

APPLICATION REPORT – 17/00710/OUTMAJ

Validation Date: 18 July 2017

Ward: Chisnall

Type of Application: Major Outline Planning

Proposal: Outline application for the mixed use redevelopment of the former Camelot Theme Park, comprising up to 195 dwellings, 1,000sqm of office space (Use Class B1), and 2,000sqm workshop/starter units, together with associated infrastructure, open space and landscaping, with all matters reserved except for access.

Location: Camelot Theme Park, Park Hall Road, Charnock Richard, Chorley, PR7 5LP

Case Officer: Adele Hayes

Applicant: Story Homes Lancashire

Agent: Mr Craig Barnes, Barton Willmore

Consultation expiry: 11 August 2017

Decision due by: 29 March 2018

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that outline planning permission is granted subject to conditions and a section 106 legal agreement to secure:
 - On site provision of 68 affordable dwellings;
 - Off-site provision of allotments and playing pitches;
 - Local primary school places;
 - Development of travels plans;
 - Pedestrian, cycling and public right of way improvements; and
 - Public transport improvements.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site boundary extends to approximately 21.4ha and covers the former Camelot Theme Park site including the areas covered by the former park rides, facilities and buildings, car and coach parks, access roads, areas of hard standing and woodland areas. The land that is occupied by the hotel and industrial units does not form part of this application.
3. The site is located within the Green Belt to the west of Charnock Richard, north-east of Heskin and south-east of Ecclestone. A large proportion of the site is designated as

previously developed land within the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026. The site was previously used as a theme park which is still very evident on site. Some former rides and associated structures are still in situ on site, although a number of the structures have now been demolished/removed from the site. The M6 motorway borders the northern part of the site and the northbound Motorway Service Station is adjacent to the site boundary.

4. In November 2012, the theme park operator, Knights Leisure Ltd, closed the park as it was considered no longer viable. A number of the rides and infrastructure were removed although there are still buildings, the remains of some rides and areas of hardstanding remaining on the site.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

5. The application is described as: *Outline application for the mixed use redevelopment of the former Camelot Theme Park, comprising up to 195 dwellings, 1,000sqm of office space (Use Class B1), and 2,000sqm workshop/starter units, together with associated infrastructure, open space and landscaping, with all matters reserved except for access.*
6. The application is therefore in outline, with all matters reserved save for access. In this case, access means the point of access and not the internal road layout (which remains a reserved matter).
7. This proposal is accompanied by an illustrative concept Masterplan and Design and Access Statement showing how the development might be accommodated on the site (in principle). The indicative plans submitted in support of the application include the following:
 - Up to 195 residential dwellings – two and three storey open market and affordable residential dwellings;
 - 2000m² workshop/starter units;
 - 1000m² of office space (Use Class B1);
 - Up to 8.8ha of public open space/landscaping;
8. It is envisaged that the Class B1 offices would become the new office of Story Homes Lancashire region.
9. A request for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion was submitted to the Council on the 14th March 2017. The letter indicated that whilst the development falls into schedule 2, Part 10(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2011 as Amended, it would have no more than a localised impact, such that an Environmental Statement (ES) should not be required to be submitted as part of the planning application. The Council formally adopted a Screening Opinion on 9th June 2017 to the effect that the Proposed Development is not EIA development. An ES is, therefore, not required.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

10. The site has an extensive planning history associated with its use as a theme park. This is listed at the end of this report. It is noteworthy that an outline application (ref.14/00071/OUTMAJ) for the redevelopment of the former Camelot Theme Park comprising of the erection of up to 420 dwellings (all matters reserved) was refused in August 2014. The reason for refusal was that the proposed development was considered

contrary to policy 1 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, and would also have had a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within in than the existing development on that part of the site that is previously developed and would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It was not considered that the resultant harm would be overcome by very special circumstances or the benefits associated with the proposed development.

11. Story Homes decided not to appeal this decision and took the opportunity to undertake a more detailed site investigation to have a greater understanding of the constraints and opportunities of the site leading to the current proposal. This proposal is for a much reduced scale of redevelopment of the site, with a greater quantum of employment uses and less residential. In particular 195 dwellings are proposed here in comparison with the 420 previously applied for. There would also be 1000m² of office space and 2000m² of employment workshops/starter units that were not previously sought. This proposal also falls entirely within the designated previously developed site in the Green Belt boundary (see appended plan), whereas elements of the previous proposal strayed outside the designation.

REPRESENTATIONS

12. Letters of objection have been received from 113 addresses raising the following issues:

Principle of development

- The site is Green Belt, not brownfield land.
- The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and there are no very special circumstances that could outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.
- The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 14 of the Framework is not considered to apply to the proposed development.
- The development is not sustainable, and is contrary to policy 1 of the adopted Core Strategy.
- It will create a satellite village with no facilities.
- The reasons the previous application were refused still stand.
- The application is not small scale or limited infilling.
- It will affect the openness of the Green Belt.
- The benefits of the development would not outweigh the harm to the area and existing communities.
- The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is not considered to apply to the development.
- The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.
- It does not comply with the Development Plan and therefore is not sustainable development. The current planned development fully meet the area's housing needs for the foreseeable future.
- The application is disproportionate to the housing needs of the area.
- The preservation of green space around towns and villages is vital for psychological and physiological health.
- It does not attempt to integrate with surrounding communities.
- There is no shortfall of housing in Chorley.
- It is planned building within the Green Belt, the primary purpose of the Green Belt is the retention of openness. New proposal shows a reduction of housing but with the addition of around 30,000sq ft of office/commercial units which will encroach on the openness.

- Proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Story Homes need to demonstrate very special circumstances. 'Alleged benefits' not very special circumstances but normal course of events when a large scale development occurs.
- Pear Tree Lane appeal upheld and Inspector agreed that Chorley Council had met its housing supply. This, and fact that Camelot has not been allocated for development in the local plan, means there is no reason to approve.

Infrastructure

- Cannot support the amount of housing never mind an industrial site
- Charnock Richard has no facilities, no shops, no doctors, no chemist
- The bus service is worse now than it was when the previous application was made
- All the local schools are oversubscribed
- Similarly the existing doctors surgeries are struggling to cope with patient numbers as it is and the local A and E isn't fully open.
- The Medical Centre in Eccleston is already at capacity.
- There is no employment in the area.
- A development of this size can bring up to 1500 extra people into the village.
- The illegal access to and from the motorway will increase.
- The nearest amenities are in Eccleston and these simply can't cope with what would be proportionally a massive jump in the number of users. The area around the library and shops is gridlocked at weekends as it is.
- The new home owners will have to travel by car to get anywhere.
- Stocks Lane and Withington Lane will be used as shortcuts to avoid bottle necks at the end of Park Hall Road on to Wood Lane/Mossy Lea Road.
- Since the last application, local buses have been severely reduced, so no incentive for cars to be left at home.
- Lancashire Constabulary has had its budget cut significantly and cannot provide a reasonable response to the village as it stands now, its neighbourhood staff have been reduced and area increased, there would be no provision for this new community to be policed effectively leading to more crime and disorder.
- Infrastructure is already inadequate and severely strained
- No community facilities in local area so youths have nowhere to go
- No primary schools within safe walking distance
- No bus service for secondary schools children have to go to – Chorley / Leyland.
- Schools oversubscribed

Ecology

- It contains a vast diversity of flora and fauna
- The increase of traffic will have a negative impact on the wildlife that already exists.
- The application refers to using existing trees as a screen but also refers to many of them for a short life. Most of the trees are not evergreen and will make the development obtrusive and change the character of the area.
- The building of this development will have a knock on effect with potential disruption and pollution to wildlife and streams in the area. This would then have a negative impact on the important species, habitats, ecology and destruction of the areas natural beauty including woodland and ecosystems.
- The site contains ancient woodland which will be encroached on by housing.

Highways

- Park Hall Road is not built to service the expected increase of traffic flow once the development is complete. The volume of traffic over the last 12 months has increased

significantly. The road is far too busy, even compared to when the Theme Park was open.

- National trends show, each house will have at least 2 cars, totalling nearly 400 cars excluding the cars / vans / trucks for the units and offices including heavy machinery. Where is this significant increase in traffic going to go?
- Chorley Lane is already used as a 'rat race' for speeding traffic to illegally access the motorway at the services. Due to this access the traffic is worse than it ever was when Camelot was open.
- Camelot was only seasonal, not open every day and then mainly at closing time coinciding with the evening commute. The traffic from a residential site will be very different.
- The commercial uses on the site are better than more housing but would mean more HGVs and to get to the top area there is a narrow S bend and then the road runs through the centre of a car park, neither are suitable for an increase in heavy traffic and the construction process.
- There is only one entrance/exit to the site and this will cause massive congestion in the morning and evening rush hours when the vast bulk of people would be trying to get into and out of the site. This will no doubt result in an increase in traffic accidents and injuries/fatalities.
- There is a risk to pedestrians using the narrow footpaths on Park Hall Road. There is no footpath on one side of the road.
- There is only a single access point to the site and this increases the problems/risks.
- It is queried whether the M6 services should be opened up to avoid more traffic on local roads
- The proposal will bring a substantial number of HGVs and construction traffic during the development that is likely to last for a number of years.
- The access to the site should be via a separate junction on the M6 between Charnock Richard Services and junction 28.
- The 30mph speed limit on Wood Lane is regularly not adhered to.
- There have been a large under of traffic incidents/accidents at the junction of Park Hall Road and Wood Lane
- Charnock Richard would become a 'rat run' from the site into Chorley
- Developers suggest occupants of new houses should use shopping facilities on Motorway Service Area but this has been roundly rejected and Highways Authority have insisted in a six foot fence to prevent direct access
- 200 houses will produce around 300 extra cars and addition of service vehicles and heavy goods will render surrounding villages dangerous and mentally destructive
- Roads not good enough for excess traffic
- Footpath along Park Hall Road perilous place for pedestrians and with extra traffic on road it amounts to an accident waiting to happen
- Fatal accident will occur unless Park Hall Road is widened and/or unless there is access directly to the motorway and/or access through the services is prevented
- Increase traffic driving into Chorley – queues already on Pall Mall
- Increase in cars with raise CO2 levels

Drainage

- Surface water drains are archaic and unfit for current development and the gulleys and grid covers overflow
- The drainage along Park Hall Road is old and is unable to cope with extra volumes of waste that will be produced by a large development. Currently, the road floods when

there is heavy rain - how is building more homes and industrial units going to help solve this problem?

- Flooding in December 2015 from Syd Brook - this development is on the same brook just up stream and would be bound to create further run off water which will inevitably make matters worse. The company may suggest the installation of emergency rainwater tanks etc. to ease the effect, but in 5/10 years time when they have been forgotten and have not been maintained, or are blocked and ineffective, then this will no doubt result in increased flooding in Ecclestone
- Concerns re flooding and run off and there appears to be no plans to deal with this

Other

- The council should not allow the houses to be sold as leasehold as another income stream for the builders.
- The common areas should be adopted by the council to prevent the builders charging large maintenance or service charges.
- The increase in traffic will increase pollution levels especially particulates and oxides of nitrogen and sulphur not to mention the greenhouse gas. Have the development company thought about the health for the people living in this village?
- It will change the character of Ecclestone
- Commercial units, especially starter units would be better.
- With all the additional developments going on around this area, why is it necessary to develop new dwellings as well as office space.
- The site would be much better as a recreational area/leisure amenities which could bring in extra visitors and income without the added pressures on local services
- The application should be considered as a Phase 1 application unless it is granted with the applicant giving irrevocable assurances they will never make further applications to develop additional housing on the site in the future.
- Residents have a right to quiet enjoyment of their homes and surroundings and the development will infringe on these rights.
- The villages of Charnock Richard and Heskin are two very distinctive villages. If this development gets passed there will be no separation between the two and a small town will be created.
- There is little to justify the development without any real contribution to the identified local needs for starter homes or sheltered accommodation.
- Footpaths and bridleways should feature highly on the agenda in relation to sustainability. Any upgrading would affect their character and attract more users. Suggested lighting would be out of keeping and inappropriate.
- Object to the proposal to create a connection from the site to the bridleway and footpath network at the north west end. Again the bridleway is of rural character and as it is adjacent to Little Wood and ancient woodland, which is outside the development area, it will become a playground and over time its character will be destroyed, and who will take ownership of its maintenance and upkeep?
- There is no shortfall in housing. Should redevelop urban brownfield before any incursion into Green Belt takes place
- The consultation prior to the application was inadequate and the developers are therefore not in accordance with the NPPF.
- The site could be developed as a low maintenance country park or nature area along the lines of Brockholes which would benefit the current population and future ones.
- There does not seem to be a pollution survey given the proximity of the motorway services.
- The application fails to place value on the surrounding countryside.

- Site scored poorly against an index of sustainability indicators when it was submitted as an allocation site as part of the Local Plan process.
- No mention of air quality or pollution in the submission.
- The destruction of the peace and rural amenity can never be reversed
- Construction of Chorley Lane bypass has already become hazardous and noise levels have increased
- Additional office space cannot be justified as there are plenty of “to Let” signs all over the Borough, in addition to the growing culture of working at home
- Open spaces are lungs of country – currently there is still land where walkers can exercise and roads are quiet for cyclists
- Tourist attraction should re-open – Council should work with a company to compulsory purchase and redevelop site and bring it back to use as another theme park
- Concern that the applicant will, at a later stage, press for a two stage housing development on additional land at the site or on land proposed for workshop space
- New houses not needed – there are unsold new homes in area – and houses won’t be priced for first time buyers and will remain on the market for months
- Issues with crime and out of control youths – police are overstretched
- Not enough blue badge parking spaces in Chorley
- Threatened by irate drivers
- Building vehicles polluting on site and in area
- Development and money involved could lead to accusations of corruption and back handers
- Heskin’s population will increase 50%
- Developer has left site as an eyesore
- Although proportion of site is previously developed land, application will encroach on ancient woodland and ancient footpath known as Woodcock Lane
- Sport or recreational use might be more acceptable
- Applicant has shown utter contempt and disregard for existing residents with this ill thought out and unsustainable site
- Building these houses will bring further crime to the village, including youth crime which is increasing
- What was prized as a small countryside village prized on its quaintness will be lost and it won’t be a village anymore
- Considering exit from the EU then the alternative would be to return the land to farming thus helping to reduce the need to import produce

13. Letters of support has been received from 5 addresses that make the following comments:

- This development is very much needed as the site in its current state with the former rides and derelict buildings is a magnet for youths. There is likely to be an incident soon and this could be averted if the site is developed;
- It is noted that there is 24 hour security and a police presence at the site due to the trespassing and vandalism;
- The developers have carried out various consultations and changed the proposed housing stock down and this reflects the site where the estate will be on the existing concrete rides and where there are buildings. This brown field site is sympathetic to the large trees and the undulating site;
- There is a provision for affordable housing which is most welcome in rural communities to ensure the locals can stay in the area they know and have links to;
- The proposal of commercial premises adjacent the motorway is ideal and the site at the north end has a history of being commercial;

- The ingress and egress of the site has taken much higher volumes of vehicles than the proposed residential and commercial plans when the theme park was open;
- The links to the PROW are most welcome for the residents to walk through the estate than walk along Park Hall Road;
- The need for extra school places and doctors cannot be determined until the residents have moved in;
- The development is most welcome from many residents of neighbouring villages who would rather see a considered and carefully managed site than the broken theme park as it is now.
- The development would help to alleviate the housing crisis for the next generation through provision of houses.
- The development would help to support the provision of amenities like local shops, surgeries, pharmacies, pubs, opticians, post offices, cash points, hairdressers and libraries.
- The site needs developing and houses including commercial units would be well suited. However, it is important that vital services are left undisrupted i.e. adequate school and doctor places.
- An excellent use of the old Camelot site and will enhance both the environment and the local community.
- Objections including the environment, increased traffic, unsuitable access, lack of resource are problems we will all have to face as our population increases.

