



## Representations

**Bretherton Parish Council** has no objections to make on this application, but is concerned that that the development will result in an increase in traffic in the village

**In total 2 representations have been received which are summarised below**

### **Objection**

- The new plans will create more noise and odours
- On some days odours can still be detected from the site
- Need to make sure that side effects similar to an abattoir are not created at this site such as noise and odour
- Visual impact of building 45, which will affect both the setting of the nearby listed dwellings and views in the green belt.
- The setting of the listed dwelling will be seriously affected by the size and height of building 45, which is proposed to be 53.7 metres long and 29.15 metres high.
- There will be an increase in larger vehicles delivering to Plocks Farm, some of which are likely to use Carr House Lane.
- The reduction in traffic referred to with the application relates to vehicles taking finished products off site, which is a separate part of the process.
- The applicant has proposed planting more trees than are in the current application, on embankments, to screen building 45 over time however there are constraints on where these trees can be planted because of power lines and underground pipes.
- The revised planting plan will help to minimise the visual impact of this development on our home. However can only fully support the planting plan if there is a good mix of fast-growing, evergreen and deciduous trees, so that the screening is effective all year round.

## Consultees

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Summary of Comments received</b>
Lancashire Constabulary	Have confirmed they have no comments
CBC Waste and Contaminated Land Officer	Have confirmed they have no comments
United Utilities	No objection subject to conditions
Natural England	No objection
CBC Economic Regeneration	Support the proposals
Lead Local Flood Authority	Originally objected to the proposals however following the receipt of further information removed the objection subject to conditions
LCC Archaeology	No objection subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation
Environment Agency	No objection subject to conditions
West Lancashire Borough Council	No objection subject to conditions in respect of noise, lighting and environmental management plan
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	No objection subject to conditions

LCC Highways	No objection subject to conditions
CBC Parks and Open Spaces Officer	No objections to the proposal from a landscape and visual standpoint.

## Applicants Summary of Benefits

Social Dimension	Economic Dimension	Environmental Dimension
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The business employs 400 people and generates significant spending in the locality (Chorley, West Lancashire and South Ribble Districts, as it sits close to the boundaries of all three).</li> <li>• This ‘multiplier’ effect supports strong, vibrant and healthy communities.</li> <li>• GA is a local business which has not changed ownership since its formation in 1992. It has a loyal workforce who mainly live locally in West and Central Lancashire.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of direct jobs has more than doubled between 2009 and 2015 to 439 employees, of which over 90% live within 10 miles of the site.</li> <li>• Two thirds of the jobs are permanent employees and a third are agency workers.</li> <li>• The majority of the growth in employment has been in the permanent employees.</li> <li>• The number of jobs supported indirectly within the supply chain has also increased significantly to an estimated 332 jobs across the UK.</li> <li>• Jobs supported as a result of employee spending (i.e. induced jobs) is estimated at 116 across the UK, of which over half are estimated to be located within 10 miles of the site.</li> <li>• The previous strategic 10 year masterplan established in 2009 set a turnover target of £100m. GA has been growing at 20% p.a. in the UK and adding an average of 6 new customers a week, so expects to achieve this target on plan by 2017/18.</li> <li>• This new strategic plan sets a further ambitious target of achieving £200m turnover within the next 10 years.</li> <li>• The principle objective of this strategic plan is to reduce manufacturing costs from over £400 per tonne to the market level of £250 per tonne.</li> <li>• Greater efficiency could be achieved as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The company is currently not hitting its revised Climate Change Levy target under the Food and Drinks Federation Agreement, being a further 12% over and above a previous 12% set in 2008 and which incurs a cost of £50,000 per annum for the purchase of carbon; currently £12.00 per tonne, but increasing to £14.00 per tonne with further increases likely. The installation of a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Plant will save 4,000 tonnes of carbon and reduce the cost from £50,000 to £10,000 per annum. The CHP will also allow waste heat to be recycled into the plant.</li> <li>• The use of anaerobic digestion to treat the liquid waste arising will save £10,000 in waste disposal and prevent the need to spread undigested fat onto agricultural land.</li> <li>• Repairs to the embankment in concert with the Environmental Agency following what happened in the winter of 2013/14 which needs repair; hence it is covered by the application.</li> <li>• Net gains in biodiversity have been achieved continually since 1993.</li> <li>• Extensive planting at the site</li> <li>• Reduction in odours and noise</li> </ul>

	<p>part of the processes at the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed investment is a statement of confidence in British manufacturing and the quality of the local workforce in the Borough of Chorley.</li><li>• It is GA's intention to make this investment at its Plocks Farm site, subject to planning, rather than choosing to invest in Eastern Europe.</li><li>• The investment proposals are expected to be entirely funded through the reinvestment of profits from the business.</li><li>• As well as the 764 jobs, the construction activity required to deliver the strategic plan will generate temporary economic benefits and can be estimated to support 203 years of construction work, based on an investment value of £31m and the UK average of £153,000 of construction turnover per job in 2013. Given that development will be phased over a 10 year period, this would suggest that the investment programme will support an average of 20 construction jobs per annum.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

## Assessment

### Background

1. Plocks Farm was originally an arable farm, but first diversified into the manufacture and distribution of dry extruded animal foods in 1992 using the farms crop production as its basis. Following on from this diversification several planning applications were approved at the site as the business grew.
2. A major application approved in 2003 (9/03/00528/FULMAJ) provided a Masterplan for the site and at the time of the application the applicants advised that they considered there to be scope over the next 10 years to increase the output to 60,000 tonnes per annum, entailing an increase in the workforce to 220 people, employed in 4 shifts, to maintain production 7 days a week. The 2003 application related to an extension to buildings to form a produce store, tractor store, administrative and staff office accommodation, raw materials store, new entrance control, landscaping and waste water treatment area. The Council recognised that the business was an industrial one (Class B2) but of a highly specialist nature which is inextricably linked to agriculture. This proposal was considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt by definition, however the Council were satisfied that there were very special circumstances to justify permitting it. It was referred to the Government Office for the North West as a departure case, but the Secretary of State did not call the application in and so permission was granted.
3. Then in 2009 the site owners applied for extensions and alterations to the pet food manufacturing facility including an automated finished product store (AFPS); upgraded and new extrusion process lines including a sunken mill; raw material storage; odour abatement (a roofed pine bark based biological filter system including venting chimneys, one 30 metres high); waste water treatment; additional capacity of waste recovery and recycling facilities; landscaping including earth excavation and mounding; related infrastructure. This application was submitted primarily because the Company, The Golden Acres Group, were required to meet changed legislative requirements. These include The Pollution Prevention and Control Regulations 2000 which requires the Company to operate under an Environmental Permit with the Environment Agency, The Climate Change Act (which requires an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050), The Climate Change Levy and the Landfill Regulations 2002. This was approved in March 2010.
4. The 2010 permission included a Masterplan for the whole site which was an update of the Masterplan approved in 2003. This current application comprise a further review of the Masterplan so that planning permission can then be sought for development envisaged over the 10 year period going forward. This will involve some of the development already implemented and other parts not. The applicants have reviewed the 2010 approved Masterplan after 6 years and now know what the Group's requirements for the site are looking forward for the next 10 years hence this application.

### Proposed Development

5. The 2015 Masterplan reflects the applicant's objectives now, which are:
  - 1) *To provide our customers' customer with the provenance of every raw material included in every bag via an enquiry over the internet.*
  - 2) *To allow the use of fresh, unprocessed meat from known sustainable sources, to allow the preparation of specialist premium pet food that is demanded by our customers across the world for their companion animals.*
  - 3) *To ensure the storage of raw ingredients, the cooking and the packing of the pet food is as hygienic and free from contamination as possible, in accordance with "Good Manufacturing Practice".*
  - 4) *To ensure that the process is fully flexible, but efficient so it can compete on the World market.*
  - 5) *To ensure that the impact on the local community, in terms of traffic, noise, odour and visual amenity is minimised, while offering a source of local employment that creates economic activity in a rural area.*
6. The proposed development includes:
  - The construction of the Ingredients kitchen, on the site of the approved 'AFPS'. This would accommodate the blending and grinding of raw materials into a fine powder ready for cooking.

- The construction of a larder to contain 14,500 boxes containing 550 kilos of dry extruded pet food to store the 500 different pet food products, where they can be tested prior to placing the products in a bag for the customer. This would comprise a 5,850m<sup>2</sup> extension beyond the approved warehouse at the north end of the complex.
- The construction of a Meat Kitchen on the west (river) side of the complex in order to prepare fresh meat by pasteurising and dehydrating with a centrifuge and evaporator ready to be cooked within the extruder. This technically advanced process would enable the meat flavours to be extracted and then reused on the product to improve the palatability for pets.
- The erection of a Fridge in the form of an extension to the Ingredients Kitchen referred to above. This would also sit on the west side of the complex.
- The installation of an Anaerobic Digestion Process, to the north of the complex, to allow for the recovery of methane gas from the liquid waste arising on site, which is currently spread on agricultural land.
- The installation of the Combined Heat and Power Plant (CHP), to be able to utilise the methane gas produced, together with natural gas, to generate on-site electricity and utilise the 90C hot water produced within the process.
- A repair to the embankment of the River Douglas, which has settled since its construction 40 years ago to prevent future flooding and in the event of high tides coinciding with certain weather conditions.
- The relocation of the approved office building and secure private car park to the north of the existing access road from the A59.

