warehouse space which will include an increase in the office area to 610 sqm and an increase in parking to create an additional 50 trailers (100 in total), 30 tractor units (60 in total), 7 shunters (14 in total), 2 Long Wheel Base Vans (4 in total), 77 private cars (164 in total), 10 motorcyces (25 in total) and 10 cycles (25 in total).
71. This level of car parking is higher than typical B8 land uses which is due to the Parcelforce operation having a higher level of staff than a typical B8 uses given the intensive nature of the distribution operation involved. Furthermore, sufficient car parking is necessary to allow for overlap of changing shifts so that staff beginning a shift can park and enter the building before staff finishing a shift have returned to their cars and left the site.
72. In this regard the agent for the application has confirmed that Parcelforce will encourage sustainable transport modes, however given the unsociable hours of operation; it is difficult for staff to travel by public transport during the night. Parcelforce will prepare a Travel Plan setting out measures to encourage use of sustainable transport modes and to reduce car journeys. This can be secured via condition.
73. The proposed materials are also a consideration to ensure that the building 'fits into' the character of the remaining site. The materials include grey profiled metal cladding on the roof and Sirius metallic horizontally spanning profiled metal cladding panels and blue feature panels for the walls.
74. As set out previously the design and orientation of this building are not in accordance with the original design concept for the Strategic Regional Site however the materials match those used elsewhere on the site. From a design perspective it is considered that the buildings will add variation into the site. The fact that the materials proposed reflect the remainder of the site ensures that the building will not create an overly 'alien' building within the streetscene.
75. As the site will be used as the distribution centre for Royal Mail a significant proportion of goods passing through the facility will comprise higher value mail, including technological goods, ordered on-line through web-sites such as Amazon as well as confidential mail and as such site security is an essential element to ensure the operation of the facility. In this regard the proposals incorporate the erection of a 2.9 metre high black weldmesh boundary fence around the entire boundary of the site. A pedestrian access turnstile/ gate is proposed from the staff car park (at the eastern end of the site) into the main part of the site, at the main vehicular in/ out access 2.9 metre high bifold gates are proposed and at the emergency exit point 2.9 metre high sliding gates are proposed.
76. The introduction of black fencing around the boundary will be very prominent within the surrounding area due to the proposed height and the fact that other units on The Revolution have a relatively open frontage. Weldmesh fencing does generally allow views through however the inclusion of access gates along the road frontage will also create prominent features within the streetscene. The occupiers security requirements are acknowledged, along with the fact that the scheme will be built to Secure by Design Standards however this need to be weighed against the visual impact of such a feature.

77. To reduce the impact of this fence along Buckshaw Avenue, which is the most prominent part of the site, landscaping has been suggested to the front of the fence which will help to 'break-up' the impact of this feature. Further details have been requested in respect of this part of the site to ensure that the scheme integrates into the character and streetscene environment established elsewhere along Buckshaw Avenue.
78. Additionally the agent for the application has confirmed that Parcelforce have identified a need to incorporate a more robust security fence along its western boundary particularly before Phase 2 is brought forward. The proposals include the erection of a security fence 5 metres above the height of the ground level however in order to reduce the visual impact of a continuous length of fence of this scale, the first 2m of height are proposed to be achieved by siting the fence on a 2m high bund (i.e. the fence will be 3 metres in height). This bund also provides the opportunity to incorporate appropriate landscape planting to both soften the appearance of the fence and to discourage unauthorised approaches.