CONSULTATIONS

Chorley Council Employment, Skills and Business Support department	Welcomes an application for new employment land, especially in this rural area of Chorley. The office, workshops and starter units would provide much needed commercial accommodation for our many start-up businesses within Chorley borough.
LCC Highways	Whilst LCC has concerns over the sustainability of the site traffic from the development it will not have a severe impact on highway capacity or safety and no objection is raised subject to the provision of accessibility improvements. This is addressed in detail later the report.
Lead Local Flood Authority	The Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of the recommended conditions.
Tree Officer	<p>The site is located within the former Camelot Theme Park site, set around a wooded valley. The site is bordered by mature woodland to the southwest, northwest and northeast. Other boundaries are screened by more recently established woodland and plantations.</p> <p>The tree population is composed from a range of native and naturalised trees growing as groups throughout the site. A large number of young self-set trees have established within the theme park area.</p> <p>The trees on site have some age diversity, although mature trees dominate the site. The trees on site are composed of common species. Tree species are listed within the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment Tree Schedule.</p> <p>In general, the trees on the site are in fair overall condition. It appears</p>

	<p>that limited management has been carried out on the tree stock within the site.</p> <p>Concerns on the number of Category A and Category B trees to be removed. Retain trees to screen the site, limit the visual impact.</p>
LCC Public Rights of Way	No response received to date.
Housing	<p>In accordance with Core Strategy Policy 7, 35% of the dwellings are required to be affordable. This equates to 68 dwellings. 70% (48) of these should be social rented and 30% (20) should be shared ownership.</p> <p>The applicant is proposing a mixture of 2 and 3 bedroom houses. However, there is also a high demand for 1 bedroom flats and 2 bedroom bungalows so there should also be some provision of these.</p> <p>In order to better meet housing need the following house types and mix are suggested:</p> <p><u>Social rented</u> 8 x 1 bedroom flats 24 x 2 bedroom houses 10 x 3 bedroom houses 6 x 2 bedroom bungalows</p> <p><u>Shared ownership</u> 6 x 2 bedroom houses 14 x 3 bedroom houses</p>
Council's Ecology Advisor	<p>Is satisfied that adequate ecological information has been supplied. However, as this is an outline application, updated surveys are likely to be required as part of any reserved matters. Ecological constraints that have been identified include great crested newts and bats, proximity to a biological heritage site, Syd Brook, four invasive species, nesting birds and the need to provide ecological mitigation. Conditions are recommended. This impact is addressed in detail later in the report.</p>
The Coal Authority	<p>Has no objection to the proposed development subject to the imposition of a condition to secure intrusive site investigation works and if found necessary secure any remedial works.</p>
Police Liaison Officer	<p>Has advised that site specific overview of crime and bespoke advice will be provided at the reserved matters stage should the application progress.</p> <p>A number of recommendations regarding the design and layout of the development have been made.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>State they do not need to be consulted on this application.</p>
United Utilities	<p>Have no objection to the application subject to conditions.</p>

Highways England	Have no objection to the proposals subject to conditions.
Environmental Health	<p>Comments that the submitted report seeks to provide information about the impact of noise, within the locality of the development site. Primarily this would appear to be traffic noise and in particular the dominant noise source of the M6 motorway.</p> <p>It is advised that all mitigation measures outlined within the report should be carefully followed to ensure that the correct mitigation measures are applied to the correct affected dwellings.</p>
LCC Education	<p>Advise that based upon the latest assessment, taking into account all approved applications, LCC will be seeking a contribution for 21 primary school places. However LCC will not be seeking a contribution for secondary school places.</p> <p>Calculated at the current rates, this would result in a claim of:</p> <p>Primary places: $(£12,257 \times 0.97) \times \text{BCIS All-in Tender Price } (287 / 240) \text{ (Q1-2017/Q4-2008)}$ = £14,217.31 per place</p> <p>£14,217.31 x 21 places = £298,563.51</p>
Contaminated Land Officer	Recommend a condition in relation to ground contamination.
Lancashire Archaeological Advisory Service	<p>Comments that the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) by Wardell Armstrong Archaeology, dated January 2014, which accompanies this application indicates that the site has low/nil potential for evidence from the prehistoric, Romano-British, early medieval, medieval and post-medieval periods. The report goes on to say that there would be no significant impact on the settings of designated heritage assets within a 1km radius of the proposed development site.</p> <p>The report also states that discussions with the then Lancashire County Archaeology Service (LCAS) <i>"have indicated that there are no below-ground archaeological issues within the proposed development area site boundary, and there would be no requirement to record the surviving elements of the former theme park"</i> and concludes that <i>"submission of a planning application to develop the site would therefore not meet with any comment from the County Archaeology Service (pers. comm. Doug Moir)"</i> (p. 7).</p> <p>Lancashire Archaeological Advisory Service (LAAS) has checked this application against the Historic Environment Record and they are in agreement with the comments made as noted in the Desk-Based Assessment.</p>
Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service	Make recommendation to make the applicant aware of conditions which will have to be satisfied on any subsequent Building Regulation application.
Heskin Parish Council	The Parish Council acknowledge that there will inevitably be some

	<p>development on the site but consider that the current proposal will be as unacceptable as the previous one for 420 houses. Council consider that the current proposal will have a serious detrimental effect on Heskin in particular and surrounding villages.</p> <p>The Parish Council resolve a) to repeat the objections submitted to Chorley in 2014 and b) the Parish Council will facilitate and attend joint presentations by Cllrs Leadbetter and Whittaker on dates to be arranged and if possible attend the public meeting which may be arranged by the residents action groups.</p> <p>This motion was proposed and seconded by members of the Parish Council and carried.</p> <p>The 2014 objection reads as follows: Heskin Parish Council strongly object to the proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A development of this size is completely disproportionate and will change the nature of Heskin as a settlement • The resultant traffic will lead to gridlock on adjacent roads, • There are insufficient footways on park hall Rd ,Stocks Lane, Mill Lane, Withington Lane and Carr House Lane which will become rat runs. • There is no infrastructure to serve the properties ,eg shops and the suggestion to provide a link to the motorway service station is ludicrous • Neighbouring schools are full and a contribution to LCC to provide additional places will only exacerbate the problem • Medical facilities in the area ie GP's cannot cope with an influx of 1000 people • The site is washed over by Green belt and Chorley's own policies BNE5 states that any application a) should "not have a materially greater impact than the existing use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land in it" and b) "should respect the character of the landscape and has regard to integrate the development with its surroundings" The Parish Council cannot see how these conditions can be met. • The applicant has not proved the need for these properties. The Parish Council believe that CBC have already given approval to a six year requirement of building sites and that there are still many properties to be built in the immediate locality eg in Eccleston.
Charnock Richard Parish Council	<p>Charnock Richard Parish Council strongly object to these proposals on the grounds that they would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would have a significant detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt in the rural village of Charnock Richard. The site is not sustainable as there are no regular transport links, no shops, no amenities or facilities to serve the site. The existing road infrastructure is inadequate and the applicant shows no evidence of improvements to the roads, drainage, water or sewage services in this location. The increase in the volume of traffic using the roads would not only be detrimental in Charnock Richard but would also have an adverse impact on neighbouring Parishes. The applicant has not provided any evidence to indicate that there are special circumstances to support this type of</p>

	<p>inappropriate development in the Green Belt, nor does the development comply with current planning policy for development in Charnock Richard as the proposals could not be considered a small development or infill. Furthermore, the Parish Council believe that the proposed build volume is significantly greater than the existing volume of buildings on the site, which is again totally unacceptable.</p>
Eccleston Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council objects to the above application on the following grounds:</p> <p>The existing schools (both primary and secondary) and the existing local medical facilities, the majority of which are currently at capacity or oversubscribed, will not cope with the additional population.</p> <p>Traffic generated by the proposed development will increase congestion on local roads.</p> <p>The development will add to existing problems with sewage and surface water drainage.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed development is disproportionate in relation to neighbouring villages.</p> <p>The Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 provides for a surplus in the number of required new dwellings for the Borough.</p>

Applicant's case: summary of benefits

14. The Framework states that sustainable development is defined as comprising three dimensions: economic, social, and environmental. These three dimensions are interlinked and should not be taken in isolation. The applicant has set out a table of benefits highlighting the three dimensions of sustainable development, and how the proposed development contributes to these.

Dimension	Benefits of the proposed development
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gross Value Added generated by residents of the proposed development; • Around £1.1 million of annual household income expended locally (convenience, comparison, leisure goods and services) helping to support and sustain the local community; • New Homes Bonus of around £2.4 million; • Direct Construction Jobs (on and off-site) over the lifetime of the build programme estimated to be 6 years; • Story Homes Lancashire Office will be relocated to the Site as part of the scheme. Story Homes project that their Lancashire Team will grow from 38 to 50 over the next 4 years. There are clear employment opportunities within all departments and potential new jobs may be filled locally, and opportunities will be provided for apprenticeships and training; • The flexible startup/workshop space will provide approximately 34 jobs based on total floorspace, using the HCA Employment Densities

	<p>guide, and whilst it is accepted that this may not be delivered in its entirety it is anticipated that jobs would be created.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indirect Jobs through the local supply chain via the purchase of goods and services by both residents and new businesses; and • Annual Council Tax contributions of around £521,985.
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to Chorley Council's minimum housing requirement; • Development of new housing in a sustainable location close to established residential areas, and which reflects the local character and the Site's surroundings; • Delivery of substantial areas of new open space, reopening a site for public use, which for a long time has been associated with leisure and recreation; • Delivery of housing provision to meet local housing needs, providing a high quality development, and a broader choice in terms of housing type, tenure and size; • Larger population will support the continuation of existing services and facilities; • Removal of hazard caused by existing Theme Park Structures; • Improvement to visual quality of the Site from surrounding areas; • Revitalising a redundant brownfield site; Commitment made through the Planning Application to provide funding towards the improvement of the existing Bus Service which links the Site to Chorley; • Support to community infrastructure delivery through a CIL payment of approximately £3 million. This could be used by the Council to fund, in part, three infrastructure projects identified locally on the Regulation 123 list, which includes funding towards improvements in Medical Care, expansion of Eccleston Primary School, and cycling route improvements between Eccleston and Chorley; • 15% of the collected CIL Payment (around £450,000) from the proposed development will be passed directly to Charnock Richard Parish Council for spending on local priorities; Given that this is an outline application that would require subsequent approval of reserved matters it is acknowledged that schemes for the use of such monies would need to be devised by the Parish Council and given the level of funding involved it is anticipated that Chorley Councils officers would be required to assist with such proposals.
Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Site benefits from links to the local highway network, local public transport services and pedestrian and cycle provision; • The Site is within walking distance of local facilities and services; • The application includes proposals to minimise the reliance on the car by residents and future users of the Site. This includes a proposal for a new footpath link from within the Site to the existing public bridleway. • Funding would be provided to subsidise an improved bus service along Park Hall Road and would be secured through a s106 agreement; • Improvements to the environmental quality of the existing site. Addressing areas which are over grown, subject to contamination, and currently occupied by large areas of hard standing/abandoned

	<p>structures/buildings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syd Brook will be de-culverted as part of the proposed development; • The proposed development makes use of previously development land avoiding the loss of Best and Most Versatile Land for future development needs; • Redevelopment of the Site would not increase Flood Risk elsewhere, and has the potential to be of benefit to existing run-off due to the reduction in hard standing proposed; • The proposed development would not have an adverse effect on local ecology. Improvements in the quality of the Site together with new planting may provide for net biodiversity gains; and • The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on nearby existing listed buildings or their setting. The proposed development does not lie within a Conservation Area.
--	---

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

15. Planning applications must still be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise as provided by section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The adopted development plan for the purposes of Section 38(6) are the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD (Sept 2013) and the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026.

Planning policy and national policy position

16. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies and how these are expected to be applied.

17. The Framework sets out at paragraph 186 that local planning authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development. The relationship between decision-taking and plan-making should be seamless, translating plans into high quality development on the ground.

18. Paragraph 187 goes on to state that local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

19. The Framework confirms at paragraph 196 that the planning system is plan-led. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions.

20. Paragraph 197 goes on to state that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

21. Paragraph 6 identifies that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which is defined with reference to paragraphs 18-219 of the Framework as a whole.
22. Paragraph 7 identifies that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental and that the planning system must therefore perform a number of roles:
- An economic role** – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy;
- A social role** – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities;
- An environmental role** – contributing to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.
23. Paragraph 14 sets out that a presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the heart of the Framework, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay
24. The development plan policies are not out of date, which was confirmed following the recent dismissal of Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/W/17/3173275, Land at Pear Tree Lane, Euxton, in November 2017.
25. Paragraph 17 sets out that within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following 12 principles set out that planning should:
- Point 1: be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;
 - Point 2: not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;
 - Point 3: proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities;
 - Point 4: always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
 - Point 5: take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;
 - Point 6: support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk; encourage the reuse of existing resources, and encourage the use of renewable resources;

- Point 7: contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution;
 - Point 8: encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;
 - Point 9: promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production);
 - Point 10: conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;
 - Point 11: actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable; and
 - Point 12: take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.
26. Paragraphs 18 and 19 indicate the Government is committed to ensuring the planning system does everything it can to support economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the system.
27. Paragraph 21 states that “In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should support existing business sectors taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting. Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances”.
28. Paragraph 28 states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. Also promotes the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages.
29. Paragraphs 29 to 36 address the importance of facilitating sustainable transport and advocates the encouragement of development in accessible locations.
30. Paragraph 32 states that all development that generates a significant amount of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement which the applicant has submitted. Decisions should take account of whether improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of a development. Development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
31. Paragraph 33 states that plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in the Framework particularly in rural areas.
32. Paragraph 38 requires that for larger scale residential developments, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.

33. Paragraph 47 states that to boost significantly the supply of housing local planning authorities should: use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the Framework. Identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five-year's worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. The interpretation and application of this policy has been the subject of a number of recent decisions by the Courts.
34. Paragraph 49 requires housing applications to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date.
35. Paragraph 50 aims to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen choice for home ownership and create sustainable inclusive and mixed communities. Local planning authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community.
36. Paragraph 54 (in relation to rural areas) states that Local Planning Authorities should in particular consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs.
37. Paragraphs 56 - 57 state that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built development.
38. Paragraph 70 states that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:
 - Plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities, and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.
 - Ensure an integrated approach towards considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities should be taken.
39. Paragraph 79 states 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.
40. Paragraph 80 sets out the five purposes of Green Belt.
41. Paragraph 81 states: *"local authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land."*
42. Paragraph 84 sets out that: *"when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards*

towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary”.