7. As planning approval 03/00528/FULMAJ has been partially implemented those parts of the approved proposals (not yet built) could be implemented. The following buildings are still required but are yet to be constructed (these are retained within the 2015 Masterplan):

Building Reference	Description	Area (m <sup>2</sup> )
19	Pallet Store	150
20	Recycling Store	648
21	IBC Store (to be designated as Hot Room ref 52)	2,475
25	Tank Farm Canopy (roof)	673
30	IBC Cleaning Building	334
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4,280</b>

8. The rationalisation of the approved facilities by the 2015 Masterplan review has resulted in some of the buildings within the 2010 permission no longer being required as follows:

Building Reference	Description	Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Reason no longer required
18	Automatic Finished Product Store (AFPS)	13,677	Storage now accommodated off site (Buckshaw Village, Chorley)
22	Mill / Raw Materials	2,268	Part superseded by Hot Room (Ref 52)
28	Fan House	669	Building no longer required
31	Biomass Material Storage	2,186	Power generation to be by CHP facility thus biomass infrastructure abandoned
35	30m high Biomass Flue Chimney	n/a	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>18,800</b>	

9. The new buildings/ elements of the development subject to this planning application are as follows:

Building Reference	Description	Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Notes
--------------------	-------------	------------------------	-------

45	Ingredients Kitchen	12,050	Improved facilities for import of materials, preparation, and delivery to production process
45A	I / Kitchen- Canopy to cover adjacent Yard	2,480	
46	Meat Kitchen	5,600	
47	Fridge	2,072	
48	Larder	5,657	
49	Wet Scrubber & Fan	75	For the odour abatement plant
50	CHP Station	153	Supersedes Fan House (Ref 28)
51	Odour Abatement Plant comprising Wet Scrubber and Biobed	450	Odour control for AD Plant (Ref 54)
52	Hot Room (for Raw Materials)		Approved IBC Store Building (re-referenced)
53	Water Storage Tanks	628	For water recycling
54	Anaerobic Digestion Plant	1,055	Area incl. Plant Room, Reception Hall & tanks
-	Flood Bank raising	n/a	Recommended by the Environment Agency to achieve a consistent 7m AOD level on local flood protection.
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>30,220</b>	

*Ref 45 Ingredients Kitchen / 47- Fridge / 48 - Larder*

10. The Ingredients Kitchen with the associated Fridge and Larder is proposed be built north of the main complex, on the site of the previously approved AFPS with the three functions arranged within a single building envelope. Incoming dry raw materials are delivered to the east end, directly off the existing access road and service yard. These materials are transferred by a series of mechanical elevators into 150no bulk storage bins, from where they are weighed into batches of mixed ingredients, ground into a fine powder, and placed in individual mobile containers (with a capacity of 3m<sup>3</sup> each) ready for transportation to the extruders.
11. The Ingredients Kitchen is split on two levels and is 190m long x 46m wide. The ridge height is generally 17m above floor level however, at the east end this rises to 23m in height to cover the delivery conveyors and batching operations.
12. The upper level of the Ingredients Kitchen is 83m long x 34m wide. The ridge height is 15.15m above floor level.
13. The Fridge is used for the storage of frozen and chilled meats. It effectively forms an extension of the lower level of the Ingredients Kitchen, at the west end. The building is 45m long x 46m wide, and the ridge height is 17m above floor level.
14. The Larder is used for the storage of the dry extruded pet food, in 14,500 no. 550 kg boxes, ready for packing into bags. The building is a similar extension to the Ingredients Kitchen, but on the north elevation. It is 140m long x 45m wide, with the ridge height also 17m above floor level
15. The Ingredients Kitchen building has a canopy extension over the adjacent yard to allow deliveries to take place in the dry.

*Ref 47 - Meat Kitchen*

16. The Meat Kitchen is where fresh and frozen meats are pasteurised, de-fatted through a centrifuge, and then dehydrated with the use of an evaporator to reduce the water content from 90% to 40%. It would be built to the south and west of the Ingredients Kitchen. It is 80m long x 70m wide, arranged on two levels to accommodate the existing landform and assist operations. The ridge height is 14.85m at the lower land level and 13.8m at the higher land level.



*Ref 50 - CHP Station*

17. The Combined Heat & Power (CHP) Station occupies the location of the previously approved Fan House (now omitted), next to the Energy Centre. It results from a decision to change from power generation from biomass as previously proposed to the more efficient CHP process, using natural gas as the energy source. The building detail is 30m long x 17m wide and the building is 8.3m high to the ridge. The south end has an open-sided extension which provides a cover to the oil storage tanks, at the end of which is a 10m high flue.

*Ref 51 - Wet Scrubber (Biobeds)/ 54 Anaerobic Digestion Plant (AD)*

18. These items of infrastructure are immediately to the north of the Larder and immediately adjacent to the perimeter woodland belt along the flood bank. The wet scrubber addresses any odour emissions from the Ingredients Kitchen and the AD plant, and is a smaller version of those already approved and constructed (building 32). There are small buildings associated with this infrastructure, these are 24m long x 16m wide (Anaerobic Digester) and 24m long x 15m wide for the Wet Scrubber. The buildings are 7m high to the ridge.

*Ref 53 - Water Storage Tanks*

19. The storage tanks for water recycling are in the same area. There are two of these, for roof and surface water storage. They are 20m diameter x 8m tall.

*Re-designated (approved) building*

20. Building 52 is not a new building per se - it is the approved IBC Store building. This is to be re-designated as the Hot Room, used for the storage of liquid raw materials that would otherwise solidify at ambient temperatures: the facility would use waste heat from the manufacturing process to raw materials to become more liquid and easier to transfer to the processing.

Principle of the Development

21. Policy 1 of the Adopted Core Strategy, which was adopted post Framework and as such is compliant with The Framework, states:

Focus growth and investment on well located brownfield sites and the Strategic Location of Central Preston, the Key Service Centres of Chorley and Leyland and the other main urban areas in South Ribble, whilst protecting the character of suburban and rural areas. Some greenfield development will be required on the fringes of the main urban areas. To promote vibrant local communities and support services, an appropriate scale of growth and investment will be encouraged in identified Local Service Centres, providing it is in keeping with their local character and setting, and at certain other key locations outside the main urban areas.

Growth and investment will be concentrated in:

(a) The Preston/South Ribble Urban Area comprising:

- i. The Central Preston Strategic Location and adjacent inner city suburbs, focussing on regeneration opportunities in Inner East Preston, the Tithebarn Regeneration Area and the New Central Business District Area in particular.
- ii. The northern suburbs of Preston, focussing on Local Centres, with greenfield development within the Cottam Strategic Site and the North West Preston Strategic Location.
- iii. The settlements south of the River Ribble, comprising:
  - Penwortham, focussing on the regeneration of the District Centre, but with some greenfield development at the South of Penwortham and North of Farington Strategic Location.
  - Lostock Hall, focussing on the regeneration of brownfield sites.
  - Bamber Bridge, focussing on the regeneration of the District Centre and brownfield sites.
  - Walton-le-Dale, Higher Walton, focussing on brownfield sites.

(b) The Key Service Centres of:

- ii. Leyland / Farington, focussing on regeneration of Leyland Town Centre\* and brownfield sites.
- iii. Chorley Town, focussing on the regeneration of the Town Centre\* but with some greenfield development.

- iv. Longridge, where land within Central Lancashire may be required to support the development of this Key Service Centre in Ribble Valley.

(c) Strategic Sites allocated at:

- i. BAE Systems, Samesbury – employment
- ii. Cuerden (Lancashire Central) – employment
- iii. Buckshaw Village – mixed use

(d) Some growth and investment will be encouraged at the following Urban Local Service Centres to help meet housing and employment needs:

- i. Adlington
- ii. Clayton Brook/Green
- iii. Clayton-le-Woods (Lancaster Lane)
- iv. Coppull
- v. Euxton
- vi. Whittle-le-Woods

(e) Limited growth and investment will be encouraged at the following Rural Local Service Centres to help meet local housing and employment needs and to support the provision of services to the wider area:

- i. Brinscall / Withnell
- ii. Eccleston
- iii. Longton

(f) In other places - smaller villages, substantially built up frontages and Major Developed Sites - development will typically be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need, unless there are exceptional reasons for larger scale redevelopment schemes.

22. The policy confirms that growth and investment will be focussed on well-located brownfield sites and the Strategic Location of Central Preston, the Key Service Centres of Chorley and Leyland and the other main urban areas in South Ribble, whilst protecting the character of suburban and rural areas.
23. This part of the Borough is not identified for growth and although Policy 1 does allow for small scale development, limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need, a large scale development as proposed does not meet any of the criteria for such locations. As such exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated for the proposals to be considered acceptable in terms of Policy 1.
24. The site is also located within the Green Belt. National guidance on Green Belt is contained in Chapter 9 of the Framework which states:

*79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.*

*80. Green Belt serves five purposes:*

- *to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- *to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- *to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- *to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
- *to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*

*87. 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.*

88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

89. A local planning authority should regard 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.

90. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are:

- mineral extraction;
- engineering operations;
- local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; and
- development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order.

25. The proposed development, however, does not fall into any of the exceptions of paragraph 89 or could be considered not inappropriate in respect of paragraph 90. The proposed development therefore constitutes inappropriate development and as such the tests of paragraph 88 of the Framework are engaged. In this case very special circumstances need to be demonstrated which outweigh the harm the development will have to the Green Belt. These are considered further below.

26. The Adopted Central Lancashire Rural development SPD (2012) mirrors advice contained within the Framework.

27. The premises at the site currently comprises 27,707.79m<sup>2</sup> of floor space (298,254sq ft) within a site of 27 hectares. Planning permission exists in perpetuity for a further 26,707m<sup>2</sup> of floor space (287,481sq ft). This gives a total of 54,414.55m<sup>2</sup> (585,733 sq ft) of consented and built floor space.

28. The proposals subject to this application result in a net increase of 9,589.18m<sup>2</sup> (103,217sq ft) in excess of the existing and approved (though unbuilt) development. This results in an increase of approximately 18% of floor area. This would all be within the established site closer to the river.

29. The very special circumstances put forward by the agent for the application in respect of the proposals include:

- Golden Acre's business requirements to secure a sustainable future and in a policy context which supports economic growth to such an extent that it must be given 'significant weight'.

- The 18% increase in the floor area (when the extant planning permission is taken into account) can be integrated into the landscape without having a material impact on the Green Belt – because the site is so well screened and will be even better screened in the future and with no 30m high chimney acting as a landmark.
- On the previous occasion a major factor was the need to plan for an automated warehouse facility; this has been replaced by a need for state of the art larder, fridge and meat kitchen. In addition the preference is for a combined heat and power station (CHP) which captures energy from the site.
- Seen in section, the height of the buildings now proposed is significant. However, the buildings would sit on lower lying land (when compared to the original complex) between the latter and the River Douglas. The river is divided from that land by a substantial bund on which there is extensive, established planting. To the east and north are further significant tree belts which very successfully screen the site.