Plot B

79. As set out above concerns were originally raised from the adjacent land owners that the building on Plot B was too close to the residential dwellings currently under construction/ already constructed. This was mainly due to the fact that the scheme did not incorporate a 20m structural landscaping strip as indicated within the original S106 Agreement but also the height of the proposed building and the fact that the building is closer to the common boundary than the Masterplan originally envisaged. It should be noted that an indicative layout was included on the Masterplan for the Strategic Regional Site the Masterplan for Buckshaw Village did not incorporate an indicative layout for the adjacent residential parcel which demonstrates that the relationship between these 2 parcels would be considered further at reserved matters stage.
80. As detailed earlier the height of the building is within the range originally envisaged for this site and the Masterplan was only indicative in respect of the siting. However at pre-application stage the agent and the applicant were advised that the western boundary was the most sensitive location of the site due to the proximity of the residential dwellings and a 20m structural landscaping strip was envisaged when the scheme was originally approved. The applicant was advised that any deviation away from this original design concept would require justification.
81. In this regard there have been several versions of the layout and landscaping plan submitted as part of this planning application which has including increasing the depth of the landscaping and the distance between the boundary and the building. The most recent plans detail a landscaping scheme which is considered to be the most appropriate solution or the site.
82. Concerns have been raised that the development is contrary to Policy EM2 of the Local Plan. It is noted that Policy EM2 states that for new industrial development on the edges of industrial areas, where sites adjoin residential areas or open countryside, developers will be required to provide substantial peripheral landscaping ranging between 5 and 10 metres in width. This notwithstanding the Masterplan for this site required a 20 metre landscape buffer between the industrial and residential development to ensure a high quality environment was created at the site. As set out below it is considered that this is now achieved in respect of the proposals for the site.
83. The agent has confirmed that the applicant is also proposing to create a series of landscape mounds on which the proposed screening vegetation will be planted. The agent has confirmed that *the landscape buffer area is currently in the ownership of BAe. In developing the site, there will be a legal obligation placed upon BAe to carry out the landscaping works in accordance with the approved plans. The landscaping area will subsequently be transferred to the Revolution Park Management Company Ltd which has now been set up. The management company will be directly responsible for maintaining the landscaping area in accordance with the approved maintenance scheme thereafter.*

84. It is considered that the inclusion of a mound, which was not a requirement of the original outline approval, increases the effectiveness of the screening and the landscaping proposed will provide a high quality landscape scheme along this boundary. Additionally the applicant has agreed to a condition which requires the landscaping to be planted within the first planting season following any approval which will enable the planting to begin maturing prior to the construction of the building (which would be in the next few months).
85. As set out above Trevor Bridge Associates, on behalf of Stewart Milne Homes, initially raised concerns in respect of the effectiveness of the landscaping proposed. The Council's Parks Open Spaces Team assessed the previously submitted scheme and raised concerns that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents, and the screening as proposed would offer little improvement for 12 - 15 years. Suggestions were offered to improve the landscaping.
86. With the submission of the scheme currently under consideration the landscaping was amended in accordance with the comments made by the Open Space Team. The Parks and Open Spaces Officer has confirmed that the height and width of bund represents a much better fit alongside the proposed building, the revised plant sizes and species mix are more appropriate and will provide a greater level of screening to the adjacent properties in the short and long term and the additional height in the bund and revised planting will help to minimise the visual effects to the adjacent properties, especially in the initial 12-15 years whilst the mass planting matures.
87. The proposed building on Plot B will be 24 metres from the common boundary at its closest point and 45 metres from the common boundary at its furthest point. It is acknowledged that this will result in a large building relatively close to residential dwellings however the landscaping proposed will assist in alleviating the visual impact.
88. The proposed materials are also a consideration to ensure that the building 'fits into' the character of the remaining site and from the neighbouring residents perspective, a 202 metre long elevation will be visible from their properties. At the time of writing this report requests for visuals have not been complied with. The materials include grey profiled metal cladding on the roof and duck egg blue horizontally spanning profiled metal cladding panels and silver vertically spanning profiled metal cladding panels for the walls on the warehouse element of the building. For the offices the materials include grey profiled metal cladding panels for the roof, horizontally spanning composite micro-rib metal panels in Silver for the walls, PPC frames in graphite grey with grey tinted glazing and grey lookalike panel spandrels where required for the doors and windows. For the entrance lobby and canopy grey profiled metal cladding panel roof in grey with grey eaves soffit and fascia and grey composite micro-rib metal panels in grey above glazing.
89. The building on Plot B incorporates windows within the main front façade profiled metal panels, a mix of materials to break up the elevations and the roof is designed to give a horizontal profile to the link road all in accordance with the original design concept for the Strategic Regional Site. The materials match those used elsewhere on the site with the exception of the red feature band. One letter has been received stating that the red cladding is out of place with all other units on development. The inclusion of this red banding is a branding inclusion by the applicant and only introduces a small amount of red into all of the buildings facades. It is not considered that this small inclusion will result in buildings which are out of character with the surrounding area.