43. Paragraph 87 sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 goes on to state that: *“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”*

44. Paragraph 89 states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this include:

... 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.

45. Paragraph 109 sets out that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
- preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability; and
- remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

46. Paragraph 111 states that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), providing that it is not of high environmental value.

47. Paragraph 113 states that: *“Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks.”*

48. Paragraph 118 states that, when determining planning applications, LPAs should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.

49. Paragraph 123 relates to noise and sets out that planning policies and decisions should aim to:

- avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development;
 - mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions;
 - recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and
 - identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.
50. Paragraph 215 states that: “By encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.”
51. In summary, the Framework identifies the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. An exception to this is 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.
52. Annex A defines previously developed sites in the Green Belt as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. None of the exclusions apply. In particular, the site does not constitute land in a built-up area (such as a private residential garden) and/or a park, recreation ground or allotment. Further, the remains of the permanent structures and/or fixed surface structures have not blended into the landscape in the process of time.
53. If the proposal constitutes inappropriate development, it must demonstrate very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness (to which substantial weight must attach) and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
54. The Framework encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. There is a presumption in the Framework in favour of a sustainable development, which will support economic growth, create jobs, and facilitate the provision of significant affordable housing.
55. The Framework states plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in the Framework particularly in rural areas.
56. The Framework states that for larger scale residential developments, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day

activities including work on site. Key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.

57. The Framework identifies that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental and that the planning system must therefore perform a number of roles: an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy; a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities; and an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.

Development plan policy

Joint Core Strategy

58. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CS) was adopted July 2012. Whilst the Plan was largely formulated prior to the Framework, the CS was actually adopted after a period of consultation after publication of the Framework. The CS therefore post-dates the Framework.
59. Policy 1 of the CS sets out to 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
60. Policy 1 designates the Camelot site within criteria (f). The Camelot site is not identified for growth or within an area identified for growth in CS Policy 1. This policy directs growth and investment to Chorley (Key Service Centre), and Strategic sites (Buckshaw Village), some growth and investment at Urban Local Service Centres (Coppull – 1.5km distance), and limited growth and investment at Rural Local Service Centres (Eccleston – 2k distance).
61. This site is to be assessed under Criteria (f), which relates to “other places” i.e. smaller villages, substantial built up frontages and major developed sites, where development will be typically 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.
62. Para 5.53 of the CS says the historic use of a large site in the Green Belt (“a Major Developed Site”) may cease and the site owners may consequently seek an alternative use. Such sites are generally not in the most accessible locations, so are normally not appropriate for uses that would generate large numbers of trips to access off-site services.
63. The red line boundary of the site is c. 21.4ha, within which is proposed 195 dwellings, Class B1 office space and workshop/starter units, as well as associated infrastructure and open space. 68 units (35%) are to be affordable dwellings and the remaining 127 units are general market housing. The proposal is, therefore, considered to be a larger scale redevelopment scheme for the purposes of Policy 1(f).

64. A large scale scheme as proposed will, therefore, only be considered appropriate on this site where there are “*exceptional reasons*”. If there are such exceptional reasons, the proposal will comply with the CS.
65. The applicant sets out their case for exceptional reasons in paragraphs 8.40 – 8.44 of the Planning Statement. In summary, the applicant states that the previous use (Theme Park) is no longer viable and the site has fallen into a state of disrepair, is a safety risk and detracts from the surrounding area. The proposed development would, therefore, provide an opportunity to make use of a redundant and dilapidated site. The applicant considers that the benefits brought by the proposed development (economic, social and environmental as set out in Chapter 9 of the Planning Statement) constitute (on balance) “exceptional reasons” to justify compliance with the development plan and approval.
66. Other relevant Core Strategy Policies are:
- Policy MP, which clarifies the operational relationship between the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the Framework. Planning policies that accord with the policies in the Core Strategy will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date the Council will grant planning permission unless material considerations indicate taking into account Policy MP a) and b).
 - Policy 2: Infrastructure: considers the need for the provision of infrastructure from development where an evidence of need can be established. This states that local authorities will “Work with infrastructure providers to establish works and/or service requirements that will arise from or be made worse by development proposals and determine what could be met through developer contributions, having taken account of other likely funding sources.
 - If a funding shortfall in needed infrastructure provision is identified, this should be secured through developer contributions, that new development meets the on and off-site infrastructure requirements necessary to support development and mitigate any impact of that development on existing community interests as determined by the local planning authority.
 - Policy 4: Housing Delivery: aims to provide for and manage the delivery of new housing. Of particular relevance criteria c) seeks to ensure there is enough deliverable land suitable for house building capable of providing a continuous forward looking 5 year supply in each district from the start of each monitoring period and in locations that are in line with Policy 1, the brownfield target (of 70% of all new housing being provided on previously developed (brownfield land)) and suitable for developments that will provide the range and mix of those types necessary to meet the requirements of the Plan area. The Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report (January 2017) identifies 56.4% of new dwellings were developed on brownfield land in 2015/16.
 - A recent appeal decision dated 30th November 2017 (Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/W/17/3173275) at Land at Pear Tree Lane, Euxton, dismissed an appeal against the decision of Chorley Council to refuse planning permission for outline

planning permission for up to 165 dwellings on Safeguarded Land. The inspector endorsed a housing requirement of 444 dwellings per annum resulting in a total requirement of 5328 dwellings over the plan period. This was translated to a requirement of 2037 over the 5 year period including a 5% buffer, With a supply of 2482 endorsed by the Inspector over the 5 year period this results in an available housing supply of 6.1 years.

- Policy 5: Housing Density – The proposal is for low/medium density within a range of 25-37 units per ha.
- Policy 7: Affordable and Special Needs Housing – The scheme as proposed will generate 68 affordable homes (35%) The policy requires a target from market housing schemes of 35% in rural areas. Affordable housing distribution within the site is not identified at this stage (see Chorley Rural Housing Needs Survey section). The policy preamble identifies a preference for locating affordable housing in more accessible locations close to amenities, but acknowledges the need for affordable housing in rural areas and the difficulties associated with achieving this. The development would provide on site affordable housing that would be targeted towards those with local connections, which would be secured through the section 106 legal agreement.
- Policies 9: Economic Growth and Employment and 10: Employment Premises and Sites - support the development and protection of employment land and premises.
- Policy 14(B): Education - sets out a requirement for developers to contribute towards the provision of school places where their development would result in or worsen a lack of capacity at existing schools.
- Policy 17: Design of new buildings - sets out a list of criteria for the design and layout of housing development. This is an outline scheme. The Applicant has shown one way in which the site could be developed acceptably (as a matter of principle).
- Policy 18: Green Infrastructure – seeks to invest and improve the natural environment.
- Policy 21: Landscape Character Areas – seeks the integration of new development into existing settlement patterns, appropriate to the landscape character type and designation within which it is situated and contribute positively to its conservation, enhancement or restoration or the creation of appropriate new features. The site falls within the County’s Landscape Character Assessment – Landscape Character Type 6: Industrial Foothills and Valleys and sub category: Adlington – Coppull. This defines the area as being not generally well wooded, but contains important semi-natural woodland within the Yarrow Valley and plantations associated with large reclamation schemes.
- Policy 22: Biodiversity and Geodiversity – seeks to conserve, protect, enhance and manage the biological and geological assets of the area through the following measures: a) promote the conservation and enhancement of biological diversity having particular regard to the favourable condition, restoration and re-establishment of priority habitats and species populations; b) seeking opportunities to conserve, enhance and expand ecological networks. The Central Lancashire Biodiversity and

Nature Conservation Supplementary Planning Document was adopted in July 2015 and further information is set out below in relation to ecological networks.

The Central Lancashire Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Supplementary Planning Document was adopted in July 2015 and part of the application site is shown as Ecological Network Woodland, which means any application in this area is likely to have an impact on biodiversity and such an application should be supported by the necessary surveys and assessments so that the impacts of the proposal can be properly assessed.

- Policy 23: Health f) – seeks to integrate public health principles and planning by, amongst other things, safeguarding and encouraging the role of allotments in providing access to healthy and affordable locally produced food options. The proposal provides community allotments and food growing.
- Policy 24: - Sport and Recreation – open space standards. The Open Space and Playing Pitch SPD (adopted Sept 2013) sets out the method by which contributions for sport and recreation facilities should be sought through development.
- Policy 25: Community Facilities – seeks to ensure that local communities have sufficient community facilities provision by, amongst other things, assessing all development proposals for new housing in terms of their contribution to providing access to a range of core services including education and basic health and care.
- Policy 27: Sustainable Resources & New Developments – seeks to incorporate sustainable resources into new development.

67. The CS policies post-date the Framework and have been endorsed by the Pear Tree Lane appeal and should be given full weight.

Minerals and Waste SADPD

68. Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD (Sept 2013) includes policy M2. The site is included within a safeguarding minerals allocated area. Lancashire County Council will assess the Minerals Assessment. The Chorley Local Plan 2010-2012 shows the mineral safeguarding area at the Camelot site.
69. The applicant has provided a Mineral Resource Assessment which shows that there are no viable mineral resources in the application area. This issue is addressed further below.

Chorley Local Plan

70. The Chorley Local Plan was adopted in July 2015. In the development of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 the Inspector, in her partial report, assessed the Park Hall/Camelot Leisure Complex (AL07) as an Alternative Housing site. The Inspector considered that, as it is a previously developed site, it could come forward as a windfall site in the Green Belt, provided that any proposal for its redevelopment satisfied other relevant policies of the Plan including policy BNE5, and the Framework.
71. Policy BNE5 relates to the redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt. The Policies Map identifies Park Hall/Camelot Leisure Complex as a previously developed site located in the Green Belt. Policy BNE5 therefore applies. The policy is permissive, provided that a number of criteria are met.

72. In relation to policy BNE5, criteria d) is of relevance to this application because this is a proposal which comprises “redevelopment”. The policy states:

“The reuse, infilling or redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt, will be permitted providing the following criteria are met:

In the case of re-use

- a) The proposal does not have a materially greater impact than the existing use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it;*
- b) The development respects the character of the landscape and has regard to the need to integrate the development with its surroundings, and will not be of significant detriment to features of historical or ecological importance.*

In the case of infill:

- c) The proposal does not lead to a major increase in the developed portion of the site, resulting in a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.*

In the case of redevelopment:

- d) The appearance of the site as a whole is maintained or enhanced and that all proposals, including those for partial redevelopment, are put forward in the context of a comprehensive plan for the site as a whole”.*

73. The preamble to policy BNE5 sets out that the Framework allows for the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield), 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. Green Belt sites are often in edge of settlement or isolated locations where redevelopment could place very different demands on existing infrastructure. It will be necessary to consider the impact on infrastructure as a result of redevelopment. It may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure improvements.

74. Other Relevant Local Plan 2012 – 2026 Policies which should be afforded weight are:

- Policy V1 Model Policy
- Policy ST1 New provision or improvement of footpaths, cycleways, bridleways and their associated facilities in existing networks and new development
- Policy ST3 Road Schemes and Development Access.
- Policy ST4 Car Parking Standards – proposals need to make parking provision in accordance with the standards set out in Appendix D
- Policy HS4A Open Space requirements in new developments.
- Policy HS4B Playing pitch requirements in new housing developments
- Policy EP9 Development in Edge – of Centre and Out of Centre Locations
- BNE1 Design Criteria for New Development.
- BNE9 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation
- BNE10 Trees
- BNE11 Species Protection

Housing land supply

75. Chorley has a five year deliverable supply of housing plus 5%. The September 2017 Five Year Supply Statement for Chorley indicates a 8.6 year deliverable housing supply over the period 2017 – 2022. Therefore, there is no urgent requirement to release additional land for housing in the Borough. However, housing requirements are not a maximum and the Government requires local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing. Proposals for additional housing will be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
76. It is noted that a recent appeal decision dated 30th November 2017 (Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/W/17/3173275) at Land at Pear Tree Lane, Euxton, dismissed an appeal against the decision of Chorley Council to refuse planning permission for outline planning permission for up to 165 dwellings on Safeguarded Land. The Inspector carried out an assessment of the Council's five year deliverable supply of housing and concluded that the 5 year housing requirement is 2037 dwellings, leading to a supply of 6.1 years. As such the Council could demonstrate a supply of housing land in excess of 5 years and relevant development plan policies for the supply of housing could be considered up to date as recently as 30th November 2017.
77. Paragraphs 49 and 14 of the Framework cannot therefore be engaged and moderate weight can be attached to the need for housing in these circumstances. It should be noted, however, that in the Euxton Appeal, the Inspector still attached significant weight to the need for more housing (DL 64), even though there was a 5 year supply.
78. Given that the policies of the development plan are not out of date the tilted balance is therefore not engaged.

Principle of the development

79. The site is located within the Green Belt and is designated as a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt under policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026.
80. This part of the Borough is not identified for growth. Policy 1 of the Core Strategy does allow for small scale development, limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need states. In other places, such as Major Developed Sites, a large scale scheme (as proposed) will only be considered acceptable where there are "exceptional reasons" for a larger scale redevelopment scheme.
81. The applicant considers that the exceptional reasons in this case relate to the benefits of the development under the Framework's social, economic and environmental dimensions (which is set out above within the applicant's case summary of benefits section).

Locating growth

82. The applicant's list of benefits is noted and will be assessed as part of the overall balancing exercise, particularly taking into account the fact that the Core Strategy includes a brownfield target to locate 70% of all new housing on previously developed sites. In addition to this, further benefits have been negotiated through the application process, which include the provision of 68 affordable dwellings to be provided on site or alternative equivalent, on-site provision of public open space and off site contributions amounting to £314,730 for allotments and playing pitches, and a contribution to the provision of local primary school places amounting to £298,563.51.
83. Of particular benefit is the reuse of a redundant and dilapidated brownfield site that has fallen into disrepair and has become a safety risk. As such it detracts from the character

and appearance of the area. Its redevelopment would open up previously inaccessible areas for public use and would provide environmental benefits through opening up an existing culvert, reducing the extent of hardstanding and improving drainage, landscape management and biodiversity. Although the benefits presented by the applicant and negotiated through the process could not be considered exceptional individually, when added together they are considered to amount to the exceptional reasons required to justify this particular large scale development in an area that is not identified for growth by Policy 1 of the Core Strategy.

Is the development inappropriate in the Green Belt?