30. The factors considered above individually do not represent Very Special Circumstances and the question for the decision taker is whether collectively those factors combine with sufficient weight to represent the very special circumstances that would overcome the harm to the green belt by reason of the openness. To assist in the decision making process the following benefit/ dis-benefit table has been produced:

	Material Consideration	Very Special Circumstance (Green Belt Policy)	Exceptional Circumstances (Policy 1 of the Core Strategy Test)	Weight to be afforded (limited/moderate/substantial)	Impact in balancing exercise (negative/neutral/positive)
<b>BENEFITS</b>					
1.	Economic Growth	This is a benefit as the proposals relates to an existing enterprise with a strong affinity with agriculture. The proposals will enable an existing business which provides an important source of local employment to compete within the market and continue to contribute to the local, regional, national, European and global economy	This is an exceptional circumstance as supporting a strong local economy is a key priority within the Council's Corporate Strategy and this company contributes to more than the local and regional market as it operates within both the European and global markets.	Substantial	Positive
2.	Removal of the approved 30m high chimney	This is a benefit as the existing site is fairly well contained and the approved chimney would have been visible within the surrounding area. From a visual amenity perspective the proposals will reduce the impact on the visual assessment of the area	This is an exceptional circumstance as the site can assist in contributing to the 5 purposes of Green Belt.	Substantial	Positive
3.	Enhanced buffer planting creating a self-contained site.	From a visual amenity perspective the proposals will reduce the impact of the development on the visual assessment of the area	This is an exceptional circumstance as the site can assist contributing to the 5 purposes of Green Belt.	Substantial	Positive
4.	The development will create construction jobs, which have acknowledged economic benefits along the supply chain.	At a national level the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and confirms that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.	This is not an exceptional circumstance as any job creation would just be during the construction process and the specialist nature of the construction reduces the potential for a local workforce	Moderate	Neutral
5.	Biodiversity/	This is a benefit as this will provide a	This is not an exceptional circumstance as	Moderate	Neutral

	Ecological Enhancements-Woodland Management Plan	suitable framework for management of the existing woodland/ biodiversity areas which is considered to contribute to good woodland management and result in a net biodiversity gain	whilst management of woodland is always considered to be a benefit the majority of the planting is a result of the development which has occurred on the site to mitigate the impact of the built development		
6.	Reduction in traffic movements	This is considered to be a benefit as the nature and size of the business generates significant large vehicle movements over a 24 hour period and the proposals will reduce the transport demands associated with production at Plocks Farm	This is considered to be an exceptional circumstance as it reduces the need to travel in accordance with Strategic Objective 3 of the Core Strategy	Substantial	Positive
7.	Improved flood defence proposals	Strategic Objective 23 of the Adopted Core Strategy seeks to manage flood risk and the impacts of flooding.  Policy 29 of the Core Strategy seeks to reduce the risk of flooding by: (d) Appraising, managing and reducing flood risk in all new developments, avoiding inappropriate development in flood risk areas (h) Seeking to maximise the potential of Green Infrastructure to contribute to flood relief.  It is considered that the scheme will assist in reducing river flooding, will address surface water flooding on the area and involves a green earth mound which seeks to contribute to flood relief	This is considered to be an exceptional circumstance as it assists with meeting the Council's Core Strategy Strategic Objective's	Substantial	Positive
8.	New rainwater harvesting system	This is considered to be a benefit to enable the control of runoff at source and to promote greywater re-use within the site. This is a key priority at both a national and local level to meet the challenge of climate change and reduce flood risk	This is not considered to be an exceptional circumstance as although it assists with the Council's Core Strategy Strategic Objective's the surface water runoff at this site can be directly attributed to the amount of hardstanding and building which have been constructed on this site.	Moderate	Neutral

9.	CHP Scheme	This is considered to be a benefit as this part of the scheme will deliver significant overall reductions in carbon emissions at the site through the efficient onsite generation of electricity.	This is considered to be an exceptional circumstance as it will assist in reducing energy use and carbon emissions in accordance with the Council's Core Strategy Strategic Objective's	Substantial	Positive
	<b>Material Consideration</b>	<b>Concerns</b>		<b>Weight to be afforded (limited/ moderate/ substantial)</b>	<b>Impact in balancing exercise (negative/ neutral/ positive)</b>
<b>DISBENEFITS</b>					
1	Inappropriate development in the Green Belt	The proposals are inappropriate development within the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt		Substantial	Negative
2	Impact on openness	It has been concluded that the proposals will impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.		Substantial	Negative
3	Visual Impact- larger building	The proposed Ingredients Kitchen/Fridge/ Larder introduces a higher, larger building on this part of the site which will be visible above the tree lines.		Moderate (in the short term). Limited (in the long term when the growth of the Woodland will provide total screening)	Neutral

## Visual Impact

31. It has been established in case law that openness and visual impact are different concepts in terms of Green Belt Policy. However they can relate to each other and as such the visual impact is a material consideration. In *Heath & Hampsted Society v LB of Camden* [2007] EWHC 977, the difference between openness and visual impact was explained as follows:

*21. Paragraph 3.6 is concerned with the size of the replacement dwelling, not with its visual impact. There are good reasons why the relevant test for replacement dwellings in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land is one of size rather than visual impact. The essential characteristic of Green Belts and Metropolitan Open Land is their openness ... The extent to which that openness is, or is not, visible from public vantage points and the extent to which a new building in the Green Belt would be visually intrusive are a separate issue...*

*The fact that a materially larger (in terms in footprint, floor space or building volume) replacement dwelling is more concealed from public view than a smaller but more prominent existing dwelling does not mean that the replacement dwelling is appropriate development in the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land.*

*22. The loss of openness (ie unbuilt on land) within the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land is of itself harmful to the underlying policy objective. If the replacement dwelling is more visually intrusive there will be further harm in addition to the harm by reason of inappropriateness, which will have to be outweighed by those special circumstances if planning permission is to be granted (paragraph 3.15 of PPG 2, above). If the materially larger replacement dwelling is less visually intrusive than the existing dwelling then that would be a factor which could be taken into consideration when deciding whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness was outweighed by very special circumstances.*

32. When interpreting paragraph 89 of the Framework the Judge in *Timmins v Gedling BC and Westerleigh Group Limited* [2014] analysed the relationship between openness and visual impact. He held inter alia:

*74. **Any construction harms openness quite irrespective of its impact in terms of its obtrusiveness or its aesthetic attractions or qualities.** A beautiful building is still an affront to openness, simply because it exists. The same applies to a building this is camouflaged or rendered unobtrusive by felicitous landscaping.*

33. In this case the Judge concluded that:

*78. In short it seems to me that there are three points which arise from the above analysis. First, there is a clear conceptual distinction between openness and visual impact. Secondly, it is therefore wrong in principle to arrive at a specific conclusion as to openness by reference to visual impact. Thirdly, when considering however whether a development in the Green Belt which adversely impacts upon openness can be justified by very special circumstances it is not wrong to take account of the visual impact of a development as one, inter alia, of the considerations that form part of the overall weighing exercise.*

34. As the development falls to be considered inappropriate development the landscape/ visual impact of the proposed development is a key material consideration in terms of the overall balance as to whether there is harm. In this regard the application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).

35. The development site generally benefits from a high level of containment created by the local topography and existing trees, hedgerows and planted areas around the boundaries



of the site. The majority of the site is effectively 'screened' when viewed externally. As a result, the visual effects associated with the proposed development are relatively limited.

36. Part of the 2015 development (shown on the current Masterplan) is the introduction of the CHP Station (replacing the approved Energy Centre) whilst the Hot House is a new use for the approved IBC Store. The LVIA asserts that in terms of substitution these are both of similar scale and thus have a nil effect on the landscape setting.
37. The most significant part of this development is the replacement of the approved AFPS with the Ingredients Kitchen/Fridge/ Larder, and the adjacent Meat Kitchen which increases the floor area and introduces a higher building. The LVIA asserts that the effect of the change is of minor significance as the roofline of these buildings will break the canopy line of the screening woodland, but that this is a short-term effect as the continued growth of the Woodland will provide total screening.
38. The proposed Ingredients Kitchen/Fridge/Larder/Meat Kitchen grouping allows for opportunities for architectural detailing to fragment their size by measures such as steps in the roofline and subtly contrasting shades of colour in the cladding. The LVIA asserts that when viewed from the side the proposed new building, though larger than the approved AFPS, is better integrated into the surroundings.
39. The most significant visual improvement is the removal of the 30m high chimney (approved but not implemented). The chimney would have provided a prominent landmark in the landscape, its removal is of benefit, and keeps the local landscape character unchanged.
40. This assessment has been reviewed by the Council's Parks and Open Spaces Officer who has confirmed that from a landscape and visual perspective, the most significant difference between the 2015 masterplan and 2010 masterplan is the height of the Ingredients Kitchen / Meat Kitchen / Fridge/ Larder (2015 masterplan) as compared to AFPS (2010 masterplan). The photomontages demonstrate that, in the short term, a limited number of views towards the site will be adversely affected by the introduction of this built form. This is particularly evident in Photomontage Viewpoints 4 (View from Carr Lane roundabout) and 7 (view from the canal bank) illustrating the 2015 scheme on completion as below:

Viewpoint 4 - View from Carr Lane Roundabout



2015 MASTERPLAN REVIEW - PHOTOMONTAGE (VP4)

Viewpoint 7 - View from the Canal Bank at the bottom of Plox Brow, Tarleton



2015 MASTERPLAN REVIEW - PHOTOMONTAGE (VP7)

41. However, this temporary increased visibility of the Ingredients Kitchen/Meat Kitchen / Fridge/ Larder must be considered in the context of the removal of the 30m chimney flue from the 2010 proposals (the following montage includes the projection planting):.



2010 PERMISSION - VP4 WITH 30M CHIMNEY (P33) (REF09/00738/FULMAJ)  
\*Note - Image includes projection planting

42. In addition, the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant in the form of architectural cladding will help to break up the visual mass of the proposed building and allowing the built forms to sit more comfortably in their landscape surroundings. The LVIA also acknowledges that advance planting will continue to mature so that 10 years following the completion of the scheme these viewpoints will have significantly improved due to the further maturation of the woodland planting.

#### **View from Carr Lane roundabout**



2015 MASTERPLAN REVIEW - PHOTOMONTAGE (VP4) +10 YEARS

#### **View from the canal bank**



2015 MASTERPLAN REVIEW - PHOTOMONTAGE (VP7) +10 YEARS

43. From a visual impact perspective it is considered that omission of the 30m high chimney from the scheme which would have been visible within the surrounding area and creating

a self-contained site which effectively integrates the complex into the local landscape benefits the visual characteristics of the area which is a material planning consideration when assessing the harm created to the Green Belt. On balance, the 2015 proposal will not result in a significantly greater level of visual intrusion than the approved scheme on this site.