Noise

90. Noise was a particular concern to the adjacent land owners due to the proximity of the building on plot B to the western edge of the site to the dwellinghouses and the fact that the building is being constructed on a speculative basis (no end user identified) which means the applicants are seeking 24 hour operation.
91. Concerns were raised that the proposed service yard situated within the rear elevation close to the common boundary of the site would lead to unacceptable levels of noise to the detriment of the neighbours amenities. However the amended scheme no longer

incorporates a service yard for Plot B adjacent to the residential dwellings which removes the need for an acoustic fence at this location. The scheme does not however include a car park at the front of the building close to the common boundary. The amended plans are supported by a revised noise assessment which concludes that the assessment of on-site operational noise has shown that moderate increases in the existing ambient noise climate are likely at the southernmost properties within the residential development site to the west of the subject site.

92. Maximum noise levels associated with heavy goods vehicle movements are predicted to be below the criterion that the World Health Organisation states is an indicator of sleep disturbance, although the slamming of car doors within the car park of Plot B may cause the criterion to be exceeded at the southernmost new residential properties.
93. The report recommends mitigation measures to ensure that the occupants of the adjacent residential site are protected from noise in respect of the proposed car park. The suggested mitigation is a 2.5 metre high acoustic fence along the rear of the car parking spaces to ensure that the maximum noise levels do not exceed the WHO criterion. This can be addressed by condition.
94. The amended plans and noise assessment have been considered by the Council's Environmental Health Officer whose initial views are that the amended proposals appear fine however further comments will be reported on the addendum along with any conditions that are considered necessary in respect of noise.

Flood Risk and drainage

95. The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy which has been reviewed by the Environment Agency (EA). The Environment Agency initially objected to the proposals as they were concerned that the scheme did not clearly establish the surface water drainage scheme for the site.
96. These concerns were forwarded to the agent for the application and the applicant's drainage consultants who have had further discussions with the EA. The first matter concerns the responsibility for the maintenance of pond 5a and the second matter concerns the surface water discharge rate.
97. The Environment Agency has subsequently confirmed that they have discussed the site with RPS, who are the applicants' engineers, and they have received additional information on 29 November 2011 (their ref. AMS/NK016970). The EA consider that the additional information addresses their previous concerns regarding the maintenance of the surface water drainage system and that the applicants have the ability to enforce maintenance of pond 5a. The EA have also reviewed the additional details submitted in relation to the surface water run-off rates. They still do have concerns about the proposed surface water run-off rates from the proposed development however they are satisfied that these concerns could be addressed by condition. In this regard appropriately worded conditions have been attached to the recommendation.
98. The proposals include a landscape mound along the western boundary and relocating the existing drainage ditch. The agent for the application has confirmed *RPS have been consulted regarding surface water runoff from the proposed landscaped bunding to the western of the building occupying Plots 7 and 9. The landscaped area in question would itself be permeable and therefore rainwater which falls upon it would normally be expected to be absorbed via infiltration into the ground. The dense planting of the landscaped zone would also significantly arrest the rate at which non-absorbed rainwater would runoff this area.*
99. Based upon a typical "greenfield" runoff rate this mound is *very unlikely to present any significant risk of flooding of the gardens of residential properties beyond the western boundary.*

100. In this regard the Environment Agency have confirmed that they have no concerns in relation to surface water and the proposed landscape mound. As such it is not considered that this mound will create any surface water flooding issues.
101. In respect of the amended proposals the Environment Agency have confirmed *Although the area of hardstanding has increased, the management of any associated increase in run-off would still be covered by the condition we recommended. The applicant will need to demonstrate that surface water run-off is managed in accordance with the Buckshaw Village Drainage Strategy and that on-site attenuation/storage is provided as required prior to the commencement of development.*
102. As such there is not considered to be any unresolved issues from a flood risk and drainage perspective.