84. The application site is identified by the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026 as previously developed land within the Green Belt. Previously developed land is defined by Annex A of the Framework as being land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures; land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.
85. As the site is defined as previously developed land the proposal would engage with the exception contained within bullet point 6, paragraph 89, of The Framework involving the complete redevelopment of a redundant previously developed site on the proviso that the development does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it.
86. The proposal is for the complete redevelopment of this major previously developed site. The site has been redundant since the closure of the theme park in 2012. It is noted that the hotel and existing industrial units adjoining the site are in continuing use, and do not form part of the application site.
87. The buildings on the site are not considered to be temporary. A "Building" is defined in Section 336(1) T&CPA (1990) to include any structure or erection, and any part of the building, as so defined, but does not include plant or machinery comprised in a building. It is considered that a fairground ride (such as a rollercoaster) is likely to constitute a "structure or erection" for the purposes of the Act.
88. Although there is no definitive definition of such a structure it is universally accepted that there are three primary factors to take into consideration when establishing whether a building / structure is temporary. These include (1) the size of the structure, (2) permanence, and (3) physical attachment to the land.
89. Whilst a number of the buildings on the site (e.g. storage buildings/ retail kiosks etc) may not have typical construction methods, such as the inclusion of foundations, it is clear that these buildings have a degree of physical attachment beyond that of a temporary building. All of the buildings/ structures on site have been in situ for a number of years and have a degree of permanence. As such it is not considered that any of the buildings/ structures on site are temporary.

90. Whilst the test for sites such as this relates to the impact on openness it is important to note that the Framework contains no specific definition of 'openness'.
91. It is considered that in respect of the Framework that the existing theme park has an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Although the existing structures have limited visibility there is an impact to openness simply because the building/structures exist.
92. However, it is important to note that the presence of a structure on the site currently does not justify any new buildings. The exception contained within the Framework is only engaged where the development would not "have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt".
93. Whether the proposed dwellings have a greater impact on openness is a subjective judgment which is considered further below. Objective criteria in the case of this site could include the footprint of the existing structures and the height of the existing structures.
94. In 2009, the Council agreed the capacity of the site with RPS who at that time were acting on behalf of a house builder. At this time it was agreed that the garden centre, demolished in March 2003, and 'Venom' ride, demolished in January 2002, could be included within future capacity considerations although the Go Kart Building was excluded. This agreement related to the provisions contained within the now superseded PPG2. The footprint of the agreed capacity of the site equates to a footprint of 26,548m², however, it is important to note that this capacity included the garden centre (4078m²) and the demolished Venom ride (1472m²) which have not been in situ for over 10 years now.
95. It is also noted that other buildings have been removed over the past few years and whilst PPG2 allowed for the inclusion of demolished buildings within any capacity assessment, The Framework does not specify such an allowance or capacity test. To engage with the exceptions of paragraph 89 of the Framework, which is reflected in policy BNE5 of the Local Plan, the test relates to the existing development, and therefore none of the building and structures that have been removed can be considered in the assessment of the impact on openness. The openness of an area is clearly affected by the erection or positioning of any object within it no matter whether the object is clearly visible or not. The openness test relates to the whole of the application site.
96. Members will recall that recent applications for development have referred to the Boot vs Elmbridge Borough Council High Court Judgment of January 2017, which considers how Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework should be interpreted, and the implications of this for the determination of planning applications in the Green Belt. This High Court Judgment reiterates the position that any conclusion of adverse impact on openness, however limited, will see an application failing to meet the requirements of Paragraph 89 of the Framework, and is specifically concerned with bullet point 2 of the Framework, concerning new facilities for outdoor sport and recreation. The Judgment does not, however, seek to alter the understood context of the test to be undertaken in cases of previously developed sites in the Green Belt, which is outlined within bullet point 6, and sets out that proposals must not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. The basis of such an assessment of openness is, therefore, provided for by contrasting this to existing urban form.

97. Based on the above context, it is considered that in order to arrive at a legitimate conclusion of the impact of a development upon openness, it is important to consider the site as a whole rather than attempt to break it down into smaller areas. To do so otherwise would be counterproductive in achieving the comprehensive redevelopment of this major developed site in the Green Belt, contrary to the aims of Paragraph 89 bullet point 6 and the requirements of policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan.
98. The impact on openness must, therefore, be assessed on a site wide basis to ensure consistency with the development plan context and the Framework in addressing brownfield land on a comprehensive basis.
99. The geographical scope of this assessment is set out within Council's Proposals Map. The Proposals Map defines the previously developed extent of the Former Camelot Theme Park with boundaries purposefully defined by the Council to reflect the current built extent of the site. The extent of this boundary together with policy BNE5 has been thoroughly examined by way of public examination and found to be consistent with the Framework.
100. Responding to this context, the applicant has submitted a scheme, which falls within the previously development land boundaries set out in the Local Plan and would reduce the overall footprint of hard standing across the site.
101. From a height perspective, there were a number of buildings and structures on site which were above 6 metres in height (i.e. the average height of a two-storey dwelling). The Nightmare ride is the tallest structure with an estimated height of 26 metres. The average height of all of the remaining structures which were on the site is 10.5 metres (not including the Nightmare ride). As such, a reduction in height would see a new benefit on the visual impacts of the site although this does not result in a development that necessarily has less impact on openness than the current structures on site.
102. The net benefits to the Green Belt are material considerations however they do not relate to the test of openness.
103. The footprint/ volume of the existing structures on site have not been provided in support of the proposals, however, from visual inspections and taking into account what currently remains on the site it can only be concluded that the proposed development will have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt given the existing large areas of hardstanding and the fact that a number of the structures no longer exist. Whilst there will be a reduction in height, which is a material consideration assessed below, from an openness perspective the perception is that the impact on openness will be greater.
104. The complete redevelopment of such previously developed land would have a greater impact on openness and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Substantial weight should be attached to the harm by reason of inappropriateness as set out at paragraph 88 of the Framework.
105. As the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development the tests of paragraph 88 of the Framework are engaged. This sets out that 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.
106. The harm to the Green Belt comprises:

- Harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness to which substantial weight is attached;
- Harm to openness to which substantial weight is attached.
- The harm to the purposes of the Green Belt are set out at paragraph 80 of the Framework, which identifies the five purposes of the Green Belt. An assessment of the application site in relation to the five purposes is set out below:

107. Purpose 1: Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. The site can be considered to be within a built environment. There are specific boundaries such as the existing M6 motorway, the existing land form of the industrial buildings and the Park Hall complex; and the natural form of woodland (Little Wood) which surround parts of the application site. The site is not adjoined to any large built-up area and as such does not fulfil this purpose. The site occupies a discrete area of brownfield land and is enclosed by robust and defensible boundaries. Its redevelopment would not alter areas outside the defined previously developed areas of the site and therefore would not urbanise any areas beyond it. Accordingly, this development would not have any material adverse impact on this purpose.

108. Purpose 2: Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. Development of the site would not lead to the coalescence of neighbouring villages. The Site is located between the nearby settlements of Heskin, Ecclestone, Charnock Richard and Coppull, which are all currently separated by existing open countryside, the Charnock Richard Motorway Service Area, and the M6. The application site is itself restricted to the previously developed areas of the Former Camelot Theme Park Site as defined by the Proposals Map, and its redevelopment would not therefore advance the urban form any closer to any of these settlements nor lead to their coalescence.

109. Purpose 3: Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The development would not result in encroachment of the countryside. The site is previously developed. The extent of the previously developed parts of the site have been defined by the Chorley Local Plan Proposals Map. The proposed development (as amended through the submission of revised plans) would not advance the built form of the site beyond this area, making best use of the developed areas of the site. There would not be any additional encroachment on the countryside.

110. Purpose 4: Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. This does not apply as the site is not located near a historical town.

111. Purpose 5: Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The proposal would recycle a derelict site, removing vacant rides, unused buildings and structures, bringing the site back into an alternative use.

112. Based on the above it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to any of the five purposes of the Green Belt.

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, including Management Plan

113. The application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (which has been prepared in accordance with the latest guidance (Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment's Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment (GLVIA) 3rd Edition (2013)) and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA).

114. The study is comprehensive and addresses both landscape and visual issues including a thorough policy review, site appraisal, visual appraisal and review of national, regional and local landscape character.
115. The LVIA acknowledges that there will be a number of adverse landscape and visual effects in the short term, however, the majority of these will become neutral or beneficial effects as the proposed landscape mitigation measures mature. By year 15 following the completion of the development the following 'residual adverse' visual effects are identified:
- Changes to views for isolated properties to the north of the site such as at Sibberings Farm and New Park Hall
 - Changes to views for isolated properties to the south of the Site such as at Highgrove Avenue and Pemberton Farm.
 - Changes to views for users of PROW EC/9, part of PROW 6, PROWs 4,5 and 7
 - Changes of views for users of Park Hall Road and Red Lane.
116. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with current best practice and acknowledges that there are likely to be a number of short term adverse landscape effects due to loss of trees and a number of short term adverse visual effects for local residential receptors and users of roads and public rights of way. The proposed development is supported by a comprehensive landscape mitigation plan, which in the context of the existing degraded nature of the site would reduce the severity of residual adverse landscape and visual effects or make these effects beneficial in the long term. The report identifies only a relatively small number of residual landscape and visual receptors, which will continue to have adverse effects beyond the development / maturation of the landscape mitigation measures (15 years after the completion of the Proposed Development).
117. It is considered that the Landscape and Visual Assessment as submitted presents a fair assessment of the likely changes to the landscape and visual resource following the construction of the Proposed Development.
118. From a visual impact perspective it is considered that removing the large structures from the site, which are visible within the surrounding area and creating a self-contained site, will benefit the visual characteristics of the area.
119. Although it is acknowledged that there will be an initial visual impact, whilst the landscaping scheme takes effect, the long term outcome would be of visual benefit with large structures removed from site and unsightly dereliction ameliorated. It is therefore considered that there would be limited adverse impacts and that the aspects of harm identified above would be mitigated on balance through a comprehensive landscaping scheme. No harm is therefore attached to this aspect of the proposal.

Other harm

120. Other harm exists in terms of the accessibility of the location. The site lies some distance from local centres and shopping areas. Local amenities would largely require access by car from the site. It is noted that the site is located on Park Hall Road, which is a classified and adopted road maintained by Lancashire County Council. The site is also

close to the A49, which is a major arterial route providing access to larger settlements. There are also footpaths along the highways, which makes walking possible. The site therefore benefits from a degree of accessibility but is located away from existing amenities and therefore some moderate harm is attached to the accessibility of the site. The technical aspects are covered in greater detail below.

121. There would be a highway impact from the proposed development through the dwellings, business units and an office. These would generate trips to and from the site, however, it must be considered that the theme park also attracted significant journeys to and from the site at its peak. It is also acknowledged that the site continues to be accessed for the hotel and leisure uses and employment units. The existing site access to Park Hall Road would be retained with some improvements, and this is considered adequate by LCC. The highway impact is considered to be finely balanced and no harm is therefore attached to this aspect of the proposal.

The case for Very Special Circumstances

122. The case for very special circumstances presented by the applicant is set out below with the associated weight attached to them;

Social Dimension (supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being)	
1. The reuse of redundant brownfield land is consistent with Paragraph 17 of the NPPF which seeks to make effective use of land.	Moderate weight
2. There is a critical need to address significant on-going public safety problems experienced on site, which is difficult to secure given its scale. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts made to access the site without authorisation. This typically amounts to at least 8 people per day sometimes raising to 15 people day. Over the last 5 months, in excess of 1,200 people have attempted to access the Site illegally, often resulting in anti-social behaviour; • Arson to several remaining buildings within the site; • Attempts to host illegal parties within remaining structures; • Attempts to scale the Nightmare Rollercoaster, amongst other structures, which poses a risk of serious injury or worse; and • Failing structures on site presenting a threat to public safety. <p>To prevent cases of unauthorised access and limit the potential for damage, injury or loss of life, Story Homes have taken extensive security measures to limit access to the site. Enhanced security fencing has been erected to make access more difficult. Story Homes also employ six security guards whom undertake regular patrols of</p>	Moderate weight

<p>the Site and operate 24 hours a day.</p> <p>Whilst Story Homes remain committed to ensuring the safety of the general public through the prevention of access to the Site, the current position is not sustainable, nor will it provide a long term solution in addressing existing problems.</p> <p>The dilapidated condition of many of the existing structures and buildings on site mean that securing its restoration to a natural state, or reuse for tourism will be at a significant cost requiring a commercial incentive. The tourism use of the site has already proven to be unviable and this continues to be the case. This use of the Site for leisure purposes is therefore not commercially viable. A mixed use redevelopment of the Site to the scale proposed is considered to create the correct balance in providing sufficient capital to sufficiently address the condition of the Site, enabling its effective and comprehensive redevelopment, whilst allowing for uses which are suitable and sensitive use of the Site to its surroundings and constraints. This will resolve any potential threats to public safety posed by those who continue to attempt to access the Site and wholly improve the appearance of the site.</p>	
<p>3. Though the applicant accepts that the Council would appear to be in a relatively strong position in terms of its housing land supply position, the delivery of new housing on site should nevertheless be considered to provide for some social benefits given that these new dwellings will supplement the achievement of minimum development requirements, assist the Council in maintaining a five year supply, provide for a range of housing types and sizes in response to needs, deliver housing in a part of the borough which has seen limited development within the plan period supporting the vitality and vibrancy of existing centres, services and facilities, and provide for additional affordable housing.</p>	Significant weight
<p>Economic Dimension (contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure)</p>	
<p>1. Support to existing local shops, businesses, services, and facilities through additional economic activity and use;</p>	Limited weight
<p>2. Support to new construction sector jobs through the development of the Site, and following construction with apprentice opportunities created on site through Story Homes apprenticeship scheme;</p>	Moderate weight

3. Opportunities for small rural enterprises to set up and operate within the locality supporting further local jobs; and	Moderate weight
4. The development of the Story Homes Lancashire Office will provide additional opportunities for local employment and training, with apprenticeships available to local people based on site. Its development will also allow for Story Homes to maintain their presence within the Borough.	Limited weight
Environmental Dimension (contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.	
1. The proposed development will see large parts of the Site opened up from development.	Moderate weight
2. The applicant proposes to de-culvert the existing watercourse which traverses the site to the benefit of local wildlife.	Substantial weight
3. The reduction in over footprint of built developed and hard standing on site will provide a benefit by reducing the rate at which surface water drains from the site.	Moderate weight
4. The proposed development will see the management of woodlands located within the site boundary which will be beneficial to the overall health and quality of existing trees and local wildlife. Supplementary planting will provide for an overall net biodiversity gain on site consistent with the NPPF.	Moderate weight

123. The site is previously developed land and its redevelopment is encouraged both at a National level within the Framework (one of the 12 core planning principles is to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) - paragraph 17) and a local level with a brownfield target of 70% of all new housing (Give reference for local policy). The development of such a site does carry moderate weight.

124. The site is currently a derelict theme park, which was of significant regional appeal. As such its abandonment attracts much attention and has resulted in repeated trespass and unauthorised activity within the site. The land owner carries out a security regime at the site, however, this is difficult considering the scale of the site and is not sustainable in the long term. There is a critical need to address significant on-going public safety problems experienced on site. The proposed development would provide a viable long term solution to addressing the security of the site and risks to public health and safety that it currently presents. It is therefore considered that substantial weight should be attached to the proposed this benefit of the proposal.