#### Green Belt Conclusion

44. It is considered that the development of the site is inappropriate development that would result in significant harm to the green belt. The benefits listed above do not individually amount to very special circumstances however when taken together, cumulatively, they are material. The consideration is whether the potential harm to the green belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is outweighed by other considerations.
45. In this case it is considered that the proposals will support the economic growth within this rural area. At a national level the Government encourages Local Authorities to support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. The DEFRA publication: Towards a one nation economy: A 10-point plan for boosting productivity in rural area (August 2015) confirmed that the Government wants to harness the enormous economic potential England's rural areas have to offer. This follows from the Treasury Publication: Fixing the foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation (July 2015) which confirms that the Government will ensure that rural areas can also contribute to, and benefit from, productivity growth. At a local level the Council is committed to economic development and if this planning application is successful the business may be eligible to apply for a Chorley Business Investment Growth (BIG) grant.
46. This is a well-established company that is growing and expanding. Since 2009, the company has grown from 209 to 439 employees and from a turnover of £44m to £77m, a growth of 75%. There has also been significant growth in their exports, increasing by 37%. This expansion plan has an estimated cost of £31m.
47. The proposals involve investment in new facilities and technology which will mean that the production process and manufacturing flow will be made more efficient and streamlined. The new manufacturing layout will allow the company to operate a 'Just in Time' manufacturing process, increasing competitiveness. By separating raw materials from production, this will improve hygiene and reduce the potential for cross contamination.
48. Another key driver for this significant investment is to reduce their manufacturing cost per tonne. This has increased from £219 in 2009 to £419 in 2015. By making the production process more efficient with less handling, the objective of the applicants is to reduce this cost to the market level of £250 per tonne, improving their competitiveness and safeguarding jobs. This projected high growth in turnover will have an impact on job creation through trade customers and local suppliers and as the majority of employees live locally, it is estimated 63 jobs in the local area are supported indirectly through employee local spending.
49. It is considered that all of the above including the benefits associated with the proposed development listed above amount to very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

### Ecology and Biodiversity

50. The main part of the proposed development involves extending the built development at the complex onto a previously undeveloped field (although this land forms part of the wider complex) to the north of the existing buildings closer to the River Douglas. The application is supported by an update to the 2009 Ecology, Biodiversity & Nature Conservation chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES).
51. The site, excluding the River Douglas, supports habitats of site-local value only. The habitats directly affected include areas of amenity grassland, bare ground, ephemeral/short perennial habitats and a small (approx. 0.25ha) formal stand of juvenile trees.
52. The River Douglas is a Biological Heritage Site (BHS) and therefore of County importance. The individual habitats affected include coarse low-diversity grasslands, salt-marsh communities and fen. The grassland and fen communities are very common nationally, while the salt-marsh communities are very common components of upper salt-marsh zones in the UK. Were these habitats to be evaluated outside the BHS, they would be of site-local importance only.
53. The construction phase will have a negligible effect on all habitats outside of the River Douglas BHS, and a slight adverse effect is predicted on the BHS. The effects in all instances are reversible. The adverse effects are sustainable and can be managed through a range of precautionary and enhancement measures which include the following:
- Restoration of grassland habitats on the river bank.
  - Woodland thinning/removal of non-native species in immature stands.
  - Improvement/creation of woodland-edge habitats at the amenity grassland/woodland interface.
54. The bird fauna of the site is unremarkable, typical, and of site-local value only. The loss of 0.25ha of juvenile woodland on birds is considered to negligible in its effect as the habitat lost has negligible value on account of its limited size, age and poor structure. No other potential impacts on nesting birds are predicted in association with the development.
55. The site overall is predominantly devoid of bat roosting potential, and the main areas where potential bat roost sites have been identified are mature trees and specific buildings on the site which will be avoided during the development. Small localised areas of Buildings 4, 5 and 17 have 'less than low' potential for foraging bats.
56. In terms of bat foraging areas, the main areas with foraging potential are located away from the development. Most of the potential foraging areas adjacent to the proposal area have low value due to poor structure, lack of associated habitats and in some instances very exposed conditions. The better foraging sites are not affected by any of the proposals. There is no loss of foraging overall.
57. The adverse effects on bats and birds are negligible and sustainable and can be managed through a range of precautionary and enhancement measures which include the following.
- The proposals do not affect any potential roost sites that are 'low potential' or above, therefore it is appropriate given the 'less than low' bat potential to apply precautionary measures during construction. These works can be managed lawfully through an appropriate planning condition. Similarly as there will be no severance of potential foraging routes, precautions in respect of the implementation of a lighting plan should be applied. This will ensure that light spillage into potential foraging routes is avoided during the operational phase.
  - The foraging potential for both bats and birds can be enhanced by the improvement of the woodland-edge habitats at the amenity grassland/woodland interface.

- Bat foraging potential can be further enhanced and maintained by the continued management of the woodlands, including thinning and removal of non-native trees. Roost potential will be increased by the provision of strategically placed bat boxes.
  - The continued management of the woodland through thinning will also improve the structural quality of the woodlands for birds.
  - Provision of dead-wood habitat for invertebrates also provides an enhanced food source for bats and birds.
58. The submitted information has been reviewed by the Ecologist at Greater Manchester Ecology Unit who has confirmed that some measures are required to protect features of ecological value on and close to the site. In particular there is potential for harm to be caused to the banks of adjacent River, and potentially to the water quality of the River, during the planned works to raise the flood defence earthworks. These earthworks also have the potential to harm the developing woodland forming the western boundary of the development site.
59. In order to protect the River the Ecologist has recommended:
- That an Environmental Construction Method Statement (ECMS) be required to be prepared for the scheme, and in particular for the works to raise the flood defence earthwork. This ECMS should include details of measures to protect the water course during the course of construction; reference should be made to Pollution Prevention Guidelines prepared by the Environment Agency, in particular PPG guidance note no 5, and Industry best practice for working close to water courses (e.g. CIRIA Guidance note no C648). Once agreed, this Method Statement must be implemented in full.
  - That full details of Landscape re-instatement on the new earthwork and the River banks should be required. Once approved the Landscape plan should be implemented in full. The Environment Agency will need to be consulted on re-instatement plans.
  - There should be no direct lighting of the water course or the flood embankments.
  - The erection of bat roosting boxes on trees or structures close to the water course.
60. The Ecologist agrees with the proposal in the ES that the small loss of woodland that may result from the scheme should be compensated for through improved management of the remaining woodland areas rather than requiring new planting. In this regard the existing Habitat and Landscape Creation and Management Plan should be updated to take into account the new proposals.
61. Following the Supreme Court ruling (*Morge vs Hampshire County Council – Supreme Court ruling Jan 2011*) the Local Authority now have a responsibility to consult Natural England on proposals which may affect protected species and ask the following questions:
- Is the proposal likely to result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations?
  - If so, is Natural England likely to grant a licence?
62. Natural England have been consulted on the proposals and raised no objection although it is noted that they have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. However taking into account the above it is not considered that that the proposals will result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations.
63. Following the high court decision (*R (on the application of Simon Woolley) v Cheshire East Borough Council, June 2009*) the Local Planning Authority have a legal duty to determine whether the three 'derogation tests' of the Habitats Directive implemented by the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 have been met when determining whether to grant planning permission for a development which could harm a European Protected Species. The three tests include:
- (a) the activity must be for imperative reasons of overriding public interest or for public health and safety;
  - (b) there must be no satisfactory alternative and
  - (c) favourable conservation status of the species must be maintained.

64. This requirement does not negate the need for a Licence from Natural England in respect of Protected Species and the Local Planning Authority are required to engage with the Directive.
65. The Framework (para 118) confirms that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles: if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
66. As such the Framework adopts a tiered/ cascade approach in that the first two tests relate to whether the development is in the public interest and whether there is an alternative to developing the site. The development is directly related to the expansion and economic development of this business and creating a sustainable business process on this existing site. The business needs to expand to meet the growing needs of the business and to compete globally. The initial development of the site represented farm diversification which is appropriate within this rural area. As such it is considered that the first two derogation tests and the alternative site test within the Framework are met in that there is no satisfactory alternative to enable the expansion of this business within the local area.
67. The next test is whether a favourable conservation status of protected species will be maintained and whether the biodiversity impacts are adequately mitigated. As set out above no significant adverse impact on protected species or biodiversity are identified and any impacts can be addressed by precautionary and enhancement measures. As such it is considered that the Local Authority has engaged with the three tests of the Habitats Directive and the guidance contained within the Framework and from an ecological perspective the proposals are acceptable.

#### Trees

68. As set out previously the site is densely vegetated and as such the application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. In respect of the site one tree, eight groups of trees, five woodlands, and three hedges were surveyed. One group and one woodland have high retention values, one woodland has a moderate retention value, one tree, six groups, three woodlands and three hedges have low retention values and one group is considered unsuitable for retention.
69. Tree removal to necessitate the development includes removing parts of existing groups, removal of 2 Horse Chestnuts to facilitate the access to the proposed car park. The trees to be removed are categorised as retention category C and U which are low quality trees and not worthy of protection by a Preservation Order. It is considered that the tree loss to facilitate the development can be adequately mitigated for through improved management of the remaining woodland areas as confirmed by the Ecologist.
70. The proposed woodland area to the south of Plocks Farm (adjacent to the A59 hedgerow) was included in the 2009 approval (09/00738/FULMAJ) but has yet to be planted, the delay was caused by the need to use the area for temporary storage as part of developing facilities on a relatively confined (and operational) site. The woodland is seen as an important part of the setting on this quarter, particularly from Bank Hall and Bank Bridge. It is scheduled for planting in the season 2015 -16. The 2009 Masterplan also included planting along the river bank to the north and east of the Farm. This will be planted as part of the finishing of the flood bank raising works (it is noted that the ecologist has requested that full details of Landscape re-instatement on the new earthwork and the River banks should be submitted. As the proposals now involve raising the height of the banking this can be secured by condition).
71. As noted above concerns have been raised about the impact of building 45 from a neighbour who occupies a listed building due to the fact that the landscaping within the north east part of the site includes gaps. To mitigate the impact the agent has confirmed

that a separate planning application for a landscaped mound and tree planting, to reinforce the screening at the north east end of the site, will be submitted before 15<sup>th</sup> December Committee. The applicant has spoken directly to the neighbours concerned to confirm this way forward. This will form part of a separate planning application as this part of the site includes both overhead and underground services and although agreement will be sought from the relevant service providers this may take longer than the timescales prescribed as part of this application hence the separate application. The proposed tree planting includes Alder, Pine and Oak trees along with understorey planting including Hawthorn, Holly and Elder in accordance with the request made by the neighbour. Carr House is a Listed Building and the Conservation Officer has considered the impact of the proposals on the setting of this Listed Building. The Conservation Officer does not consider that the proposed development will adversely impact on the setting of this Listed Building given the degree of separation maintained and the existing planting although it is noted that any additional planting will be a benefit to the wider area. New planting is not required to overcome harm but will provide additional benefits and supplement the visual screen detailed in the above photomontage when viewed from Carr Lane roundabout (above) as follows:



Noise

- 72. The business at the site is a manufacturing process and as such noise generation as a result of the proposals is a consideration. In this regard the application is supported by an update to the 2009 Noise Assessment.
- 73. The 2010 planning approval (09/00738/FULMAJ) contains a condition on sound emissions, as follows:  
 “16, Upon Commencement of operations in Building 22, as shown on the approved Masterplan (drawing 12), the rating level of noise from development hereby permitted shall not exceed 44 dB (LA<sub>r</sub>) for 5 minutes between 2300 and 0700 hours daily, recorded in a ‘free-field’ location at properties east of the site on the A59 Liverpool Road. The properties are identified on the approved Masterplan.  
 Reason: To secure effective control over noise levels experienced at certain local residential properties close by and in accordance with Policy EP20 of the Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review”.
- 74. The 44 dB limit value was informed by the findings for background sound levels at Liverpool Road to be typically 40 dB overnight. The recent development of housing at Plox Brow to the west of Plocks Farm has brought residential neighbours closer to the site and in particular closer to elements which have the potential to generate audible sound at night. It would therefore be prudent for the new housing to be considered as an additional receptor to Liverpool Road. For consistency with the Liverpool Road receptors, a limiting sound level at Plox Brow would be one that (as a rating level) is no more than 4 dB above the typical night-time background sound level.
- 75. Policy 28 of the Adopted Core Strategy relates to renewable and low carbon energy schemes, which is applicable to the proposed CHP plant, and states that any noise, odour, traffic or other impact of the development should be mitigated so as not to cause unacceptable detriment to local amenity. In terms of the proposed elements of this application the noise impact is as follows:

Building Reference	Description	Noise
--------------------	-------------	-------

45	Ingredients Kitchen	<p>Building 45 would incorporate a basement plantroom for the milling equipment. Being below ground level and within a masonry plantroom, the sound from the mills has the opportunity to be substantially attenuated.</p> <p>The 2009 assessment of sound levels for the mills predicted a sound level of 39 dB to the nearest dwelling on Liverpool Road at 90 metres distance.</p> <p>The expectation is that the primary sound source associated with the Ingredients Kitchen would be substantially within the current 44 dB limit value for the night-time period at Liverpool Road residential properties.</p> <p>For existing and proposed residential development at Plox Brow to the west, the extrapolation of sound from the Building 45 mills plantroom (a distance of approximately 320 metres) would equate to a sound level of 28 dB</p>
46	Meat Kitchen	<p>Building 46 would sit closest to Plox Brow and housing at that location. The east elevation would feature the loading bay with its doors for goods access and egress. The west elevation to Plox Brow would not incorporate doors, other than personnel doors for means of escape.</p> <p>There is the potential for moderately high levels of sound to be generated by the meat preparation processes. It is prudent to enclose (acoustically) machinery that is particularly noisy and that is the intention for this development.</p> <p>The Assessment forecasts a sound level at Plox Brow dwellings of 30 dB. This would be satisfactory in the context of a 39 dB limit at night. It is not expected for goods delivery doors nor personal doors to be in regular use during the night-time period.</p>
47	Fridge	<p>The source of sound associated with the Building 47 Fridge would be external dry-air cooling (refrigeration) fans. Their location is currently not finalised, nor the extent or specific type of equipment. This would be evaluated in detail through condition discharge at a future point.</p> <p>The illustration in respect of the noise assessment finds that cooling fans could generate a level of 29 dB at dwellings to the west. This is within a suggested reasonable limit value.</p> <p>Cooling plant would need to be selected in the first instance with low sound emissions in mind, and sited so as to benefit from shielding by other buildings or structures so that the resultant level at Plox Brow was compatible with other source contributions.</p>
48	Larder	<p>Sound levels within the larder are not expected to be of significance given this Building 48 would be a store.</p>
49	AD Process	<p>Sound would arise from the odour control system fan associated with the proposed installation. Fan noise has been successfully controlled at the Bio-Bed facility identified at Building 32 on the Masterplan. The same principle of sound level control would apply, that comprising acoustic-</p>
51		
54		



		<p>grade enclosure for fans and associated ductwork, plus attenuators where necessary.</p> <p>The illustration in respect of the noise assessment states that the level of fan sound emission via a stack would be satisfactory in relation to a suggested limit value at Plox Brow and the permitted level at Liverpool Road.</p>
50	CHP Station	<p>The primary source of sound likely to apply to the CHP installation would be the fan-powered coolers external to the plantroom. The information available to date on these indicates a sound level of 60 dBA at a distance of 10 metres. Sound emanating from the insulated cladding of the CHP Building 50 itself would be controlled by way of enclosures (within the building) of the engines and air intake/exit points would be attenuated. The actual exhausts for the engine would pass through heat exchangers and the boiler before exiting to atmosphere. Exhaust silencers would still be a part of the system.</p> <p>It is understood the sound emission value at the exhaust stack termination point would typically be 55 dBA at 10 metres.</p> <p>The illustration in respect of the noise assessment finds the primary sources of the CHP facility could generate a level at the closest dwelling of 35 dB. Compared with the permitted rating level limit of 44 dB this value would be satisfactory.</p> <p>In the direction of Plox Brow, the separation distance would be approximately double (at 400 metres) and the corresponding level of CHP fan and exhaust sound would be 6 dB less, at 29 dB. This would be satisfactory in the context of the suggested 39 dB limit.</p>
52	Hot Room (for Raw Materials)	<p>This would be the same as the Building 21 (store) approved following the 2009 ES submission. No sound of significance is expected to arise. Building 52 may provide some acoustic shielding of site sound to Windmill Cottages.</p>

76. The proposed development also includes the erection of a 5m high acoustic fence which has already been erected within the site (as such consent is sought for this element of the scheme on a retrospective basis). The fence is located adjacent to the existing buildings on the site. This fence was erected to give a quick and immediate response to complaints from residents on Mill Brow, opposite the site during 2012.

77. West Lancashire Borough Council have no objection subject to conditions in respect of the following:

- Noise- to ensure that the conditions include a representative location for Plox Brow, Tarleton residents and encompass a noise monitoring scheme for the noise sensitive receptors in West Lancashire.
- Lighting- to ensure the impacts on the West Lancashire residents are taken into account
- The inclusion of an environmental management plan condition which includes no activity that results in noise being audible at the boundary of the development site shall occur outside of the hours of (i) 0800 - 1800, Monday to Friday; (ii) 0800 to 1300, Saturday. Additionally no such activity shall occur on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

78. Points 1 and 2 have been addressed within the suggested conditions.

79. In terms of the environment management plan condition the following condition was attached to the 2010 permission and it was proposed to reflect this on any new permission at this site:  
No development shall take place for any of the phases to be shown in the phasing plan, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
- operating hours during which works of construction or demolition or works incidental thereto shall take place;
  - the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - loading and unloading of plant and materials;
  - storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
  - the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
  - wheel washing facilities;
  - measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction and
  - a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
80. The applicants have raised concerns with West Lancashire's request in terms of the construction hours for the following reasons:
- 1) It would retrospectively restrict the current operations particularly on Sundays or bank holidays
  - 2) For the 2 year construction phase, the applicants have engaged European contractors who have specialist skills to install parts of the plant. They are required to work for 10 continuous days, followed by 4 days off site. While working on site they will be working from 7.00am to 7pm
  - 3) The methodology used by the noise consultants and environmental health involves an acknowledgment of background noise levels over a 24 hour period and restrictions (where necessary) then take account of best practice e.g. WHO guidance. The context, here an established industrial complex, is a material consideration.
  - 4) The applicants have consulted with their noise consultants (Sharps Redmore) on WLBC's proposed wording and the former have advised that the relevant British Standard is helpful. BS5228-1:2009 + A1:2014 is a Code of Practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Part 1: Noise is the relevant section. This expressly deals with the impact of noise from construction operations. Annex E therein provides comprehensive guidance on thresholds for sound for daytime, evening, night-time and weekend periods, acknowledging (as one would imagine) that such out-of-hours working is commonplace. The applicants along with their noise consultants consider that a condition stating that construction works should to be inaudible at the boundary is impractical, unnecessary and unreasonable and would prejudice the project
81. As such given the site specific considerations of this business and the history of this site (2 major planning approvals without such time restrictions) the planning condition as previously attached is considered to be appropriate.
82. It is important to note that from a noise perspective (and odour addressed below) this site is a permitted site with the Environment Agency. The applicant has informed the Environment Agency of the proposed plans and the applicant has been advised that a permit variation may be required to change/add new activities in their Environmental Permit. The Environment Agency has advised the applicant to consider the proposal of the combined heat and power system as a new permitted activity or a directly associated activity to the existing permitted operations as a minimum.

83. As such it is considered from a noise perspective that the impacts can be fully addressed by suitable conditions and any increase in the construction hours will be considered when the relevant discharge applications are submitted.

#### Odours

84. The business which operates from the site is a pet food manufacturer which has associated odours. Clearly the way forward the applicant's wish to pursue which includes the use of fresh raw materials which are cooked as part of the process also has the potential to create odour, and the concern of one of the neighbouring residents is noted in this regard.

85. The supporting information confirms that odour complaints have reduced from the period between 2010 to 2012 when an average of 110 per annum were received, to a total of two per annum for the years ending 2013 and 2014. This is directly related to the implementation of the major odour abatement system which formed part of the 2010 planning permission. Odours are now reduced to 20% below the approved limit and as such the approved 30m high chimney is no longer required.

86. This application is supported by an odour impact assessment as this application seeks to construct a more permanent solution to controlling odour emissions from the plant from both the existing production facilities and for proposed future upgrades in raw materials reception and processing plant. This process is split into 4 phases as follows:

87. Under Phase One of its development proposals the Company proposes to construct three new wet scrubbers and biofilters to treat air extracted from:

- Process air extracted from the current Lines A, B & C
- Process air extracted from a proposed new production line - Line D
- Factory headspace extraction from the building housing Line D
- Raw materials tipping areas for Lines A, B & C

88. Phase Two of the proposals will involve a review of the effects of the biofilters constructed in Phase One with results assessed both by emissions testing, using odour sampling and olfactometric analysis to quantify emissions, and by local subjective assessments in the area around the plant. The results of the objective odour sampling and analysis will be compared with the predictions derived from the modelling described in the submitted odour assessment. If the monitoring shows that odour impact is above target levels, and/or exceeds the "limits" derived in dispersion modelling, then enhanced dispersion arrangements will be used improve dispersion of treated odours off the biofilters.

89. Under Phase Three of the development plans the Company proposes to construct a further two new wet scrubber and biofilter sets to treat air extracted from the following sources in addition to that treated by the new Phase One biofilters:

- Process air extracted from a proposed new production process line - Line E
- Factory headspace extraction from the building housing the current Lines A, B & C (air currently treated by activated carbon filters)
- Additional raw materials storage areas within the extended plant
- Air extracted from the Effluent Treatment Plant (air currently treated by a series of small abatement plants)

90. Phase Four of the development proposals will involve a further review of the impact of the biofilters constructed in Phases One and Three, as carried out under Phase Two. Again, if the monitoring shows that odour impact is above target levels, and/or exceeds the "limits" derived in dispersion modelling, then additional or enhanced dispersion arrangements will be used improve dispersion of treated odours off the biofilters.