Traffic and Transport

103. Vehicular access to Plot A is proposed as an in/out function at the existing junction. A new emergency exit point is also proposed along Buckshaw Avenue. Access to Plot B is via the existing junction on Buckshaw Avenue.
104. The current proposals subject to this application are supported by a Supplementary Transport Statement which has been reviewed by the Highway Engineer at Lancashire County Council. The Highway Engineer initially raised the following concerns *the road layout is already strategically designed in terms of the number and level of access junctions as part of the pre-planning and master planning stage for the village. The proposals will result in 3 accesses in close proximity of each other which will lead to traffic congestion and the level of conflicting vehicle movements will also have adverse impact on highway safety.*
105. The agent for the application has confirmed that the access and exit arrangement proposed in respect of Plot A are part of security obligations required by Parcelforce which have specific operational access requirements. Parcelforce check vehicles at a site entry point and vehicles are then either permitted into the site or refused entry. Parcelforce cannot allow unauthorised vehicles into the secure site to turn around. As such, the Plot A design initially incorporated a bypass lane with access/egress onto the public highway. This was to enable vehicles to drive back on to the highway avoiding reverse manoeuvres onto the public highway. As well as safety concerns any reversing manoeuvre out of the site would cause delays to operational movements. Whilst such occurrences are likely to be infrequent, the access design acts as a safety feature in such an event
106. Following receipt of these concerns the plans were amended to incorporate a turning circle within the site and further justification provided for the proposed emergency access which not only provides access for emergency vehicles but also in the event of a breakdown of normal access arrangements (e.g. a technical failure or vehicle breakdown at the entrance point) then the emergency access would allow operational vehicles to enter and exit the site. This circumstance would require staff to physically monitor the gate and so would only be used as an emergency measure.
107. The Highway Engineer has reviewed these amendments and confirmed that as plot A is now served by the existing single access point this removes the highway objection to the application.
108. The Highway Engineer has confirmed that the overall access arrangements which include the widening of the existing access and provision of a new emergency access as a site safety feature for operational purposes are acceptable. The works to alter the existing access and formation of the new emergency access will be required to be carried out under a S278 agreement.
109. In respect of Plot A, access to the staff car park is via the existing private access road serving Unit 3 (Wolseley). This access has been constructed on site and formed part of the planning approval for unit 3. The Highway Engineer has commented however that the limit of highway adoption is 10m back from the nearside edge of the carriageway on Buckshaw Avenue (ie

10m into the access road). As such the access road is essentially private from this point onwards and the new access point to serve the proposed Unit is to be taken off the private section of the access road. The Highway Engineer considers that whilst this in itself would not constitute a reason for highways objection, as the existing access road is privately maintained. The Applicant should check with their solicitors that they have a right to use the private road for access to the proposed new Unit.

110. Additionally in this regard concerns have been raised by the property advisor for unit 3 (Wolseley) in respect of the impacts of a shared access on their clients operation. However as the access will only be utilised by private vehicles and not HGVs etc conflict is not considered to be an issue.
111. The Highway Engineer has requested a S106 contribution for travel planning which is £18,000.
112. The National Planning Policy Framework guidance published on 27th March 2012 replaces Circular 05/2005 in respect of Planning Obligations. The NPPF states that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
 - necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - directly related to the development; and
 - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
113. The application is however supported by a Framework Travel Plan which demonstrates the applicant's commitment to providing a full travel plan. It has not been demonstrated that the above request meets the relevant tests and as such it is proposed to deal with the requirement for a travel plan via condition.
114. The Highway Engineer understands that provision for a Bond for Phase 2 Highway Works was put in place with the S106 with Chorley B.C. This is addressed below within the S106 section.

Sustainability

115. In September 2008 the first policy document, Sustainable Resources DPD, within Chorley's new Local Development Framework (LDF), was adopted. The applicants have provided an Energy Efficiency/Resources Conservation Statement which was revised in February 2012 to address the amended scheme. This document sets out how the scheme will meet the requirements of Policy SR1 of the Sustainable Resources DPD. Policy SR1 requires these types of developments to achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' and incorporate a 15% reduction in carbon emissions through the use of low/ zero carbon technology.
116. The submitted document confirms that the two plots will be designed to achieve a BREEAM 'Very Good' rating and will incorporate numerous measures to conserve the use of natural resources including energy, water, materials and land.
117. The energy and carbon performance of the proposed development has utilised the functional characteristics of the site and its future use to deliver a 15% carbon reduction below the predicted baseline through energy efficiency and conservation measures.
118. Energy efficiency will be delivered through the use of high levels of insulation, air tightness, protection against thermal bridging, lighting specification, use of daylight where practical, and the general use of efficient systems throughout the design. Energy conservation will be achieved by providing the tools within the building to allow occupants to minimise their energy consumption by effectively zoning controls for lighting and heating, incorporating automatic light switching for presence and daylight where appropriate, and using a BMS to facilitate the remote monitoring and control of energy-consuming systems within each building.
119. The applicants have considered the full range of potential low carbon generation technologies and should additional measures be required to meet the 15% threshold, then

then air source heating and/or cooling offers the best solution and will be included as part of the energy solution for the office spaces only.