125. The poor condition of the site has a very negative impact on the character and appearance of the locality creating a sense of dereliction and decay, which has detrimental implications for the local community. The proposed development would address the derelict character and create a visual benefit through the removal of existing tall structures and enhanced buffer planting creating a self-contained site that would be possible to maintain. It is considered that substantial weight should be attached to these improvements and the benefits this would have for the community.
126. The development would contribute to the housing land supply within the Borough. Whilst the Borough has in excess of a 5 year housing land supply and has over delivered when compared to the Core Strategy target in recent years this figure is not a maximum and the development would contribute to the Borough's housing land supply in the medium to long term within the Local Plan period. It is also important to note that the Planning Inspector at the time of the Local Plan assessment stated that the site could come forward as a windfall site in the Green Belt. It is considered that significant weight should be attached to this benefit.
127. The new community that would emerge on the site would create additional demand that would support existing local shops, businesses, services, and facilities through additional economic activity and use. This is considered to carry some limited weight.
128. The development would create construction jobs, which have acknowledged economic benefits along the supply chain. At a national level the Framework confirms that the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future (paragraph 18). Paragraph 19 goes on to confirm that the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system. The Central Lancashire Employment Skills Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) would help to secure local employment benefits through the development of the scheme. It is considered that this benefit carries moderate weight.
129. The development would provide opportunities for small rural enterprises to set up and operate within the locality supporting further local jobs. This is encouraged by both national and local policy and is considered to carry moderate weight.
130. The development of the Story Homes Lancashire Office would provide additional opportunities for local employment and training, with apprenticeships available to local people based on site. This is considered to carry some limited weight.
131. The proposals would open up large parts of the site to provide public access with footpath improvements and significant new areas of POS. This would improve accessibility at the site and for the wider community. The development would also contribute to improving existing areas of open space in the Borough, which would benefit the Borough as a whole. This benefit is considered to carry moderate weight.
132. The proposals involve de-culverting an existing watercourse, which has the dual benefit of ameliorating flood risk and improving habitats and ecological conditions. It is considered that substantial weight should be attached to this benefit.

133. The proposed development would result in an overall reduction in the built footprint across the site, which would result in a reduction in the amount of surface water run-off affecting the watercourses downstream at Croston. This would result in a positive benefit in respect of reducing the flood risk potential downstream, and moderate weight should be attached to this benefit.
134. Management of woodlands located within the site boundary would be beneficial to the overall health and quality of existing trees and local wildlife, and supplementary planting would provide for an overall net biodiversity gain on site. This benefit is considered to carry moderate weight.

Green Belt balancing exercise

135. It has been established that there is definitional harm to the Green Belt as the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and also that there is further harm due to the impact on openness, which essentially means free from development, which the site will not be (though it isn't at present).
136. It is considered that there would not be any further harm in terms of visual impact or highway impacts, although there would be moderate harm arising from the accessibility of the site.
137. In terms of the benefits, these are detailed above as covering a range of social, economic and environment benefits already set out in this report. When assessing if there are very special circumstances a number of factors, while ordinary in themselves, can combine to create something very special. These benefits have to be considered and an assessment made as to whether these clearly outweigh the harm so as to amount to very special circumstances.
138. The benefits of the development, when taken together are considered to provide very special circumstances that, on balance, outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm. The very special circumstances also demonstrate exceptional reasons to support such a large scale development scheme in an 'other place' as defined by policy 1 of the Core Strategy. The proposal therefore complies with paragraphs 87 and 88 of the Framework and policy 1 of the central Lancashire Core Strategy;
139. The proposed development complies with policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026 as the application provides a comprehensive plan for the site that would enhance its appearance in line with criterion d.
140. It is concluded that, on balance, this development demonstrates very special circumstances which outweigh the substantial harm (by reason of inappropriateness) and the harm to openness, together with the other harm (particularised above). Further, the proposal demonstrates exceptional reasons for the grant of consent. The proposal therefore complies with policy 1 of the Core Strategy, and policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan. It can also be considered to constitute sustainable development (in the terms of the Framework).

Technical matters

Density and design

141. The application is in outline only at this stage, with all matters reserved save for access. As such no details of the proposed dwellings are proposed at this time. However, an illustrative masterplan and landscape masterplan have been provided to show how development could be laid out acceptably (in principle) across the site, in response to existing features and constraints.

142. New housing provided as part of the redevelopment would be directed towards the southern and north western parts of the site. These parts of the Site feature the most prominent areas of previously developed land and are covered extensively by former theme park structures and buildings. These areas would be separated by extensive greenspace occupying the land close to Syd Brook. The Parcels would be linked through this greenspace by a new road as well as footpath connections. The greenspace would feature retained and enhanced woodland, and natural play space facilities.
143. The southern parcel of new housing would be developed at an indicative density of 25 dwellings per hectare, and would act as the gateway to the site. Strong frontages through the site would aid navigation, and provide for increased surveillance. The southern parcel would also contain a small park, at a nodal point creating an important local communal space for future residents. Dwellings would back onto Park Hall Road to create for a softer development edge. Development adjacent to Kiln Wood would be characterised by larger detached family dwellings.
144. The north western area is to be developed at an indicative density of 23 dwellings per hectare. The lower density reflects the proximity of the Site to more sensitive surroundings and provides for transitional development to more open areas of open countryside to the west and north. Existing trees and water bodies would be retained and interspersed with residential areas to create varied green spaces. Sensitive treatment of the Site boundary with Little Wood would be required to minimise adverse effects on this ecological asset, which could be secured by reserved matters and conditions. Buffer planting along the northern edge of the site would assist in screening views into the site from the north.
145. Although there are no nationally or locally prescribed densities, policy 5 of the Core Strategy pre-ambles states that in rural and suburban locations an average of 25 to 35 dwellings per hectare is typical. It is considered that the densities suggested respect the character of the site by detailing lower densities around the peripheries and higher density contained within a central location. This ensures the efficient and effective use of this brownfield site.
146. The proposal therefore complies with policies 5, 18, and 22 of the Core Strategy and policies HS4, BNE1 and BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 and relevant parts of the Framework.

Employment development

147. Proposals that include employment development in rural settlements are encouraged by policy 13 of the Core Strategy but should aim to meet the needs of local businesses and the local workforce, by assisting to reduce or discourage further increases in commuting to other employment facilities or areas and by creating a sustainable use that relates to the local public transport network. It will be necessary to consider the impact on infrastructure and it may be necessary to co-ordinate the delivery of development with the delivery of infrastructure improvements. This is considered further on in the assessment.
148. The northern area of the site proposed for employment use would feature a number of low density buildings amounting to 2,000sqm each with dedicated parking areas. Buildings would be arranged to overlook the street/parking areas to aid surveillance and provide for a sense of place. New planting/landscaping to the north would screen the site from open countryside, which lies beyond. The south eastern employment area would

feature a single, two-storey building of up to 1,000sqm of floorspace. The building would provide for an attractive landmark, and would act as a gateway to the wider site.

149. The site would be developed on a comprehensive basis with a quantum of employment development that would be appropriate in this location and in the context of a major developed site in the Green Belt. As regards the criteria set out in policy EP3 of the Local Plan these would be addressed in detail at the time of any reserved matters application.
150. Since the submission of this planning application in July 2017, Chorley Council has adopted the Central Lancashire Employment Skills Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD). As a result, the SPD is now a material consideration to this planning application.
151. The proposed development triggers the need for a response to the requirements of the SPD, including the submission of an Employment and Skills Statement (template provided in Appendix 1 to the SPD). It is, however, noted that the submission of this Statement is not required until the detailed stage. As such, given that the application is outline only, an Employment and Skills Statement is not needed to be submitted at this stage. The applicant has, however, submitted a letter providing their position on the SPD, which sets out how the application is responsive to the content of the SPD.
152. The letter makes clear that the proposed development would provide real opportunities for local employment with equal opportunities provided for all members of the local community and prioritisation of youth skill development for local people. The proposed development would benefit the local economy and community with the employment and training opportunities to be offered on site. The letter makes clear that the proposed development is consistent with the Employment Skills SPD, adding weight in favour of approving the submitted outline planning application.
153. In terms of the need for employment units of the type proposed, the Council's Economic Development Officer confirms that over the previous 18 months the Council's database shows that the majority of enquires have been for smaller scale business / industrial units of up to 1500 sq. ft. The Council's data suggests that the borough is currently struggling to provide for these requirements with appropriately sized units. It is noted that similar units at the Momentum Business Centre were occupied quickly following completion and vacancies remain scarce.

Highway safety and access

154. In relation to the strategic highway network Highways England state the proposal would not result in there being a traffic impact upon the Strategic Road Network at M6 Junctions 27 or 28 that would be deemed to be 'severe' in line with the threshold set out in the Framework.
155. It is recognised that private vehicles use the employee / service accesses of the nearby Charnock Richard Motorway Service Area (MSA), illegally, to facilitate access to and from the M6 and the surrounding local road network. Highways England condemns this practice. Increases in development, such as this, surrounding the MSA will undoubtedly increase this problem. It should be noted that the MSA is not within the control of either Highways England or the applicant, and so it is not possible to recommend that conditions are applied to this development to curtail this illegal usage. This means that Highways England is not in a position to enforce measures designed to

deal with this problem. This is a matter for the MSA operator and also for police enforcement.

156. Lancashire County Council (LCC) as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) is responsible for providing and maintaining a safe and reliable highway network. The present and proposed highway systems have been considered and areas of concern that potentially could cause problems for the public, cyclists, public transport, motorists and other vehicles in and around the area have been identified.

157. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) would note that it is critical that further development does not compromise the safe movement of people and goods by any mode or the quality of life experienced within, through and also beyond this local network

Transport Assessment

158. The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) in support of the application. The information contained within the TA is sufficient for highways impact to be suitably assessed without the need for further work to the TA to be undertaken.

Traffic Figures and Traffic Forecasts

159. The TA refers to the previous application and the traffic generation associated with the theme park and goes on to state that this traffic has not been included within the current assessment. LCC accept this as being the appropriate approach.

160. The applicant has undertaken traffic counts at a number of key junctions on the highway network in order to carry out impact assessments. The traffic count information is considered reasonable and suitable for the current base situation for impact assessment analysis.

161. The applicant has used the TRICS database to establish the trip rates for the site. At 7.6.4 of the TA the developer states: "No allowance has been made for potentially lower trip rates from the affordable housing element of the site or for the potential for modal shift away from the private car that could occur as a result of the successful implementation of the Residential and Workplace Travel Plans." And at 7.6.8: "No allowance has been made for the potential for modal shift away from the private car that could occur as a result of the successful implementation of the Travel Plans." This implies that there is robustness in the trip rates used. However, LCC would contend that due to the site's location and the distances to services and amenities, the trip rates could be slightly higher. LCC are prepared to accept the trip rates used by the applicant on the basis that travel plans for the site will be introduced and that sustainable transport improvements can be delivered. These are to be secured through a s106 agreement.

162. The methodology used by the applicant to predict traffic distribution is reasonable and acceptable to LCC.

163. The TA put 2018 as the base year for assessment and provides assessment up to 2025. Given the scale of the development, the assessment years are acceptable. The TA includes a list of committed development and also takes into account traffic growth.

Junction Operational Assessments

164. The TA examines the following 5 junctions;

- i. Park Hall Road/Site Access Priority T-junction

- ii. Park Hall Road/Mill Lane Priority T-junction
- iii. A49 Preston Road/Mill Lane 3 arm mini-roundabout
- iv. Park Hall Road/Wood Lane Priority T-junction
- v. A581 Southport Road/B5250 Lydiate Lane Priority T-junction

165. Each junction has been assessed at 2015 (the base year for assessment), 2018 (the year of opening with traffic grown) and 2025 (with traffic grown, development traffic added and committed developments added).
166. Junctions that operate with an RFC (ratio of flow to capacity) below 0.85 rarely suffer with delay. However, above 0.85 delay can occur, and the higher the RFC the greater the severity of delay.
167. Developments which increase the RFC above 0.85 at a junction may be required to provide mitigation. Increasing queuing at a junction is not necessarily a severe impact unless there is an associated road safety issues associated with it.

Park Hall Road/Site Access Priority T-junction

168. The analysis in the TA shows that this junction currently operates well within its theoretical capacity. The analysis also shows that in the year 2025 when development traffic, traffic from other committed development and background traffic growth are included the junction will continue to operate well within capacity.

Park Hall Road/Mill Lane Priority T-junction

169. The analysis undertaken on this junction shows that the junction will continue to operate with a significant level of spare capacity in the year 2025.

A49 Preston Road/Mill Lane 3 arm mini-roundabout

170. The 2015 base assessment shows that the RFC in the PM peak hour on Mill Lane and the A49 (N) to be at a level where LCC has concerns (ie above 0.85 RFC). Also, of particular concern, is where the base assessments indicate that average queues of 74 vehicles occur throughout the peak hour.
171. Within the TA, the developer explains that the model produces queues that do not reflect the observed situation and, as such, the model needs be tweaked in order to reflect the observed situation (i.e. validating the model). LCC agree that the original model does not reflect the actual situation and that it is appropriate to review the model.
172. When inputting the observed number of vehicles into the model, the model assumes an equal distribution of traffic over the hour. There are situations where traffic peaks within the peak hour, i.e. traffic builds to a peak and then tails off. The developer has tweaked the model in the recognised industry standard fashion to take this into account to produce a validated model which reflects observed queuing. LCC agree with this approach.
173. The scenario for 2025 shows that the junction will operate below capacity but with some arms operating at over 0.85 RFC. This means that some queuing will occur. The level of queuing here is not considered to be excessive and would not be considered to be a severe impact based solely on a slight increase in queue length. Therefore, unless there are safety issues at this junction the impact of the development is not unacceptable. Safety issues are considered further below.

Park Hall Road/Wood Lane Priority T-junction

174. The analysis shows that the junction currently operates below the 0.85 RCF threshold where LCC have no operational concerns, however, in 2025 the RCF in the PM peak is 0.88.

A581 Southport Road/B5250 Lydiate Lane Priority T-junction

175. The base year assessment shows that the junction operates within capacity, however, on examining the traffic profiles for the junction to validate the model it was identified that the model needed to be amended. LCC are content that the appropriate approach during modelling has taken place.

176. The result of the analysis for the 2025 scenario shows that the junction will operate marginally below capacity and some queuing will occur on Lydiate Lane throughout the AM peak hour.

177. Overall the junction capacity assessments show that all the modelled junctions will continue to operate within capacity, albeit with some arms of some junctions close to capacity. As such there are some junctions where longer (than present) queues will occur.

178. As traffic levels increase longer queues are inevitable, this in itself is not necessarily a reason to raise a highways objection. The Framework requires the impact to be severe in order for an objection to be raised.

179. When queuing occurs on the highway it can lead to inappropriate driver behaviour and subsequently impact on road safety. Therefore the impact of queuing at the assessed junctions will need to be assessed to determine whether or not it impacts on highway safety.

Accident Analysis

180. Within the TA the applicant considers injury accidents at a number of junctions and lengths of road over a 5 year period. Although the applicant has identified a total of 48 slight injuries and 7 serious injuries they have concluded that: "from the review of the personal injury accident data that there are no existing road safety concerns within the vicinity of the site."

181. Whilst a total of 55 injuries may appear high it should be noted that this is over a 5 year period and covers 15 junctions and 20 links (roads between junctions). Whilst every accident results in personal injuries is regrettable, in general the overall road safety record is not at a level that causes concern.