91. The submitted assessment concludes that experience at this site with existing biofilters has shown that long residence time biofilters following pre-treatment with wet scrubbers will provide more effective odour abatement than has been achieved at comparable plants using wet chemical scrubbers and cold plasma systems. Although there is some uncertainty about predicting the performance of any abatement plant before it is actually

running practical experience from the Company's existing biofilters, which have relatively basic pre-treatment of air by simple wet scrubbers, suggests that more elaborate scrubbers and biofilters should be able to achieve treated air odour concentrations of less than 1,000 ouE/m<sup>3</sup>. If this is achieved then biofilters will provide effective control of off-site odours with treated air discharged through stacks at around 12m above ground.

92. If the proposed biofilters fail to achieve the expected levels of odour abatement the assessment concludes that it is important the Company are prepared with a "fall back" position of additional odour mitigation at relatively short notice so that the duration of any off-site odour impact is limited. The most sustainable additional mitigation measure would be the use of stack of around 30m to improve dispersion of residual odours treated air off the biofilters.
93. The above phases will be secured by condition and it is considered that the measures proposed along with the fact that this is a permitted site with the Environment Agency will satisfactorily address an potential odour impacts at this site.

#### Flood Risk

94. The applicants work closely with the Environment Agency given the proximity of the site to the River Douglas and the fact that the banks of the river overflowed during recent past extreme flooding events. The application sites falls within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 and as it sits behind raised embankments the defined Flood Zone 3 areas constitute defended floodplain. This scheme includes repairs to the river embankment and due to the size of the development this has been reviewed by both the Environment Agency and Lancashire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.
95. LCC originally objected to the scheme however following further discussions with the applicant's drainage consultants and the Environment Agency which resulted in the production of an updated assessment they have removed their objection subject to conditions. This reflects the Environment Agency comments on the proposals.
96. Appropriate flood resistant and resilient measures have been designed as part of the scheme which can be secured by condition. Measures to upgrade the existing on site drainage system to manage surface water from impermeable surfaces has been proposed which includes a new rainwater harvesting system to allow for the control of runoff at source and to promote greywater re-use within the site. In conclusion the Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the site is at a low risk of flooding from all sources and includes measures to manage the residual risk. The proposed development would not result in an increased risk of flooding to the site or the land outside of its boundary.

#### Transport and Highways

97. Due to the nature and scale of the proposed development the application is supported by a transport assessment. Golden Acres currently have two core sites, the manufacture of pet food is undertaken at Plocks Farm with the distribution of finished product at the 'R2' distribution site at Buckshaw Village in Chorley. Under current production levels, even the off-site storage at R2 Buckshaw is fully utilised and so GA has leased a further storage facility in Much Hoole in Lancashire, known as 'Longton Unit 2'. This facility is used solely for the storage of finished product.
98. The proposals will result in a reduction in trips relating to the movement of raw materials and finished product thus reduce the transport demands associated with production at Plocks Farm. Staff levels will not increase as a result of the proposals and so there will be no impact to employment trips.
99. Currently, 65,000 tonnes of finished product is produced annually at Plocks Farm. The production from the plant is constant across the year and the plant is in operation 24 hours a day and 365 days a year. Transport associated with the operation of the plant using current production processes can be broken down into the following categories:
- Transfer of Raw Materials- at current production levels, the movement in raw materials accounts for on average 98 trips per day

- Transfer of Finished Product- at current production levels, the trips associated with the movement in packed finished product accounts for 71 daily trips
  - Other Trips- at current production levels, trips associated with employment are estimated to be 328 trips per day.
100. In order to transfer finished product from Plocks Farm to R2 and Longton Unit 2, an articulated HGV runs between the sites, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. During each trip from Plocks Farm, the HGV carries a full load of 25 tonnes of finished product and on the return legs it carries empty pallets and packaging which is where possible, reused or recycled. The logistics of the HGV has therefore been designed to reduce potential trips on the highway network.
101. Currently around 439 staff are employed by GA with around 359 employed at Plocks Farms and the remainder based at the distribution centre at R2 Buckshaw. Production is undertaken 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Two 12 hour shifts are undertaken in a 24 hour period with the shifts starting and finishing at 6am and 6pm.
102. The proposed development will not increase the productive capacity of the plant, but will increase storage facilities for raw ingredients and finished products. The development proposals will enable a significant reduction in the need for trips associated with off-site storage of raw materials and finished product. It is estimated that the development proposals will result in a reduction of 99 (-41%) HGV trips per day from the local highway network
103. The proposed car park will provide approximately 150 spaces, which will reduce congestion in the car park during shift changes. As the proposed development will not increase the number of staff on site, there will be no increase in staff trips to the plant.
104. Lancashire County Council Highways have considered the proposals and confirmed that the proposals are acceptable from highways safety point of view; however, to prevent any more increase in the level of traffic generation a condition to ensure that the proposed buildings do not serve any other uses other than those described has been recommended.
105. The Engineer has pointed out that there is a discrepancy in the net additional gross internal floor space indicated in the Transport Assessment and that shown on the planning application form however the Engineer's response is based on the higher GFA figure provided.
106. The existing 88 car parking spaces on site are to be increased to 150 although no additional staff to the existing 359 will be employed. Based on the 150 spaces, a total of 8 disabled parking spaces should be provided and provision should be made for secure and covered storage of 21 bicycles and 9 motorcycles in accordance with the Chorley Council Parking Standard (Policy ST4 of the Adopted Local Plan). This can be secured by condition.

#### Sustainable Resources and Energy Impact

107. The works done at the site in recent years has increased the electricity base-loads which has resulted in increased levels of carbon emissions, such that the target reductions in Specific Energy Consumption (SEC) demanded by the Climate Change Agreement (CCA) are currently exceeded by a significant margin.
108. To address this issue the proposed development includes the introduction of a 2MWe CHP engine fuelled with natural gas and an anaerobic digester plant coupled with a 500kWe CHP engine.
109. The submitted Energy Impact Assessment concludes that the introduction of the two proposed CHP schemes would deliver significant overall reductions in carbon emissions at the site through the efficient onsite generation of electricity. Based on electricity and gas forecast demands over the course of the 10 year plan, carbon emissions would be

approximately 25% lower when compared with the scenario without onsite generation. This is largely achieved by a 56% reduction in electricity taken from the grid, albeit with a 24% increase in natural gas required to fuel one of the CHP schemes, when compared with the scenario without onsite generation.

#### Public Consultation

110. In accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement prior to submitting this application the applicants undertook an Open Day on Sunday 5th July 2015 to which all residents of Bretherton and those in Tarleton located in close proximity to the site were invited. A letter and brochure were also sent to all Parish Councillors of Tarleton and Bretherton, together with the District Councillors of Chorley Council advising them of the proposals and inviting them to view the site on a day to be arranged following receipt of the comments from the Open Day. A letter and brochure was sent to the MP for the South Ribble constituency, Seema Kennedy, inviting her to attend the Open Day.
111. The Open Day was held between 10.00am and 4.00pm and a total of 140 visitors attended site for a tour around the factory and to view the proposals with 82 questionnaires being completed at the end of the tour which allowed visitors to express their views on the proposals.
112. Following the Open Day GA Pet Food Partners wrote to all those that attended and responded to the comments received.
113. The vast majority of these were supportive of the proposals. The main comments received were transport related comments as follows:
114. Improved Signage – The comments recommend improvements to signage for the plant applies to drivers who are unfamiliar with the location of the Plocks Farm site access. Drivers who are unfamiliar with the location of the access road will be those making deliveries from 3rd party suppliers. The applicant will seek to reduce the chances drivers missing the access to Plocks Farm by enhancing the information that is issued to 3rd party delivery companies. The provision of additional highways signage is a matter that the applicant is also prepared to discuss with the local highway authority.
115. HGV Traffic Turning Left - In response to the concerns over the site access, the suggestion that HGVs should only be able to turn left out of the access has been considered in relation to safety and the capacity of the junction. The A59 in the vicinity of the site access junction is considered to have a low accident rate with only 6 accidents in the last 5 years. Additionally, a highway improvement scheme at the access road was recently implemented. This has removed the ambiguity associated with unclear lane markings and provided a right turn ghost island at the site access junction. It is considered that this has enhanced safety at the access.
116. It terms of the capacity of the access to Plocks Farm, the only movements that are opposed are the movements out of Plocks Farm and the right turn from the A59 into Plocks Farm. It should be noted that traffic movements that do not relate to Plocks Farm will be unaffected by capacity issues, should they arise. Notwithstanding this, it is demonstrated that in 2020 the site access will continue to operate within capacity in its current configuration without any significant queues and delays. After consideration by the applicant to whether the site access exit should be left out only, there is no evidence base to suggest that there is an existing safety issue at the access. Additionally, if the site access was to operate over its capacity, then this would only affect vehicles related to Plocks Farm. On this basis, it is concluded that a left turn only from the access is not necessary.
117. Site Access off Roundabout - One comment suggested that it would be beneficial to provide a site access directly off the roundabout where the A59 meets Carr House Lane (B5247). Provision of such a link would displace trips from the A59 as they could instead use the new site access road. This would bring some benefits to users of the A59, along the 450m section that runs between the existing site access and the roundabout.

However the site access will continue to operate within capacity in its current configuration without any significant queues and delays and without evidence of any existing highway safety issue. Notwithstanding this, GA may in the future, wish to consider construction of a secondary access directly off the Carr House Lane roundabout, however provision of this access this would have environmental impacts that would need to be assessed.

### Overall Conclusion

118. For the reasons set out above it is considered that very special circumstances have been demonstrated which outweigh the harm the proposals will have on the Green Belt. All of the other impacts can be addressed by condition.

119. If Members are minded to approve the application please note it is not open to Members to determine the application as it will have to be referred to the Secretary of State under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 as the proposal constitutes inappropriate development incorporating the provision of a building where the floor space to be created is 1,000 square metres or more and would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The Secretary of State will then determine whether he wants to call in the application for determination or whether this can be determined at the local level.