120. This is considered to be the most appropriate solution for the buildings proposed and the above requirements can be addressed by suitably worded conditions.

Section 106 Agreement

121. When outline planning approval was originally granted for this site there was an associated S106 Agreement. As this is a full application which is not associated with the outline planning approval there is a requirement to ensure that all of the originally agreed obligations have been satisfied and any outstanding would have to be secured via a new S106 Agreement. All of the obligations within this agreement have been met apart from clause 8 which the Highway Engineer refers to above.
122. Clause 8 relates to phase II highway works and requires works to be done at the junction with the A6 when certain triggers are met. These triggers have not yet been met. The owner was required to provide a bond or a parent company guarantee to the Council to cover the cost of the phase II highway works.
123. BAE, via their Bondsman, have confirmed that the bond for 'highway works at the A6' will be retained.
124. As the necessary arrangements are in place in respect of clause 8 and the remainder of the obligations have been satisfied there is no requirement for a S106 in respect of this application.

Overall Conclusion

125. It is acknowledged that this is a 'stand alone' application for the erection of 2 industrial units at The Revolution however the fact that in the past it has been established that this type of use is appropriate for this site is a material consideration. The site is allocated within the Local Plan under Policy EM1a as a regional investment site which reserves land at the Royal Ordnance Site for strategic inward investment of regional significance. The agents for the application have confirmed that Parcellforce anticipate 267 jobs will be created once the site is fully operational. Jobs would comprise warehouse operatives, management and administration roles, maintenance engineers and drivers.
126. It is acknowledged that the building on plot B will be close to the residential dwellings on Parcel L and this is the most sensitive location of the site. The building height accords with that originally envisaged for the whole site, as set at outline stage, and although the proximity in respect of the siting of the building is closer than that agreed on the masterplan at outline stage, this plan was only indicative. It is considered that the proposed landscaping on a mound, which was not a requirement of the original outline approval, will achieve a high quality landscape environment for the employment area which was the original objective of the Masterplan and outline approval.
127. Noise is a concern particularly due to the potential for 24 hour working however it is considered that adequate mitigation measures can be accommodated and secured via condition to ensure that the proposals do not create a statutory nuisance.
128. As such the proposals are considered to be acceptable and the application is recommended for approval.

Other Matters

Public Consultation

129. In accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement the applicant carried out a consultation exercise prior to submission. This was in the form of an informal exhibition event. 16 members of the public attended and 10 questionnaires were completed. 8 supported the scheme and 2 raised concerns in respect of the impact on the highway network, the scale of the development and potential overshadowing to the neighbouring properties and the effects on the local landscapes.

130. Concerns have been raised from neighbouring land owners about the extent of consultation undertaken. In response to this the agent for the application has confirmed that the applicant worked closely with the BVCA to design an appropriate community consultation programme to ensure the local community, including residents, businesses and landowners, were given the opportunity to meet the applicant and view and comment on draft development proposals at an appropriate stage of the planning process.
131. The principal consultation exercise took the form of an exhibition held on 31st August between 3pm and 8pm at the Buckshaw Village Community Hall. Advertisement of this event was largely co-ordinated by the BVCA and consisted on the following:
- An emailed advert of the proposed exhibition sent to over 1,200 members of the Community Association's Community Forum on 5 August 2011;
 - Display of the aforementioned advert on the BVCA website from 5 August to 31 August;
 - Display of the aforementioned advert on seven notice boards across Buckshaw Village on 6 and 7 August 2011;
 - Distribution of 150 copies of the aforementioned advert to residential properties located close to the application site.
132. Whilst the applicant did not originally approach individual landowners direct, the above advertisement was intended to reach as many realistically interested parties as possible, including businesses and landowners. The advertisement was proven to be successful in this respect as Barratt Homes attended the exhibition.
133. Following their attendance at the exhibition a meeting was held with Barratt Homes on 7th September. At the meeting a number of matters were discussed and concerns explained which were taken on board. It was agreed that a full set of the application documents would be issued to Barratt Homes following submission and that a further meeting would be considered. An email was subsequently sent to Barratt Homes on 20th October suggesting a further meeting to discuss the proposals. No response was received to this invitation.

Planning History

Site:

04/00029/FULMAJ - Remediation and reclamation earth works. Approved 28 April 2004.