182. However, the road safety record for the A581 is of concern.

183. The A581 Southport Road has been identified by the Road Safety Foundation as one of England's 50 roads with the highest risk of fatal and serious collisions. This has led to LCC submitting a bid to the Department for Transport to fund road safety improvements. This does not mean that LCC will cease seeking improvements, to be delivered through s278 works or for contributions secured through s106 from developers.

184. Through the analysis undertaken in the TA it can be seen that the applicant predicts that this development will lead to an additional 16 vehicle movements at the A581 / Lydiate Lane junction in the AM peak and 23 vehicle movements in the PM peak. The

applicant considers that this number of additional movements forms only a small percentage of the 1,600 vehicle movements in the AM and PM peaks at this junction and as such it would have negligible impact on road safety.

185. At the junction of the A49 and Mill Lane, increased queuing will occur as a result of the development proposal. But there has only been 1 injury accident in the last 5 years and as such it should be concluded that the impact of the development proposal here is not severe.
186. At Park Hall Road / Wood Lane junction, there have been 2 injury accidents in the last 5 years and whilst the queuing at the junction will be marginally worse the impact of the development proposal here is not regarded as being severe.
187. Overall the assessment shows that the development traffic can be accommodated locally and strategically without it having a severe impact on highway safety or capacity. It is, nonetheless, an aspect of "other harm" (addressed above).
188. Accordingly, the proposal complies with policy 2 of the Core Strategy and ST4 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026.

Provision for Equestrian, Pedestrian & Cycling, PROW

189. The TA describes the existing highway network from a walking, cycling and equestrian point of view and supplements this information with the Residential and Workplace Framework Travel Plans.
190. There are parts of the existing highway network that are deficient, to the extent that they are not attractive to use as a sustainable transport link. Therefore it is essential that improvements take place to upgrade the existing network to a standard whereby they are safe and attractive to use. It should also be noted that this would also increase use and consequently have a beneficial effect on health.
191. LCC PROW team have identified circular off road walking routes (see appended plan) that link to the wider network that should be improved to facilitate safe pedestrian passage for all (improving surfacing) and allowing cycling (change of status and possible widening). This together with those improvements previously identified when the previous application was being considered would address a number of the sustainable issues associated with the development proposal.
192. Some of the routes that should be upgraded are within the development site and the necessary improvements can be delivered are part of any reserved matters application.
193. Routes which are external to the site may require co-operation of other land owners and involve a change in status from Footpath to Bridleway or dedication as a Cyclepath. Under this situation, LCC consider that the developer should fund these improvements through a s106 contribution.
194. The existing footways on Park Hall Road are narrow but in keeping with the existing pedestrian demand. Some of these footways have become overgrown from vegetation from adjacent land. This should be cleared to improve the quality of walking routes. Elsewhere there are sections adjacent to verges that can be widened.

Public Transport Accessibility and Provision

195. Within the TA the developer discusses rail travel and identifies three stations within 6.5km of the development site. A fourth station (Buckshaw Parkway) is a little further away but offers a greater level of car parking than the other three combined.
196. In terms of distance from the development site to the stations, all are beyond the mean average length for walking journeys (approximately 1 km or 0.6 miles) and for cycling, (4 km or 2.4 miles), as identified in DfT's LTN 1/04 - Policy, Planning and Design for Walking and Cycling and as such are likely to lead to car borne journeys as there are currently limited opportunities for bus travel.
197. Since the time of the previous application, LCC have reviewed public transport provision countywide due to a need to make budget cuts. This has resulted in a reduction of subsidised services and in some cases the total withdrawal of some services.
198. In the TA, the developer identifies one bus service that passes the site access, however, there are only five buses per day. The developer identifies a second bus service at Woods Lane, approximately 1.1km from the site access, where buses operate on an hourly basis.
199. The developer states that "community transport" services operate in the Heskin / Ecclestone area.
200. The developer discusses potential improvements to public transport in the TA and have held discussions with Stagecoach regarding the re-introduction of services. LCC welcome this approach and consider that funding through a s106 would ensure that reasonable public transport provision for the area could be provided.
201. The developer has also indicated a willingness to provide school transport to local schools and make contributions via the travel plan to support the dial a bus service, which would also be secured through a s106 agreement.

Accessibility / Sustainability.

202. The development site is removed from amenities, shops, schools, employment, etc. and as such it will be a car dominant development. Limited on site employment opportunities currently exist and although the proposal will increase these level they will still be limited when compared with the scale of the residential element of the proposal.
203. The Motorway Service Area (MSA) immediately adjacent to the site offers a range of shops, however, no legitimate access to it exists. Within the TA, the developer discusses pedestrian access to the MSA, which the developer previously promoted but the LPA considered "not suitable". Even without a direct pedestrian link between the development site and the MSA there is a likelihood that journeys would be made via the service road access to the MSA.

Travel Plan

204. The developer has submitted Framework Travel Plans for both the residential and employment elements of the development proposal, which can be secured via condition.
205. 1. Residential Framework Travel Plan: The Residential Framework Travel Plan submitted does not meet all of LCC's submission criteria for a Framework Travel Plan.

Listed below are comments on the submitted document in relation to the submission criteria that would need to be included within any submitted Travel Plan.

- A commitment and timescale for the appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator.
- The information submitted fulfils this requirement. (a Travel Plan Coordinator will be in post 3 months prior 1st occupation). However 5.2.4 states the TPC will remain in post until all the dwellings are occupied. The TPC must remain in post for the full length of the Full Travel Plan (at least 5 years),
- A commitment and timescale to undertake travel surveys.
- The information submitted fulfils this requirement (A residents travel survey will be undertaken within 3 months of occupation of the 50th dwelling).
- A commitment and timescale for the development of a Full Travel Plan.
- The submitted document states that a Full/Final Travel Plan will be submitted prior to 1st occupation. For a Travel Plan to meet the submission criteria for a Full Travel Plan it must include results from a survey and SMART targets. Therefore a Full Travel Plan cannot be submitted prior to the residential survey. The submitted Framework Travel Plan must make a commitment to develop a Full Travel Plan post residents travel survey. LCC would recommend within 3 months.
- Details of cycling, pedestrian and public transport links to and within the site
- The information submitted within the document fulfils this requirement.
- Details of the provision of secure cycle storage
- No information has been provided, there must be a commitment that adequate cycle storage will be available to each dwelling
- Outline objectives and targets
- The information submitted within the document fulfils this requirement.
- List of proposed measures to be introduced
- A list of proposed measures has been included within the document, including financial contributions to support bus services, a school bus, dial a bus provision, travel vouchers, etc. A level of financial contribution should be agreed through a S106 agreement. The list of proposed measures also includes a school walking bus to Heskin Pemberton Church of England Primary School. In LCC's experience the distance between the site and this school would make this proposal unviable.
- Details of arrangements for monitoring and review of the Travel Plan.
- The information submitted within the document fulfils this requirement. (a commitment to 5 years)

206. 2. Workplace Framework Travel Plan: The Workplace Framework Travel Plan submitted does not meet all of LCC's submission criteria for a Framework Travel Plan. Listed below are comments on the submitted document in relation to the submission criteria that would need to be included within any submitted Travel Plan.

- A commitment and timescale for the appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator.
- The information submitted fulfils this requirement. (a Travel Plan Coordinator will be in post 3 months prior 1st occupation). However 5.2.4 states the TPC will remain in post until all the employment units are occupied. The TPC must remain in post for the full length of the Travel Plan (at least 5 years).
- A commitment and timescale to undertake travel surveys.
- The information submitted fulfils this requirement (Travel survey will be undertaken within 3 months of occupation of 25% of the employment units).
- A commitment and timescale for the development of a Full Travel Plan.
- The submitted document states that a Full/Final Travel Plan will be submitted 3 months prior to 1st occupation. For a Travel Plan to meet the submission criteria for a Full Travel Plan it must include results from a survey and SMART targets. Therefore a Full Travel Plan cannot be submitted prior to the baseline survey. The submitted Framework Travel Plan must make a commitment to develop a Full Travel Plan post travel survey. We would recommend within 3 months.
- Details of cycling, pedestrian and public transport links to and within the site
- The information submitted within the document fulfils this requirement.
- Details of the provision of secure cycle storage
- The information submitted within the document fulfils this requirement.
- Outline objectives and targets
- The information submitted within the document fulfils this requirement.
- List of proposed measures to be introduced
- The information submitted within the document fulfils this requirement
- Details of arrangements for monitoring and review of the Travel Plan.
- 6.2.5 states the formal monitoring period will extend from implementation of the Final Travel Plan or occupation of all of the employment units. A Full Travel Plan needs to commit to a full 5 years.

207. The travel plan co-ordinator and monitoring would be secured through a s106 agreement.

Parking

208. The TA states that: "On-site car and cycle parking will be provided in accordance with relevant parking standards and guidance. Parking provision will be dealt with at the appropriate reserved matters application stage."
209. For an outline application, LCC Highways are content with this approach. However, the developer should take note of the comments relating to Internal Site Layout, Parking Standards/Parking Provision and SUDS detailed below.

Access Strategy

210. The developer is proposing to utilise the existing access to the site albeit with some minor modifications.
211. The access will remain a simple priority junction. Modelling assessment of this junction shows that this form of junction is appropriate.
212. The applicant has undertaken traffic speed surveys to ascertain what sightlines should be provided. The speed survey and proposed sightline are deemed to be acceptable to LCC.
213. The applicant has identified the possibility of providing a second access to be used in the case of emergency. No details of this are provided, however, LCC are satisfied that an emergency access can be provided but it would require sightline protection resulting in the loss of road side hedges / trees. Such details could be secured by condition.
214. Given the potential scale of the development LCC recommend the provision of a secondary access point to the development site. However, LCC consider a further modification to the existing access, which could negate the need for a secondary (emergency) access. The modifications would mean a wider access with a pedestrian refuge / splitter island in the mouth of the junction. The applicant has confirmed that a secondary access to the site is not sought. It is recommended that the modifications required to make the existing access acceptable are to be secured by condition. The proposed access arrangements are therefore considered to be acceptable in highway safety and movement terms.

Impact of development proposals on neighbouring villages and communities.

215. The nearest primary schools to the development site are located within Ecclestone and Heskin where the streets around the primary schools suffer with a level of congestion, which impacts on the free flow of traffic and raises some road safety concerns. It is acknowledged that the applicant is offering to provide primary school transports, however, there will still be some parents that would still take and collect their child by car. There is a concern that this would exacerbate the current issues to the point where highway safety is compromised. This is true even if school transport is provided as the larger vehicles would require greater manoeuvring space.
216. The Carrington Centre in Ecclestone provides a range of shops and would be attractive to the residents of this development, leading to increased car parking demand. At times the car parks are at or close to capacity and with little local opportunities elsewhere for shopping this development may lead to increased car parking demand, resulting in additional inappropriate parking around the centre and neighbouring streets to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity.

217. At Heskin the SPAR / Post Office on Woods Lane opposite Withington Lane provides some retail opportunities, however, limited off-street parking facilities lead to some inappropriate parking to the detriment of highway safety.

218. In order to address the above concerns it is requested that the developer contribute £30,000, secured through a s106 towards:

- the monitoring of traffic issues in Ecclestone and Heskin;
- identifying and evaluating schemes and proposals;
- implementing any changes to road markings and traffic signs;
- advertising and implementing Traffic Regulation Orders.

Highways Summary

219. LCC has concerns over accessibility and the locational sustainability of the development site. Although the developer has put forward an accessibility strategy, it is debatable whether or not the measures go far enough to make the site sustainable and make travel other than by the private car a viable option.

220. Whilst improvements to the walking and cycling networks can be made locally, they will have limited impact on reducing travel by car.

221. Restoring and providing new bus services will provide an alternative to the car and the attractiveness of public transport can be strengthened through an effective travel plan, especially if the developer provides residents with free or subsidised weekly / monthly / etc passes / tickets early in the life of the development. The most effective way of encouraging a modal shift away from the car is by addressing travel issues before travel patterns by car are established.

222. Whilst LCC has concerns over the sustainability of the site, traffic from the development will not have a severe impact on highway capacity or safety. Nonetheless LCC consider it essential that accessibility improvements are provided.

Planning Obligations

223. It is recommended that the developer be required to enter a Section 106 Agreement. The S106 should include the following:

- Travel Plan contribution of £12,000 residential element and £6,000 workplace element.
- Pedestrian / Cycling / PROW improvements £90,000.
- Public Transport Improvements £400,000 to provide new bus services.

224. The Travel Plan contribution will be used by LCC to provide support to the developer for the developer produce a full Travel Plan. Such support shall include:

- To appraise the Travel Plan(s) submitted to the Council pursuant to the Planning Permission and provide constructive feedback;
- Oversee the progression from Framework to full Travel Plan in line with agreed timescales;
- Monitor the development of, implementation and review of the Travel Plan for a period of up to 5 years.

225. The Pedestrian / Cycling / PROW contribution will be used to upgrade existing PROW's. LCC suggest that the following routes be improved:
- Bridleway 18, Footpath 15 /19, Footpath 15 / 16 and Footpath 9.
226. The Public Transport contribution will be used to upgrade existing services, provide new services so that a minimum of an hourly service is available daytime between the site and Chorley (Mondays – Saturdays and regular week day evening and Sunday Services) for a minimum of 5 years.
227. LCC would expect to see the following payment schedule:
- Travel Plan contribution prior to commencement of the development.
 - Pedestrian / Cycling / PROW contribution prior to occupation of 100th dwelling.
 - Public Transport contribution £80,000 prior to occupation of 40th dwelling and £80,000 on the 1st, 2nd, 3rd & 4th anniversaries of the payment of the first public transport contribution.

Affordable housing

228. Policy 7 of the Core Strategy requires a minimum proportion of 35% affordable housing on market housing schemes in rural areas. The applicants should, therefore, provide 35% affordable housing on the site, which equates to up to 68 affordable units. Where it is proposed that the affordable housing provision should be on-site, but where the calculation does not equate to whole units, the actual provision will be rounded up or down to the nearest number (see para 49 – Central Lancashire Affordable Housing SPD Oct 2012).
229. However, given the wider context, together with the issues facing Registered Providers (RPs) with the rent increase and the lack of RPs willing to accept shared ownership as an intermediate home ownership product, consideration has been given to how the Council can work within the adopted policy framework to achieve an affordable housing contribution which meets demand and the Council's aspirations and is deliverable.
230. It is important to avoid a situation where secured affordable housing provision needs to be re-negotiated because an RP will not engage with a developer later on.
231. It is considered that in this case, the standard policy mix of 70:30 (social rented to shared ownership) may not be deliverable and there needs to be flexibility within any S106 Obligation to reflect the uncertainty of the market and the unknown impact and demand for starter homes. This approach is considered to be within the Council's policy framework as the Affordable Housing SPD allows some flexibility where there are other policy objectives and would secure agreement for either the provision of affordable dwellings or an off-site commuted sum prior to commencement of development.
232. The proposed development would provide 68 affordable dwellings in line with the policy requirement of 35% and is therefore in compliance with policy 7 of the Core Strategy.