### Planning Policies

In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/ guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

### Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Date
77/00049/FUL	General Purpose Farm Building	Approved	29 March 1977
80/00466/FUL	Farm office and weighbridge	Approved	9 June 1980
89/01190/FUL	Erection of farm building	Approved	13 March 1990
93/00025/COU	Change of use of building to house extrusion plant with ancillary equipment	Approved	9 March 1993
93/00368/AGR	Agricultural determination for agricultural machinery storage building	Approved	18 June 1993
93/00699/FUL	Extension to farm office and weigh office	Approved	9 November 1993
93/00729/FUL	Construction of two elevator towers	Approved	6 December 1993
94/00503/FUL	Ground floor and first floor extension to farm office and weigh room	Approved	27 September 1994
94/00968/FUL	Erection of General Purpose Agricultural Building	Approved	15 March 1995
94/00969/FUL	Extension to existing building housing Extrusion Plant to accommodate Bio Filter Plant	Approved	March 1995
95/00279/FUL	Alteration of existing roofline to accommodate mixing bin,	Approved	6 June 1995
96/00044/FUL	Widening of the existing driveway and improvements to the access	Approved	1 May 1996
96/00320/FUL	Extension of existing mill	Approved	28 August 1996

	building over existing yard area incorporating rising of roof height,		
99/00132/FUL	Demolition of outbuildings, construction of bin storage building together with canteen shower block, garage, stables and stores,	Approved	7 July 1999
03/00528/FULMAJ	Extension to buildings to form produce store, tractor store, administrative and staff accommodation, raw materials store, new entrance control, landscaping and waste water treatment area,	Approved	26 September 2003
07/00843/FUL	Proposed installation of a sprinkler tank and associated pump house	Approved	5 October 2007
08/00364/FUL	Installation of fan house, three activated carbon filters and flue to control odour emissions at Plocks Farm	Approved	15 August 2008
09/00078/SCE	EIA Screening Opinion for Plocks Farm, Liverpool Road, Bretherton	EIA Required	23 February 2009
09/00236/SCOPE	Scoping Opinion for the Environmental Impact Assessment at Plock farm, Liverpool Road, Bretherton.	Comments issued	23 April 2009
09/00738/FULMAJ	Extensions and alterations to pet food manufacturing facility including an automated finished product store (AFPS); upgraded and new extrusion process lines including a sunken mill; raw material storage; odour abatement (a roofed pine bark based biological filter system including venting chimneys, one 30 metres high); waste water treatment; additional capacity of waste recovery and recycling facilities; landscaping including earth excavation and mounding; related infrastructure.	Approved	25 March 2010
10/00572/DIS	Extensions and alterations to pet food manufacturing facility including an automated finished product store (AFPS); upgraded and new extrusion process lines including a sunken mill; raw material storage; odour abatement (a roofed pine bark based biological filter system including venting chimneys, one 30m high); waste water treatment; additional capacity of waste recovery and recycling facilities; landscaping including earth excavation and mounding;		



	related infrastructure.		
10/00647/FUL	Relocation of plant to treat waste water from dry pet food production process	Approved	13 October 2010
10/01054/DIS	Application to discharge conditions no. 5 and 6 of planning permission 10/00647/FUL	Discharged	12 January 2011
10/01080/MNMA	Application for minor Non Amendment to planning application 10/00647/FUL for the relocation of plant to treat waste water (Effluent Treatment Plant)	Approved	6 January 2011
12/00032/FUL	Change of use from residential (C3) use to mixed residential (C3) use and office (B1) use	Approved	12 March 2012
12/00450/DIS	Application to discharge condition 14 of planning approval 09/00738/FULMAJ (odour assessment)	Conditions discharged	21 June 2012
12/00644/FUL	Substitute revised drawings for those noted as 'Approved Plans', to reflect changes made to the buildings to address operational requirements. For summary details please refer also to Supporting Statement (dated 22 June 2012) attached.	Withdrawn	
12/01118/FUL	Construction of a new Energy Centre and Fan House, part retrospective application for amendment to previously approved plans (under permission ref: 09/00738/FULMAJ), to allow the building to be higher than the detail approved by the Masterplan to allow the filter bags (which remove airborne dust) to be removed from within the building, and to accommodate acoustic protection. The Fan House part of the building was required to comply with condition 14 of the 2009 permission.	Approved	January 2013
13/00472/FUL	Construction of service yard - in situ concrete surfacing to existing stone area, plus structures to allow unloading and cleaning of silos which deliver raw materials to Plocks Farm	Approved	August 2013
14/00049/FUL	Construction of an acoustic enclosure building over an air extraction system	Approved	April 2014
14/00581/FUL	Construction of building for use as engineering workshop and formation of concrete	Approved	July 2014

	hardstanding		
--	--------------	--	--

## **Suggested Conditions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Condition</b>																																																									
1.	<p>The proposed development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission. Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>																																																									
2.	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 501 1283 1899"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="320 501 612 551">Title</th> <th data-bbox="612 501 920 551">Drawing Reference</th> <th data-bbox="920 501 1283 551">Received date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 551 612 600">Location Plan</td> <td data-bbox="612 551 920 600">14.505/100</td> <td data-bbox="920 551 1283 600">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 600 612 649">Masterplan</td> <td data-bbox="612 600 920 649">11G</td> <td data-bbox="920 600 1283 649">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 649 612 748">Extent of Flood Bank Raising With Contours</td> <td data-bbox="612 649 920 748">P2014-003-01 B</td> <td data-bbox="920 649 1283 748">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 748 612 797">Sections 2</td> <td data-bbox="612 748 920 797">P2014-003-02 P2</td> <td data-bbox="920 748 1283 797">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 797 612 846">Sections 3</td> <td data-bbox="612 797 920 846">P2014-003-04 P2</td> <td data-bbox="920 797 1283 846">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 846 612 896">Bund Extension Cross Section</td> <td data-bbox="612 846 920 896">P2014-003-05 P2</td> <td data-bbox="920 846 1283 896">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 896 612 945">Flood Bank Location Plan</td> <td data-bbox="612 896 920 945">P2014-003-06 A</td> <td data-bbox="920 896 1283 945">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 945 612 994">Site Plan</td> <td data-bbox="612 945 920 994">2014-040-P001 B</td> <td data-bbox="920 945 1283 994">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 994 612 1093">Meat Kitchen - Proposed Plan &amp; Elevations</td> <td data-bbox="612 994 920 1093">2014-040-P002 B</td> <td data-bbox="920 994 1283 1093">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1093 612 1191">I / Kitchen &amp; Fridge - Proposed Plan</td> <td data-bbox="612 1093 920 1191">2014-040-P003 A</td> <td data-bbox="920 1093 1283 1191">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1191 612 1290">I / Kitchen &amp; Fridge - Proposed Elevations</td> <td data-bbox="612 1191 920 1290">2014-040-P004 B</td> <td data-bbox="920 1191 1283 1290">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1290 612 1339">CHP Station Floor Plan</td> <td data-bbox="612 1290 920 1339">P2015-018-01 P1</td> <td data-bbox="920 1290 1283 1339">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1339 612 1388">CHP Station Roof Plan</td> <td data-bbox="612 1339 920 1388">P2015-018-02 P1</td> <td data-bbox="920 1339 1283 1388">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1388 612 1487">CHP Station North East Elevation</td> <td data-bbox="612 1388 920 1487">P2015-018-03 P1</td> <td data-bbox="920 1388 1283 1487">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1487 612 1585">CHP Station South West Elevation</td> <td data-bbox="612 1487 920 1585">P2015-018-04 P1</td> <td data-bbox="920 1487 1283 1585">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1585 612 1635">CHP Station Site Location Plan</td> <td data-bbox="612 1585 920 1635">P2015-018-05 P2</td> <td data-bbox="920 1585 1283 1635">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1635 612 1684">CHP Station Floor Plan (Drainage)</td> <td data-bbox="612 1635 920 1684">P2015-018-06 P1</td> <td data-bbox="920 1635 1283 1684">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1684 612 1899">Plant Room, Wet Scrubber &amp; Anaerobic Digestion Plant - Proposed Site Plan &amp; Elevations</td> <td data-bbox="612 1684 920 1899">2014-040-P005 A</td> <td data-bbox="920 1684 1283 1899">3rd September 2015</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="320 1899 1283 1935">Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning</p>	Title	Drawing Reference	Received date	Location Plan	14.505/100	3rd September 2015	Masterplan	11G	3rd September 2015	Extent of Flood Bank Raising With Contours	P2014-003-01 B	3rd September 2015	Sections 2	P2014-003-02 P2	3rd September 2015	Sections 3	P2014-003-04 P2	3rd September 2015	Bund Extension Cross Section	P2014-003-05 P2	3rd September 2015	Flood Bank Location Plan	P2014-003-06 A	3rd September 2015	Site Plan	2014-040-P001 B	3rd September 2015	Meat Kitchen - Proposed Plan & Elevations	2014-040-P002 B	3rd September 2015	I / Kitchen & Fridge - Proposed Plan	2014-040-P003 A	3rd September 2015	I / Kitchen & Fridge - Proposed Elevations	2014-040-P004 B	3rd September 2015	CHP Station Floor Plan	P2015-018-01 P1	3rd September 2015	CHP Station Roof Plan	P2015-018-02 P1	3rd September 2015	CHP Station North East Elevation	P2015-018-03 P1	3rd September 2015	CHP Station South West Elevation	P2015-018-04 P1	3rd September 2015	CHP Station Site Location Plan	P2015-018-05 P2	3rd September 2015	CHP Station Floor Plan (Drainage)	P2015-018-06 P1	3rd September 2015	Plant Room, Wet Scrubber & Anaerobic Digestion Plant - Proposed Site Plan & Elevations	2014-040-P005 A	3rd September 2015
Title	Drawing Reference	Received date																																																								
Location Plan	14.505/100	3rd September 2015																																																								
Masterplan	11G	3rd September 2015																																																								
Extent of Flood Bank Raising With Contours	P2014-003-01 B	3rd September 2015																																																								
Sections 2	P2014-003-02 P2	3rd September 2015																																																								
Sections 3	P2014-003-04 P2	3rd September 2015																																																								
Bund Extension Cross Section	P2014-003-05 P2	3rd September 2015																																																								
Flood Bank Location Plan	P2014-003-06 A	3rd September 2015																																																								
Site Plan	2014-040-P001 B	3rd September 2015																																																								
Meat Kitchen - Proposed Plan & Elevations	2014-040-P002 B	3rd September 2015																																																								
I / Kitchen & Fridge - Proposed Plan	2014-040-P003 A	3rd September 2015																																																								
I / Kitchen & Fridge - Proposed Elevations	2014-040-P004 B	3rd September 2015																																																								
CHP Station Floor Plan	P2015-018-01 P1	3rd September 2015																																																								
CHP Station Roof Plan	P2015-018-02 P1	3rd September 2015																																																								
CHP Station North East Elevation	P2015-018-03 P1	3rd September 2015																																																								
CHP Station South West Elevation	P2015-018-04 P1	3rd September 2015																																																								
CHP Station Site Location Plan	P2015-018-05 P2	3rd September 2015																																																								
CHP Station Floor Plan (Drainage)	P2015-018-06 P1	3rd September 2015																																																								
Plant Room, Wet Scrubber & Anaerobic Digestion Plant - Proposed Site Plan & Elevations	2014-040-P005 A	3rd September 2015																																																								
3.	<p>No development shall commence until a plan showing the phasing of the development has been submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.</p>																																																									