04/00882/OUTESM - Outline application for employment development including full details of a link road – Approved December 2004

07/01395/REMAJ- Reserved matters application for the erection of 3 buildings for B2 use with ancillary parking areas. Approved March 2008

Adjacent Sites:

06/00589/REMAJ – Site 6/8- Erection of regional distribution centre, including warehouse/storage, ancillary offices, car and lorry parking, access and part circulation space, gatehouse, MHE store and fuel point (site area 6.6 Ha) – Approved September 2006

06/00590/REMAJ – Site 6/8- Part gatehouse, circulation space, MHE store and fuel point, associated with the erection of Regional Distribution Centre (Site area 1.0 Ha) – Approved September 2006

06/00601/REMAJ – Site 2 - Reserved Matters Application for the erection of 18,353 Sq m building for B2/B8 use with ancillary parking areas and landscaping – Approved July 2006

06/00602/REMAJ – Site 3- Reserved Matters Application for the erection of 9,821 Sq m building for B2/B8 use with ancillary parking areas and landscaping- Approved July 2006

06/00674/REMAJ- Site 4- Reserved Matters Application for the erection of 21,563 Sq m building for B2/B8 use with ancillary parking areas and landscaping. Approved October 2007

06/01078/REMAJ- Site 6/8- Part RDC, access, parking gatehouse, circulation space, part MHE store, bottle gas store and fuel point and landscaping. Approved December 2006

06/01079/REMAJ- Site 6/8- Erection of regional distribution centre, including warehouse/storage, ancillary offices, car and lorry parking, part circulation space and landscaping. Part MHE store, pallet store, bottle gas store and compactor machine. Approved December 2006

10/00792/FULMAJ- Erection of 42 No 2 and 2½ storey dwellings. Approved November 2010

11/00149/REMAJ- Reserved Matters Application for southern part of Parcel L for the construction of 59 No dwellings together with associated works. Approved May 2011

Recommendation: Permit Full Planning Permission Conditions

1. The proposed development of Phase 1 of Plot A must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission. *Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.*
2. The proposed development of Plot B must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission. *Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.*

3. The approved plans are:

Plan Ref.	Received On:	Title:
EVAM2000	15 September 2011	Site Location Plan
2028-PL002 Rev A	12 March 2012	Landscape
5257 - 014	10 April 2012	Site Layout Plan (Complete)
<u>Plot A Phase 1</u>		
3500-099 PL-EX-09	5 March 2012	Proposed Fencing Details Phase 1 (Plot A)
3500-099 SK55 Rev A	22 March 2012	Feature Security Boundary Treatment (Plot A)
3500-099 SK28 Rev H	5 March 2012	Proposed Site Layout Plan Phase 1 (Plot A)
3500-099 SK55	5 March 2012	Proposed Site Layout Site Levels Phase 1 (Plot A)
3500-099 SK35 Rev C	5 March 2012	Building Plan Phase 1 (Plot A)
3500-099 SK59 Ph1 Rev A	12 March 2012	Proposed Site Plan Phase 1 (Plot A)
3500-099 SK36 Rev B	5 March 2012	Proposed Elevations Phase 1 (Plot A)
<u>Plot A Complete</u>		
3500-099	27 January 2012	Building Plan (Plot A)
3500-099 SK45	27 January 2012	Elevations (Plot A)
3500-099 SK31 Rev G	5 March 2012	Office Accommodation (Plot A)
3500-099 SK46	27 January 2012	Office Accommodation Plans (Plot A)
3500-099 SK59 Rev A	12 March 2012	Proposed Site Plan (Plot A)
<u>Plot B</u>		
5257 - 014	27 January 2012	Building Plan (Plot B)
5257 - 016	27 January 2012	Office Floor Plans (Plot B)
5257 - 019	27 January 2012	Elevations (Plot B)
2028-DL001	27 January 2012	Cross Sections Showing Proposed Plantings at Year 1
2028-DL002	27 January 2012	Cross Sections Showing Proposed

Reason: To define the permission and in the interests of the proper development of the site.