Public open space

233. The Open Space and Playing Pitch SPD was adopted for development control purposes at the Council meeting on 17th September 2013. Therefore, based upon the

standards within the Local Plan Policies HS4A and HS4B and the approach in the SPD, the various open space typologies will be required as follows:

Amenity greenspace

234. The Local Plan Policy HS4A sets a standard of 0.73 hectares per 1,000 population. There is currently a deficit of provision in the Chisnall ward in relation to this standard, a contribution towards new provision in the ward is therefore required from this development. As the development is 10 or more dwellings the required amenity greenspace should be provided on-site. The amount required by policy is 0.34 hectares and the actual amount proposed is 8.8 hectares. A maintenance cost of £136,500 is also required for a 10 year period if private maintenance is not proposed.

Provision for children/young people

235. There is currently a surplus of provision in the Chisnall ward in relation to this standard, however the site is not within the accessibility catchment (800m) of an area of provision for children/young people. A contribution towards new provision is therefore required. As the development is 100 or more dwellings the required provision for children/young people should be provided on-site. The amount required is 0.04ha. A maintenance cost of £25,350 is required if private maintenance is not proposed.

Parks and gardens

236. There is no requirement to provide a new park or garden on-site within this development. There are no parks/gardens within the accessibility catchment (1,000m) of this site identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study therefore a contribution towards improving existing provision is not required.

Natural/semi-natural greenspace

237. There is no requirement to provide new natural/semi natural greenspace on-site within this development. There are no areas of natural/semi-natural greenspace within the accessibility catchment (800m) of this site identified as being low quality and/or low value in the Open Space Study therefore a contribution towards improving existing provision is not required.

Allotments

238. There is no requirement to provide allotment provision on site within this development. The site is within the accessibility catchment (10 minutes' drive time) of a proposed new allotment site at Sylvester's Farm, Euxton (HW5.2). A contribution towards new allotment provision is therefore required from this development. The amount required is £15 per dwelling.

Playing pitches

239. A Playing Pitch Strategy was published in June 2012 which identifies a Borough wide deficit of playing pitches but states that the majority of this deficit can be met by improving existing pitches. A financial contribution towards the improvement of existing playing pitches is therefore required from this development. The Playing Pitch Strategy includes an Action Plan which identifies sites that need improvements. The amount required is £1,599 per dwelling.

Ecology

240. Due to the nature of this Green Belt site (although a previously developed site) and the nature of the land surrounding the site the ecological impacts of the development is a

significant material planning consideration. As noted above concerns have been raised by residents/ parish councils in this regard.

241. The application is supported by various ecological assessments including bats, birds, amphibians, water voles and badgers (although the badger information is confidential due to the possible inclusion of badger setts).

Great Crested Newts

242. A medium population of great crested newts (GCN) was identified in ponds adjacent to the proposed development site, with the risk of GCN being present in a pond within the site that was problematic to survey and located between the two breeding ponds. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) as advisors to the Council are confident, given that the majority of the development site is hardstanding, that adequate mitigation can and will be provided for loss of terrestrial habitat and that a licence would be issued by Natural England. Conditions are recommended to control this.

243. Therefore, the proposal complies with the relevant legal and planning policy tests.

Bats

244. A number of bat roosts were found across the site including one maternity roost. A licence would therefore be required for demolition of the buildings, where bat roosts were identified. The loss of a maternity roost is a significant negative impact, which would require significant mitigation. It is noted that a bat barn is proposed, and this is adequate in terms of the level of mitigation required as long as it is properly designed. GMEU are, however, satisfied that, given this commitment, a license will be issued.

245. Therefore, the proposal complies with the relevant legal and planning policy tests.

Little Wood Biological Heritage Site (BHS)

246. The development lies immediately adjacent to Little Wood BHS. Buffer planting is proposed, which is supported by GMEU. The development would also result in a potential increase in public pressure, which GMEU recommend is dealt with via a management plan secured by condition. The buffering can be dealt with as part of wider Landscape and Environmental management plan condition.

247. The BHS should also be protected during construction, and it is, therefore, recommended that this detail should form part of a Construction and Environmental management that is secured by condition. The development is considered to be compliant with policy 22 of the Core Strategy.

Protection and Enhancement of Syd Brook

248. Syd Brook forms part of the River Douglas catchment. The brook falls under the EU Water Framework Directive, which requires environmental objectives be set for all surface and ground waters to enable them to achieve good status or potential for heavily modified water bodies by a defined date. One objective is to prevent further deterioration, which can include changes to flow pattern, width and depth of channel, sediment availability/transport and ecology and biology.

249. The applicant proposes to de-culvert a section of the brook currently under the development site. This will positively improve the ecological status of the watercourse and this is supported by GMEU. The details should be conditioned as part of reserved matters.

250. There is, however, the potential for negative impacts on water quality during and post construction from inert material and pollutants entering the watercourse. To mitigate against negative impacts during construction appropriate detail should be provided as part of any construction method statement required.

Invasive Species

251. Four species listed under schedule 9 part 2 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended were found on site, though only three appear to be within the footprint of the proposed development. It is, therefore, recommended that a condition, attached to any grant of planning permission requiring a method statement detailing eradication and/or control and/or avoidance measures for Japanese knotweed, giant hogweed, rhododendron and Himalayan balsam.

Nesting Birds

252. Bird nesting habitat occurs on the site and nesting birds were identified during the bird survey. All British birds nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Therefore it is recommended that no works to trees or shrubs shall occur or demolition occur between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to site clearance and confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present which has been agreed in writing by the LPA.

253. Mitigation should be provided for loss of bird nesting habitat. The illustrative masterplan indicates that bird boxes will be provided. However, it is unclear whether this will include mitigation for loss of swallow nesting habitat, therefore the provision of such details should be required by condition.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment

254. Paragraph 109 of the Framework states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. The development site is generally of low ecological value consisting of hard standing and buildings. Mitigation is proposed through de-culverting of Syd Brook, buffering of Little Wood BHS, wildlife friendly planting, bird and bat boxes and the creation of a new pond. GMEU are therefore satisfied that, on balance, no net loss and most likely a net gain will be achieved. Given the extensive nature of the proposals, it is recommended that a landscape and environmental management plan covering a 10 year period is conditioned for the following ecological features:

- Description and objectives of the existing features to be protected, maintained and enhanced;
- Description and objectives for riparian and aquatic habitats for the restored Syd Brook;
- Description and objectives for buffer habitat adjacent to Little Wood BHS;
- Details of mitigation for loss of bird nesting habitat including swallows;
- Details of mitigation for loss of open water habitat;
- Preparation of a work schedule, including an annual work plan over a five year period;
- Details of the organisation(s) responsible for implementation and long term management of the plan and;
- A 10 year monitoring plan

Summary of ecological issues

255. Adequate ecological information has been supplied. However, as this application is in outline, updated surveys are likely to be required as part of any reserved matters application. Ecological constraints that have been identified include great crested newts and bats, proximity to a biological heritage site, Syd Brook, four invasive species, nesting birds and the need to provide ecological mitigation.
256. Due to the nature of the application site, the application is supported by an Ecological Survey and Assessment, as well as supplementary reports.
257. The Council's ecology advisor at GMEU has reviewed the proposals and confirmed that the subject of roosting bats and great crested newts has been adequately addressed. Conditions are recommended as a means of securing precautionary measures and mitigation.
258. Following the Supreme Court ruling (*Morge vs Hampshire County Council – Supreme Court ruling Jan 2011*) the Local Authority now have a responsibility regarding 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?
259. 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.
260. In considering planning applications that may affect European Protected Species, Local Planning Authorities are bound by Regulation 9(1) and 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 to have regard to the Habitats Directive when exercising their function. Government Circular 05/06 gives guidance to local authorities on how these issues should be considered. All three tests must be satisfied before planning permission is granted on a site.
261. The first two tests are essentially land-use planning tests. The application includes the removal of existing structures across the site and a means of securing the site over the long term, with clear benefits for health and safety. The provision of 195 dwellings, 68 of which would be affordable, would address an identified housing need in the borough and particular need for affordable housing. Employment opportunities would be provided through the development of the commercial element of the site which would also contribute to the social and economic interest. There would also be environmental improvements to habitat, drainage and public access. The development is therefore considered to be imperative reasons that override the public interest of conserving the presence of bats and great crested newts on the site.
262. The site represents the only opportunity for such a scale of development in the area, and is a major developed site in the Green Belt. The use as a theme park has proven to

be unviable and there is no alternative way of securing the site in the longer term and no other prospect of addressing the dereliction that currently exists.

263. As regards the third test the Council's ecology advisors consider that this test could be satisfied providing that appropriate conditions are applied as recommended by them.

264. It is considered that the ecological impacts of the proposals have been fully considered and as such it is considered that the Council, subject to suitable conditions, has discharged its obligations in respect of the above tests and that the application complies with policy 22 of the Core Strategy and policies BNE9, BNE10 and BNE 11 of the Chorley Local Plan.

Flood risk and drainage

265. Lancashire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of detailed conditions requiring that the development is carried out in line with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), details of a surface water drainage scheme to be agreed, no occupation until the completion of the agreed sustainable drainage scheme, details of the agreed surface water management and construction and operation of pond/attenuation basin prior to occupation.

266. The application site lies within Flood Zone 1, which is defined as having a low probability of flooding. The site area exceeds 1 hectare and, in accordance with footnote 20 of paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), applications for planning permission should be accompanied by a suitable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) when development on this scale is proposed in Flood Zone 1. The FRA should be appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposed development and demonstrate that it will be safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

267. Lancashire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have assessed the information submitted in support of the application.

Discharge to Combined Sewer/Surface Water Sewer/Highway Drain/Existing Drainage System

268. It is evident from the applicant's revised Flood Risk Assessment, November 2017 that the applicant intends to discharge surface water to Outfall 1 to the unnamed ordinary watercourse in Area B and Outfall 2 adjacent to Area C.

Sustainable Drainage Systems: General Advice

269. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Written Statement on Sustainable Drainage Systems (HCWS161) requires that surface water arising from a developed site should, as far as it is practicable, be managed in a sustainable manner to mimic surface water flows arising from the site prior to the proposed development, whilst reducing flood risk to the site itself and elsewhere, taking climate change into account.

270. The Lead Local Flood Authority encourages that site surface water drainage is designed in line with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems and Planning Practice Guidance, including restricting developed discharge of surface water to greenfield runoff rates making suitable allowances for climate change and urban creep, managing surface water as close to the surface as possible and prioritising infiltration as a means of surface water disposal where possible.

271. Regardless of the site's status as greenfield or brownfield land, the Lead Local Flood Authority encourages that surface water discharge from the developed site should be as close to the greenfield runoff rate as is reasonably practicable in accordance with Standard 2 and Standard 3 of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.
272. Sustainable drainage systems offer significant advantages over conventional piped drainage systems in reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of surface water run-off from a site, promoting groundwater recharge absorbing diffuse pollutants and improving water quality. Ponds, reedbeds and seasonally flooded grasslands can be particularly attractive features within public open space.
273. The wide variety of available sustainable drainage techniques means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles and provide multiple benefits, reducing costs and maintenance needs. No detailed scheme is proposed at this point, however, it is considered that a suitable scheme can be designed and implemented.

Sustainable Drainage Systems: Infiltration & Permeability Testing

274. The Lead Local Flood Authority wishes to highlight that the FRA states no geotechnical survey has been undertaken at this stage. It is therefore unknown whether infiltration techniques will prove feasible. This must be confirmed prior to the submission of a drainage scheme and should be detailed within the rationale for the type of scheme proposed.
275. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF requires priority use to be given to SuDS and in accordance with Paragraph 80, Section 10 of the Planning Practice Guidance the preferred means of surface water drainage for any new development is via infiltration. At the time the drainage scheme is submitted to the LPA the applicant must submit evidence as to why each 'level' of this hierarchy cannot be achieved.
276. Prior to designing site surface water drainage for the site, a full ground investigation should be undertaken to fully explore the option of ground infiltration to manage the surface water in preference to discharging to a surface water body, sewer system or other means. For example, should the applicant intend to use a soakaway, they should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365 revised 2016.
277. The Lead Local Flood Authority also strongly encourages that the developer should take into account designing drainage systems for exceedance working with the natural topography for the site. Should exceedance routes be used, the applicant must provide a site layout plan with these displayed, in line with Standard 9 of DEFRA's Technical Standards for SuDS.
278. There are a number of methods available to the applicant by which adequate surface water drainage can be achieved, and it is considered that a suitable drainage scheme can be developed for the site. A surface water drainage scheme must be submitted to the Council either as part of a reserved matters application or prior to commencement and it is recommended that this is secured by condition.

Noise

279. Given the proximity of the site to the motorway, the application is supported by a Noise Assessment Report. This has been reviewed by one of the Council's

Environmental Health Officers who considers that the recommended conclusions contained within the report are appropriate.

280. Chorley Council's Environmental Health officer confirms that the submitted report seeks to provide information about the impact of noise, within the locality of the development site. Primarily this would appear to be traffic noise and in particular the dominant noise source of the M6 motorway.
281. The report (Noise Assessment Report for Story Homes; Project 124/2015, version 5 14 June 2017) refers to the most current guidance and uses recognised measurement methodology, identifies possible issues and provides mitigation measures.
282. It is noted that within the report (section 4.31) at some measurement positions the WHO guidelines for internal noise levels are exceeded with windows ajar, but as the report identifies in section 4.32, in some circumstances BS8233 suggests that it may be appropriate to relax the indoor ambient noise levels by up to 5dB.
283. Within section 6.10, of the report it mentions the 'option' of using PIV or MVHR mechanical ventilation systems as an alternative to trickle ventilators but does not specify which areas of the site these would be used. It is recommended that to assist with internal thermal comfort that mechanical ventilation systems are utilised within habitable rooms, where internal sound level targets are exceeded and especially with dwellings that also have habitable rooms with an east/west façade orientation.
284. All mitigation measures outlined within the report should be carefully followed to ensure that the correct mitigation measures are applied to the correct affected dwellings. These can be assessed at the time of any subsequent reserved matters applications.

Air quality

285. With regards to the impact on air quality the applicant has provided an Air Quality Assessment in support of the application. This has been examined by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, who is satisfied that it has considered the impact of the development and that the air quality impacts of the development will be limited.

Sustainable resources

286. Policy 27 of the Core Strategy seeks to incorporate sustainable resources into new development through a number of measures. The policy currently requires dwellinghouses to be built to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 which increases to Level 6 on 1st January 2016. However the 2015 Deregulation Bill received Royal Assent on Thursday 26th March 2015 which effectively removes Code for Sustainable Homes. The Bill does include transitional provisions which include:
287. *“For the specific issue of energy performance, local planning authorities will continue to be able to set and apply policies in their Local Plans which require compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the energy requirements of Building Regulations until commencement of amendments to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 in the Deregulation Bill 2015. This is expected to happen alongside the introduction of zero carbon homes policy in late 2016. The government has stated that, from then, the energy performance requirements in Building Regulations will be set at a level equivalent to the (outgoing) Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Until the amendment is commenced, we would expect local planning authorities to take this statement of the government's intention into account in applying existing policies and not set conditions with requirements above a Code Level 4 equivalent.”*

288. *“Where there is an existing plan policy which references the Code for Sustainable Homes, authorities may continue to apply a requirement for a water efficiency standard equivalent to the new national technical standard, or in the case of energy a standard consistent with the policy set out in the earlier paragraph in this statement, concerning energy performance.”*

289. As such, there is a requirement for the proposed dwellings to achieve a minimum Dwelling Emission Rate of 19% above 2013 Building Regulations in accordance with the above provisions.