	<p>Implementation shall be in accordance with that plan unless as otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure effective control over the respective phases of the development hereby permitted.</p>
4.	<p>No development shall commence until a plan showing the phasing of the development has been submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Implementation shall be in accordance with that plan unless as otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure effective control over the respective phases of the development hereby permitted.</p>
5.	<p>Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development full details of existing and proposed ground levels and proposed building slab levels (all relative to ground levels adjoining the site) shall be 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 and in the interests of the amenities of local residents this information is required prior to the building process beginning</p>
6.	<p>No development shall take place for any of the phases of the development to be shown on the phasing plan until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing, and those works shall be carried out as approved. Those details should include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; parking layouts; vehicle access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communication cables, pipelines etc). In particular details of landscape re-instatement on the new earthwork and the River banks shall be provided at the appropriate time. The submitted information shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Soft landscaping works shall include planting plans; written specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; implementation programme.</li> <li>b) All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority.</li> <li>c) No development shall take place until details of earthworks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority those details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surround landform.</li> </ul> <p>The development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the appearance of the area and to ensure that the landscaping, which is an essential component of retaining the character of this site, is implemented at an appropriate time.</p>
7.	<p>None of the phases of development to be shown on the approved phasing plan shall be commenced until a habitat creation and landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and</p>

	<p>maintenance schedules for all landscape areas has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Any loss of woodland as a result of the scheme should be compensated for though improved management of the remaining woodland areas to be set out within the submitted plan. The habitat and landscape at the site shall thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved plan as part of the wider site management unless amendments to the plan are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of nature conservation, to enhance biodiversity and the appearance of the locality.</p>
8.	<p>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 occupation of any buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the appearance of the locality</p>
9.	<p>No development shall take place for any of the phases to be shown in the phasing plan, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The approved Statement should be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operating hours during which works of construction or demolition or works incidental thereto shall take place;</li> <li>• The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;</li> <li>• Loading and unloading of plant and materials;</li> <li>• Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;</li> <li>• The erection and maintenance of security boarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;</li> <li>• Wheel washing facilities;</li> <li>• Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; and</li> <li>• A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.</li> </ul> <p>Reason: To minimise the impact of construction on the local environment, in the interests of noise generation and highway safety this information is required prior to the building process beginning</p>
10.	<p>No works shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological investigation, recording and analysis. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the site this work needs to be undertaken prior to the commencement of building works on the site</p>
11.	<p>Details of all external lighting for each approved phase of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before each phase of the development hereby permitted is used. In particular no lighting proposed should result in direct lighting of either the adjacent water course or River banks. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise the visual impact of the development, to protect the</p>

	ecological value of the adjacent watercourse and to ensure that the proposed development does not result in excessive light pollution to the detriment of the neighbours amenities (including those neighbours in West Lancashire)
12.	<p>No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme, based on the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Planning Practice Guidance with evidence of an assessment of the site conditions (inclusive of how the scheme shall be managed after completion) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The surface water drainage scheme must be in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacement national standards and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no surface water shall discharge to the public sewerage system either directly or indirectly.</p> <p>The development shall be completed, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. This condition is imposed in light of policies within the NPPF and NPPG</p>
13.	<p>No development shall commence until details of the design, based on sustainable drainage principles, and implementation of an appropriate surface water sustainable drainage scheme, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Those details shall include, as a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Information about the lifetime of the development, design storm period and intensity (1 in 30 &amp; 1 in 100 year +30% allowance for climate change), discharge rates and volumes (both pre and post development), temporary storage facilities, the methods employed to delay and control surface water discharged from the site, and the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters, including watercourses, and details of floor levels in AOD;</li> <li>b) The drainage strategy should demonstrate that the surface water run-off must not exceed the pre-development greenfield runoff rate. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.</li> <li>c) Flood water exceedance routes, both on and off site;</li> <li>d) A timetable for implementation, including phasing as applicable;</li> <li>e) Evidence of an assessment of the site conditions to include site investigation and test results to confirm infiltrations rates, where applicable;</li> <li>f) Details of water quality controls, where applicable.</li> </ol> <p>The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any of the approved buildings, or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Thereafter the drainage system shall be retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason : To ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the proposed development can be adequately drained.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> there is no flood risk on or off the site resulting from the proposed development</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> water quality is not detrimentally impacted by the development proposal</li> </ul>
14.	<p>No development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the sustainable drainage scheme for the site has been completed in accordance with the submitted details. The sustainable drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the drainage for the proposed development can be adequately maintained.</li> <li>there is no flood risk on- or off-the site resulting from the proposed development or resulting from inadequate the maintenance of the sustainable drainage system.</li> </ul>
15.	<p>No development shall commence until details of how surface water and pollution prevention will be managed during each construction phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction phase(s) of development does not pose an undue flood risk on site or elsewhere;</li> <li>To ensure that any pollution arising from the development as a result of the construction works does not adversely impact on existing or proposed ecological or geomorphic condition of water bodies.</li> </ul>
16.	<p>All attenuation tanks and flow control devices are to be constructed and operational prior to the commencement of any other development and prior to any development phase.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site drainage during the construction process does not enter the watercourses at un-attenuated rate.</li> <li>to prevent a flood risk during the construction of the development</li> </ul>
17.	<p>No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until a travel plan to promote travel by sustainable modes has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable to be set out in that plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reports demonstrating progress in promoting sustainable transport measures shall be submitted annually to the Local Planning Authority for approval for a period of ten years from the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the site is as sustainable as possible from a transport perspective.</p>
18.	<p>During the construction period all trees to be retained shall be protected by 1.2m high fencing as specified in BS3998 of 2010 – Tree Work Recommendations</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the trees to be retained in the interest of the appearance of the area and nature conservation.</p>
19.	<p>The monitoring of noise from each phase of the development hereby permitted, to be shown on the phasing plan shall be undertaken in accordance with a noise monitoring scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme for each phase shall provide full details of, and justification for, how, where, when and by whom monitoring will be performed. The scheme shall remain in place throughout the operation of the site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To secure effective control over noise levels to protect local residents (including those residents within West Lancashire)</p>
20.	<p>The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and the following mitigation measure detailed within the FRA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finished floor levels of occupied buildings are set no lower than 7.02 m above Ordnance Datum (AOD).</li> </ul> <p>The mitigation measure shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied</p>

	<p>within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.</p>
21.	<p>The proposed increase in the height of the river embankment shown on the approved plans shall be to 7.0m AOD.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise flood risks</p>
22.	<p>None of the buildings hereby permitted shall be occupied until a flood evacuation plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. In the event of a flood event the site and/or building(s) shall be evacuated in accordance with the approved plan.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that appropriate measures are in place in the event of a flood event</p>
23.	<p>The premises shall be used for the extrusion of agricultural produce for the purposes of animal and pet food production only and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class B2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order without modification.</p> <p>Reason: The site is in the Green Belt where development is strictly controlled.</p>
24.	<p>Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.</p> <p>Reason: To secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.</p>
25.	<p>Prior to the first use of the car park hereby approved 8 disabled parking spaces shall be marked out on the approved car park and made available for use. The disabled car parking provision shall be retained at all times thereafter specifically for this purpose.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate car parking on site for this purpose.</p>
26.	<p>Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development details of covered and secured cycle storage and associated shower and changing facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall accord with the Chorley Council Parking Standards. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the first occupation/use of the development. The facilities shall be retained at all times thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To encourage sustainable transport modes.</p>
27.	<p>Prior to the commencement of the works to raise the flood defence earthwork an Environmental Construction Method Statement (ECMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This ECMS should include details of measures to protect the water course during the course of construction; reference should be made to Pollution Prevention Guidelines prepared by the Environment Agency, in particular PPG guidance note no 5, and Industry best practice for working close to water courses (e.g. CIRIA Guidance note no C648). The development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement.</p> <p>Reason: to protect features of ecological value on and close to the site. In particular there is potential for harm to be caused to the banks of adjacent River, and potentially to the water quality of the River, during the planned works to raise the flood defence earthworks. These earthworks also have the potential to harm the developing woodland forming the western boundary of the development site.</p>
28.	<p>Prior to the commencement of the development full details of the bat roosts/ boxes</p>



	<p>to be installed on trees or structures close to the water course shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority. The approved bat boxes shall be installed prior to the occupation of the first building hereby approved. The bat boxes shall be maintained in perpetuity thereafter. Reason: in the interests of maintaining bats at the site.</p>
29.	<p>Prior to the commencement of the construction of building 47 details of the external dry-air cooling (refrigeration) fans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Cooling plant should be selected with low sound emissions and sited so as to benefit from shielding by other buildings or structures. Full details of the noise level generated from the fans shall be detailed. The fans thereafter shall be installed in accordance with the approved details. Reason: The details of the fans and the level of noise to be generated is unknown at this point. The details are required prior to the construction process to ensure that the resultant level at Plox Brow was compatible with other noise source contributions at the site.</p>
30.	<p>Prior to the commencement of the construction of the CHP Station details of the fan-powered coolers external to the plantroom shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Full details of the noise level generated from the coolers shall be detailed. The coolers thereafter shall be installed in accordance with the approved details. Reason: The details are required prior to the construction process to ensure that the resultant noise level at nearby noise receptors is compatible with other noise source contributions at the site.</p>
31.	<p>The measures to control odours at the site shall be undertaken as follows:</p> <p><i>Phase 1</i> Construct three new wet scrubbers and biofilters to treat air extracted from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process air extracted from the current Lines A, B &amp; C</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Process air extracted from a proposed new production line - Line D</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Factory headspace extraction from the building housing Line D</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Raw materials tipping areas for Lines A, B &amp; C</li> </ul> <p><i>Phase 2</i> Review the effects of the biofilters constructed in Phase One with results assessed both by emissions testing, using odour sampling and olfactometric analysis to quantify emissions, and by local subjective assessments in the area around the plant. The results of the objective odour sampling and analysis will be compared with the predictions derived from the modelling described in the submitted odour assessment. If the monitoring shows that odour impact is above target levels, and/or exceeds the "limits" derived in dispersion modelling, then enhanced dispersion arrangements will be used improve dispersion of treated odours off the biofilters.</p> <p><i>Phase 3</i> Construct a further two new wet scrubber and biofilter sets to treat air extracted from the following sources in addition to that treated by the new Phase One biofilters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process air extracted from a proposed new production process line - Line E</li> <li>• Factory headspace extraction from the building housing the current Lines A, B &amp; C (air currently treated by activated carbon filters)</li> <li>• Additional raw materials storage areas within the extended plant</li> <li>• Air extracted from the Effluent Treatment Plant (air currently treated by a series of small abatement plants)</li> </ul> <p><i>Phase 4</i> Further review of the impact of the biofilters constructed in Phases One and Three,</p>

	<p>as carried out under Phase Two. Again, if the monitoring shows that odour impact is above target levels, and/or exceeds the “limits” derived in dispersion modelling, then additional or enhanced dispersion arrangements will be used improve dispersion of treated odours off the biofilters.</p>
--	--

Reason: To ensure that the odour impact on local residents is minimised and addressed by appropriate mechanisms