4. Development of Plot A shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding the previously submitted plans. The scheme shall include details of the surface water discharge rates from the site in accordance with the Buckshaw Village Drainage Strategy and details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion. The scheme shall also include details of surface water from yard storage areas, vehicle washing areas, loading and unloading areas. Any areas which are likely to be contaminated by spillage should be connected to the foul sewer. In the absence of a sewerage system, such drainage must go to a tank(s) with no discharge to watercourse. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. In accordance with Policy Nos. EP18 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

5. Development of Plot B shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding the previously submitted plans. The scheme shall include details of the surface water discharge rates from the site in accordance with the Buckshaw Village Drainage Strategy and details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion. The scheme shall also include details of surface water from yard storage areas, vehicle washing areas, loading and unloading areas. Any areas which are likely to be contaminated by spillage should be connected to the foul sewer. In the absence of a sewerage system, such drainage must go to a tank(s) with no discharge to watercourse.

The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system. In accordance with Policy Nos. EP18 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

6. In respect of Plot A prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking / servicing areas shall be passed through an oil interceptor in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding the previously submitted plans. The scheme shall be designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with, the site being drained. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. *REASON: To protect water quality. In accordance with Policy Nos. EP18 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.*

7. In respect of Plot B prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking / servicing areas shall be passed through an oil interceptor in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding the previously submitted plans. The scheme shall be designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with, the site being drained. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.
Reason: To protect water quality. In accordance with Policy Nos. EP18 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
8. Before the development of Plot B hereby permitted is first commenced, full details of the position, height and appearance of all fences and walls to be erected to the site boundaries (notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied or land used pursuant to this permission before all walls and fences have been erected in accordance with the approved details. Fences and walls shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details at all times.
Reason: To ensure a visually satisfactory form of development, to protect the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 and EM2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
9. Before the development of Plot A Phase 2 hereby permitted is first commenced, full details of the position, height and appearance of all fences and walls to be erected to the site boundaries (notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied or land used pursuant to this permission before all walls and fences have been erected in accordance with the approved details. Fences and walls shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details at all times.
Reason: To ensure a visually satisfactory form of development, to protect the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 and EM2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
10. Before the development of Plot B commences full details, of the 2.5 metre high acoustic fence to be erected along the car park boundary in accordance with appendix F of the submitted Noise Assessment dated February 2012, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
Reason: To protect the amenities of the neighbouring residents and in accordance with Policy EP20 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
11. Prior to the first use of the development of Plot A hereby permitted, a Business Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The measures in the agreed Travel Plan shall then thereafter be complied with unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To reduce the number of car borne trips and to encourage the use of public transport and to accord with Policies TR1 and TR4 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

12. Prior to the first use of the development of Plot B hereby permitted, a Business Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The measures in the agreed Travel Plan shall then thereafter be complied with unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To reduce the number of car borne trips and to encourage the use of public transport and to accord with Policies TR1 and TR4 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
13. Before the development of Plot A Phase 1 hereby permitted is first commenced full details of lighting proposals for the site shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans. The development shall only be carried out in conformity with the approved details.
Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality, to prevent light pollution, in the interests of public safety and crime prevention and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5, EM2 and EP21A of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
14. Before the development of Plot A Phase 2 hereby permitted is first commenced full details of lighting proposals for the site shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans. The development shall only be carried out in conformity with the approved details.
Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality, to prevent light pollution, in the interests of public safety and crime prevention and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5, EM2 and EP21A of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
15. Before the development of Plot B hereby permitted is first commenced full details of lighting proposals for the site shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans. The development shall only be carried out in conformity with the approved details.
Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality, to prevent light pollution, in the interests of public safety and crime prevention and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5, EM2 and EP21A of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
16. The development of Plot A Phase 1 hereby permitted shall not commence until full details of the colour, form and texture of all hard ground- surfacing materials (notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans and specification) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in conformity with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
17. The development of Plot A Phase 2 hereby permitted shall not commence until full details of the colour, form and texture of all hard ground- surfacing materials (notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans and specification) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in conformity with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

18. The development of Plot B hereby permitted shall not commence until full details of the colour, form and texture of all hard ground- surfacing materials (notwithstanding any such detail shown on previously submitted plans and specification) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in conformity with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

19. Before the development of Plot A Phase 1 hereby permitted is first occupied details of the cycle parking provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking provision shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason : To ensure adequate on site provision for cycle parking and in accordance with Policy No. TR18 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

20. Before the development of Plot A Phase 2 hereby permitted is first occupied details of the cycle parking provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking provision shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason : To ensure adequate on site provision for cycle parking and in accordance with Policy No. TR18 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

21. Before the development of Plot B hereby permitted is first occupied details of the cycle parking provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking provision shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason : To ensure adequate on site provision for cycle parking and in accordance with Policy No. TR18 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

22. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas for Plot A Phase 1 shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the premises as hereby permitted. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of and manoeuvring of vehicles.