290. The proposed employment development is within the threshold category of criterion b of policy 27 which requires either additional fabric insulation measures or appropriate decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources are to be installed and implemented to reduce CO2 emissions by a minimum of 15%. This is in addition to achieving a BREEAM ‘very good’ rating for energy efficiency.

291. Suitably worded proposed conditions would secure the development in terms of sustainable resources. The proposed development is, therefore, considered to be in conformity with policy 27 of the Core Strategy.

Mineral resource assessment

292. The site is included within a safeguarding minerals allocated area as defined by policy M2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan - Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (2013) and as such the application is supported by a Minerals Assessment. The allocation indicates that resources of sandstone, sand and gravel, brick clay, fireclay and coal may be present both on the site and in the surrounding area.

293. The Framework and policy M2 of the Local Plan confirm that planning permission will not normally be supported for incompatible development within mineral safeguarding areas. Incompatible development is defined as that which would be incompatible by reasons of scale, proximity and permanence with the working of the mineral.

294. Policy M2 provides criteria to be used when considering whether permission should be supported. The submitted information concludes that the mineral is no longer of any value or has been fully extracted, and that prior extraction of minerals is not feasible due to the depth of the deposit. This is informed by a desk-top study and reference to recorded off site borehole logs.

295. The applicant’s Mineral Resource Assessment (MRA) presents a detailed review of available evidence of the presence of any viable mineral deposits beneath the application site and any potential for their prior extraction. It is considered that the MRA sufficiently demonstrates that there are no viable coal, brick clay/fireclay or sand and gravel resources beneath the site. This is due to a combination of factors such as; historic working of the resources, a high quantity of overburden and site constraints such as the M6 and the hotel and leisure complex.

296. In light of the above, it is considered that there is no conflict with policy M2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan - Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (2013) or the National Planning Policy Framework, with regards to minerals safeguarding.

Education

297. Based upon the latest assessment, taking into account all approved applications, Lancashire County Council seek a contribution from the development towards the provision of 21 primary school places. However, LCC do not seek a contribution for secondary school places. This amounts to £298,563.51.
298. Following an initial scoping exercise of the local schools it has been determined that Lancashire County Council intend to use the primary education contribution to provide additional primary places at Heskin Pemberton's Church of England Primary School. This is the closest primary school to the development that has space to accommodate an expansion.
299. Whilst the County Council have confirmed its intention to deliver projects at Heskin Pemberton's Church of England Primary School, it should be noted that this would be subject to the following:
- willingness of school governing body to expand
 - suitability of site
 - planning permission & compliance with Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 and Schedule 1 to the Academies Act 2010.
 - consultation with local schools and the community
 - parental preference at the time that the places are required
 - school standards at the time that the places are required
 - availability of other funding streams
300. Should the primary education contribution not be spent on the project named within this assessment, the County Council will return the entire sum to the owner. Furthermore, the County Council will ensure that sufficient local primary school places are provided to address the impact of the development at no cost to the owner.
301. To ensure that the approach is in line with the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations, the County Council confirms that there is no secured Section 106 pooled or proposed expenditure projects within the district against Heskin Pemberton's Church of England Primary School.
302. Aside from this it is noted that a significant financial contribution would be generated through the Community Infrastructure Levy, which may be used to fund education provision identified locally on the Regulation 123 list, which includes funding towards improvements in the expansion of Eccleston Primary School.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

303. The Chorley CIL Infrastructure Charging Schedule provides a specific amount for development. The CIL Charging Schedule was adopted on 16 July 2013 and charging commenced on 1 September 2013. The proposed development will be a chargeable development and the charge is subject to indexation in accordance with the Council's Charging Schedule.
304. CIL Liability is not calculated at outline application stage. However, this development will be CIL Liable on approval of the final reserved matters application (if approved). At present, if the final reserved matters application is approved, based upon this outline application information, this development will be subject to the following CIL Charges: 'Dwelling Houses' and 'All Other Uses' as listed in Chorley Councils CIL Charging Schedule.

Other matters

305. Inadequate consultation prior to submission of the application: This is a matter for the applicant to address and the level and type of consultation prior to submission is at the applicant's discretion. Story Homes carried out a three stage consultation process including an event for Stakeholders from Ecclestone, Charnock Richard and Heskin Parish Council along with other local groups/clubs to attend a workshop to discuss a scheme of up to 275 units in June 2016, a public consultation presenting a draft Masterplan for 200 homes, along with a timeline and next steps in July 2016 and two further consultation events with the local community to present the final Masterplan scheme in March 2017.
306. The preservation of green space around towns and villages is vital for psychological and physiological health: The site is a major previously developed site and the development would be contained within the previously developed site boundary. Large areas of green space would be retained and opened up to the public for the benefit of psychological and physiological health.
307. It does not attempt to integrate with surrounding communities: The development site itself is well contained and does not bound other areas of development therefore physical integration is not possible. It is anticipated, however, that any future occupants would integrate with surrounding communities through the use of local amenities and will also have existing links with surrounding communities.
308. Local health care facilities are oversubscribed: It is anticipated that local GP surgeries would respond to the increase in demand for health care provision.
309. Police numbers have been reduced: This is a matter that Lancashire Constabulary must address.
310. No community facilities in local area so youths have nowhere to go: It is recognised that provision for young people is often lacking in more rural parts of the borough. The redevelopment of the site would remove the temptation to access the theme park site and remove the dangers associated with doing so.
311. The council should not allow the houses to be sold as leasehold as another income stream for the builders: The Council has no control over this.
312. The common areas should be adopted by the council to prevent the builders charging large maintenance or service charges: The Council has no control over this.
313. It will change the character of Ecclestone: The development is considered to be well contained and distant enough from Ecclestone so as not to alter the character of this settlement.
314. The site would be much better as a recreational area/leisure amenities which could bring in extra visitors and income without the added pressures on local services: A major recreational area/leisure development is not without its impacts on local services. Such a use has not proven to be viable in past, hence the nature of the proposed development.
315. Residents have a right to quiet enjoyment of their homes and surroundings and the development will infringe on these rights: The proposal is only in outline at this stage, however, it is considered that the proposed development could be designed and delivered in such a way as not have any unacceptable impact on the amenity of local occupiers.

316. The site could be developed as a low maintenance country park or nature area along the lines of Brockholes which would benefit the current population and future ones: Such a proposal has not been submitted for consideration by the Council. It is noted, however, that parts of the site would be opened up to public access.
317. Concern that the applicant will, at a later stage, press for a two stage housing development on additional land at the site or on land proposed for workshop space: This would require planning permission and could only be considered if and when such a proposal came forward.
318. Development and money involved could lead to accusations of corruption and back handers: The application process has been dealt with in a clear and transparent manner. Accusations of corruption should be directed to the Council's Head of Legal Services.
319. Developer has left site as an eyesore: The site is redundant. The proposed development would address the dereliction left by the abandonment of the previous use.
320. Building these houses will bring further crime to the village, including youth crime which is increasing: There is no evidence to suggest this will happen.
321. What was prized as a small countryside village prized on its quaintness will be lost and it won't be a village anymore: It is not considered that the proposed development would affect the character of any nearby villages.
322. Considering exit from the EU then the alternative would be to return the land to farming thus helping to reduce the need to import produce: The site is previously developed land and the amount of land that would be capable of agricultural use for the production of food is small.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

323. In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
324. The development plan consists of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026. As set out above the proposals are considered to be in accordance with policy 1 of the Core Strategy as the proposed development is of a Major Developed Site and there are exceptional reasons in support of the development by virtue of the benefits that would be generated. The development is considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt and as such can only be considered acceptable if there are very special circumstances which clearly outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt (by reason of inappropriateness) and any other harm.
325. As set out above it is considered that on balance sufficient very special circumstances exist in the case of the benefits associated with redeveloping this site for housing to outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt (by reason of inappropriateness) and any other harm (particularised in the sections set out above). Further, the proposal demonstrates exceptional reasons for the grant of consent. The proposal therefore complies with policy 1 of the Core Strategy, and policy BNE5 of the Chorley Local Plan. It can also be considered to constitute sustainable development (in the terms of the Framework).
326. This is considered to be a finely balanced decision based upon securing an appropriate use of a redundant brownfield site within the Green Belt, whilst ensuring that

the scheme constitutes sustainable development in accordance with advice contained within the Framework.

327. Advice contained within the Framework directs Local Planning Authorities to look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. The advice for the Government is that local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.
328. In this regard the three dimensions of sustainable development are a material consideration which are assessed further below:
329. **An economic role** - the proposed development would provide employment units and would create construction jobs and would result in a higher population with an associated spend within the Borough. Development of the site would benefit the neighbouring employment uses by providing an attractive surrounding environment rather than a derelict site and locating a potential customer base within a close distance. The residential development would provide a New Homes bonus and provide a commuted sum to improving the Borough's existing facilities.
330. **A social role** - the development would assist in both securing a continuous housing land supply within the Borough within the medium to long term of the local plan period, whilst contributing to affordable housing provision within the Borough. The required improvements to buses and footpaths/ cycleways would ensure that the site is accessible to local services and would see a net benefit in the bus services which run between Chorley and Ecclestone. The development would provide funding for improvements to existing services via the CIL levy. The development would comprise high quality built development set within a landscaped area replacing an existing derelict site, which currently detracts from the character of this rural area.
331. **An environmental role** - the proposals seek to improve the natural and built environment and the ecology advice confirms that on balance the proposed development would be of benefit to biodiversity. A major benefit would be that Syd Brook would be de-culverted as part of the proposed development. A large amount of hard surfacing would be landscaped and the level of landscaping proposed would be significant in supporting an increased biodiversity across the site.
332. In consideration of the factors advanced in support of the proposed development, the benefits and impacts assessed above and the three dimensions of sustainable development it is considered that on balance, the proposed development is acceptable in line with the provisions of the development plan. It is considered that it constitutes sustainable development, for the purposes of the Framework 18-219 taken as a whole. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement securing affordable housing and financial contributions towards the provision of public open space, education and highway schemes.

Suggested conditions

To follow

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

Planning History

80/00512/FUL- Malibu Grand Prix leisure Centre (including games room, snack bar, vehicle garage and layout of skill driving course). Approved 1980

87/00124/FUL- Construction of grandstand to joust area. Approved 1987

87/00206/ADV- Erection of 10m and 8m high flag poles with removable banners. Approved 1987

87/00737/OUT- Outline application for construction of indoor park. Withdrawn

87/00738/FUL- Extension to theme park westwards onto approximately 3 hectares of land formerly touring caravan park. Approved 1988

88/00010/FUL- Erection of indoor childrens play area building in extended theme park area (see 9/87/0738). Approved 1988

88/00072/FUL- New stores building. Approved 1988

89/00115/FUL- Relocation of cinema refurbishment of retail food unit 3 new games retail food units new staff office unit and new emergency access road. Approved 1989

89/01077/FUL- Weekend Market (Sat and Sun). Withdrawn

89/01101/FUL- Sunday market (9am-4pm) Easter to October every year. Withdrawn

89/01159/FUL- Construction of emergency access to Park Hall Lane. Permitted 1990

91/00023/FULMAJ- Erection of new ball pool, new air bed, new rope climb, new pathway - 'Enchanted Wood' and new climbing bridge. Approved 1991

91/01087/FUL- Erection of public toilet block on car park. Approved 1992

93/00013/FUL- Themed frontage to existing building known as Circus World. Approved 1993

93/00014/FUL- Extension to existing admission booths. Approved 1993

93/00265/ADV- Display of internally and externally illuminated pole signs. Approved 1993

94/00209/MAS- Prior notification of erection of 12 antenna on existing mast. Prior approval not required 1994

94/00494/ADV- Display of externally illuminated advertisement. Refused 1994

94/00702/COU- Change of use of land and erection of buildings to form Rare Breeds and Falconry Visitor Centre in association with existing Theme Park. Approved 1994

94/00702/FUL- Change of use of land and erection of buildings to form Rare Breeds and Falconry Visitor Centre, in association with existing Theme Park. Approved 1994

98/00039/TEL- Prior notification of erection of three dual polar antennas, two dish antennas, one radio equipment housing and ancillary development on existing radio tower. Prior approval not required 1998

98/00593/FUL- Erection of steel frame building to accommodate indoor leisure attractions. Approved 1998

99/00002/FUL- Alterations to entrance and feature walling. Approved 1999

99/00133/ADV- Display of externally illuminated entrance sign. Approved 1999

99/00298/ADV- Display of illuminated advert on proposed bus shelter within Theme Park car park. Approved 1999

99/00299/FUL- Siting of bus shelter within theme park car park. Approved 1999

99/00313/TEL- Installation of 3 x dual polar antenna and 1 x 0.6m dish on existing 26m tower and 1 equipment cabin. Prior approval not required

99/00899/COU- Change of use to Go Kart track of section of Car Park immediately in front of Camelot Theme Park entrance. Approved 2000

00/00677/FUL- Erection of 40m high roller coaster ride. Refused 2000

01/00052/FUL- Erection of fixed ferris wheel (temporary permission sought until 30 November 2001). Approved 2001

01/00542/MAS- Prior notification of siting of telecommunications equipment consisting of 15m pole with antenna and cabinet. Determined prior approval was not required 2001

01/01073/FUL- Erection of fixed ferris wheel (temporary permission required until 30th November 2002). Approved 2002

02/00640/FULMAJ- Erection of an indoor theme park. Approved 2002

07/00187/FUL- Erection of replacement roller coaster. Approved 2007

08/00350/OUTMAJ- Outline application for the creation of a 75 unit Leisure Village, adjacent to existing "Spanish Village" and Theme Park (Renewal of Outline Planning Permission 99/00905/OUT). Withdrawn

13/00255/SCE- Request for Screening Opinion Pursuant to Regulation 5 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. Not EIA development

13/01226/TPO- Removal of 8 trees covered by TPO 2 (Charnock Richard) 1974 to facilitate the removal of the existing sub-station. Approved March 2014

14/00071/OUTMAJ- Outline application for the redevelopment of the former Camelot Theme Park comprising of the erection of up to 420 dwellings (all matters reserved). Refused August 2014.

14/00583/TPO- Application to undertake works to protected trees to clear vegetation from overhead high voltage power line covered by TPO 2 (Park Hall) 1974. Permitted July 2014.

15/00970/DIS- Removal of 8 trees covered by TPO 2 (Charnock Richard) 1974 to facilitate the removal of the existing substation. Condition discharged 2 November 2015.

15/01118/NOT- Notice of intention to install 3no. replacement panel antennas mounted on existing support poles affixed to the existing 26.00 metre high lattice tower, together with new and replacement small scale ancillary apparatus (i.e. MHAs and feeder cables). Notification acknowledged November 2015.

17/00285/SCE- Request for Screening Opinion Pursuant to Regulation 5 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 for a proposed mixed use development comprising up to 195 dwellings, 1000sq. m. B1 office and 2000sq. m. workshop units/starter offices plus landscaping and open space.
Not EIA development