Reason: To ensure adequate on site provision of car parking and manoeuvring areas and in accordance with Policy No. TR8 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

23. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas for Plot A Phase 2 shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the premises as hereby permitted. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of and manoeuvring of vehicles.

Reason: To ensure adequate on site provision of car parking and manoeuvring areas and in accordance with Policy No. TR8 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

24. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas for Plot A Phase 2 shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the premises as

hereby permitted. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of and manoeuvring of vehicles.

Reason: To ensure adequate on site provision of car parking and manoeuvring areas and in accordance with Policy No. TR8 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

25. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas for Plot B shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the premises as hereby permitted. The car park and vehicle manoeuvring areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of and manoeuvring of vehicles.

Reason: To ensure adequate on site provision of car parking and manoeuvring areas and in accordance with Policy No. TR8 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

26. The development of Plot A Phase 1 shall not begin until details of a 'Design Stage' assessment and related certification have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the approved assessment and certification.

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with Policy SR1 of Chorley Borough Council's Adopted Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document and Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document.

27. The development of Plot A Phase 2 shall not begin until details of a 'Design Stage' assessment and related certification have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the approved assessment and certification.

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with Policy SR1 of Chorley Borough Council's Adopted Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document and Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document.

28. The development of Plot B shall not begin until details of a 'Design Stage' assessment and related certification have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the approved assessment and certification.

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with Policy SR1 of Chorley Borough Council's Adopted Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document and Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document.

29. Within 6 months of occupation of each building hereby approved (including Plot A Phase 1 and Phase 2) a 'Post Construction Stage' assessment shall be carried out and a Final Certificate, certifying that a BREEAM standard of minimum 'very good' has been achieved, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with Policy SR1 of Chorley Borough Council's Adopted Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document and Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document.

30. Prior to the commencement of the development of Plot A Phase 1 full details of the on-site measures to reduce the carbon emissions of the development (related to predicted energy use) by 15% shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be completed in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with Policy SR1 of Chorley Borough Council's Adopted Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document and Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document.

31. Prior to the commencement of the development of Plot A Phase 2 full details of the on-site measures to reduce the carbon emissions of the development (related to predicted energy use) by 15% shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be completed in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with Policy SR1 of Chorley Borough Council's Adopted Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document and Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document.

32. Prior to the commencement of the development of Plot B full details of the on-site measures to reduce the carbon emissions of the development (related to predicted energy use) by 15% shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with Policy SR1 of Chorley Borough Council's Adopted Sustainable Resources Development Plan Document and Sustainable Resources Supplementary Planning Document.

33. Prior to the commencement of the development of Plot A hereby permitted full details of the public footpath along the eastern boundary of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the levels of the footpath and the surrounding land, the gradient of the footpath and the route. The footpath shall be completed and open to the public prior to the occupation of the building on Plot A.

Reason: To ensure that safe and adequate links for pedestrians and cyclists are incorporated into the development connected to the surrounding area. In accordance with Policy EM1a of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

34. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the grant of this planning approval and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interest of the appearance of the locality and in accordance with Policy No GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

35. The external facing materials detailed on the approved plans shall be used and no others substituted.

Reason: To ensure that the materials used are visually appropriate to the locality and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

36. The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in conformity with the proposed ground and building slab levels shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To protect the appearance of the locality and in the interests of the amenities of local residents and in accordance with Policy Nos. GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.

37. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an amendment to the Method Statement detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.
Reason: To protect the environment and prevent harm to human health by ensuring that the land is remediated to an appropriate standard for the proposed end use and in accordance with Government advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework
38. No materials or equipment shall be stored on the site other than inside the building.
Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy No. EM2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
39. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (Schedule 2, Part 8, Classes A, B and C) or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no extension or alteration (other than Phase 2 of Plot A) shall be carried out in respect of the buildings to which this permission relates.
Reason : To prevent an intensification in the use of the premises, in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and the amenities of local residents and in accordance with Policy No. EM2 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
40. In the event that Phase 2 of Plot A has not commenced within 3 years of the completion of Phase 1 a scheme for the landscaping and management of the phase 2 land shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be landscaped and managed in accordance with the approved scheme and maintained in perpetuity pending the commencement of phase 2 of Plot A.
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy GN5 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.