

Development Control Committee

Meeting to be held on 27 November 2019

Electoral Division affected: Preston East
--

Preston City: Application number LCC/2019/0029

Energy recovery facility fuelled by residual non-hazardous household, commercial and industrial waste and refuse derived fuel, and incorporating an energy recovery facility main building, air cooled condensers, weighbridges and gatehouse, site roads, landscaping including bunds, car parking, surface water swale and wetland, electricity sub-station building and switchyard, pump house, fire water storage tanks, other ancillary plant and equipment, fencing and site security, realignment of existing roadway and drainage ditch through the site, underground power cable network and a temporary construction compound. Land at Red Scar Industrial Estate, Longridge Road, Preston.

Contact for further information:

Rob Jones, 01772 534128

DevCon@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

Application - Energy recovery facility fuelled by residual non-hazardous household, commercial and industrial waste and refuse derived fuel, and incorporating an energy recovery facility main building, air cooled condensers, weighbridges and gatehouse, site roads, landscaping including bunds, car parking, surface water swale and wetland, electricity sub-station building and switchyard, pump house, fire water storage tanks, other ancillary plant and equipment, fencing and site security, realignment of existing roadway and drainage ditch through the site, underground power cable network and temporary construction compound. Land at Red Scar Industrial Estate, Longridge Road, Preston.

The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary.

Recommendation – Summary

That after first taking into consideration the environmental information, as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, planning permission be **granted** subject to conditions controlling time limits, working programme, building materials and landscaping, construction management plan, hours of operation, highway matters, surface water drainage, R1 status, provision of cable to electricity distribution network, employment and skills, review of heat supply, construction and operational travel plan and decommissioning.

Applicant's Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the development of an energy recovery facility to generate up to 47 megawatts of electricity from the combustion of up to 395,000

tonnes of imported residual non-hazardous household, commercial and industrial waste, and refuse derived fuel.

The heat from the combustion of the waste and refuse derived fuel would produce steam by the heating of water in a boiler that would then power a turbine to produce electricity. The electricity (and potentially heat) generated would be distributed via the electricity grid or direct connection, to businesses and other users nearby.

The energy recovery facility would consist of a main building plus ancillary structures and infrastructure around the site.

The main building would be 174 metres in length and between 70 metres and 121 metres wide and would vary in height between 17.1 metres and 37.1 metres above ground level. There would be two 85 metre high chimneys / stacks each with a diameter of 3 metres. The main building would include a waste reception hall, waste storage bunker, boiler hall, flue gas treatment facility, turbine (electricity generator) hall with associated turbine coolers, ash storage building and control room. The main building would also include offices and meeting rooms, workshops and maintenance areas, a visitor centre, reception and staff welfare and changing facilities.

The external elevations of the main building would be clad with trapezoidal profile metal cladding in contrasting dark grey colours of alaska grey (RAL 7000) and anthracite (RAL 7016) for the lower level and an upper level to consist of light reflecting mill finished standing seam aluminium cladding. The administration/ visitor centre would be five storeys in height to be fronted by a large scale colonnade and projecting roof form. The façade would be a glazed cladding system with spandrel (blanking) panels to be coloured alaska grey (RAL 7000) within areas of curtain walling. The twin emissions stacks would be coloured oyster (RAL 7035).

The ancillary structures and infrastructure around the site would include the following:

- Air cooled condenser building measuring 52 metres by 27 metres with a maximum height of 30.7 metres. The building would be externally clad with trapezoidal profile metal cladding in contrasting dark grey colours of alaska grey (RAL 7000) and raised off the floor on a 10 metre high steel framework.
- Weighbridges and associated gatehouse.
- Internal site access roads and yard/ hardstanding areas.
- Landscaping including bunds.
- A 46 space staff and visitor car park plus 4 disabled and 2 van parking spaces, and a bicycle shelter.
- Re-alignment of existing industrial estate spine road and surface water drainage ditch through the site.
- Surface water swale and attenuation wetland.
- Electricity sub-station building and switchyard. The substation building would measure 40 metres by 6.75 metres by 3.5 metres in height and would sit within a fenced compound measuring 22 metres by 80 metres.
- Fire water storage tanks and pump house.
- Water treatment facilities.
- Fuel oil tank.
- 2.2 metre high perimeter palisade fencing around the boundary of the site.

There would also be an underground power cable for export of electricity generated at the site, and the provision of a temporary construction compound.

The ash storage building would be 10 metres high, the workshop would be 10.1 metres high, and the administration/ visitor centre building 23.2 metres high.

The processes that would be carried out within the energy from waste plant include the following:

- Incoming refuse collection and bulk transport vehicles would enter the facility via the southern access point off the internal site access road. Upon entering the site, vehicles would pass over the weighbridge and proceed to the enclosed waste reception / tipping hall.
- Waste would be tipped into the bunker, vehicles would exit the tipping hall and proceed back to the weighbridge before exiting the site.
- The base of the bunker would be 10 metres below existing ground level which would have effect of reducing the overall height of the building and avoid the need for waste delivery vehicles to ascend and descend ramps thereby reducing noise and exhaust emissions from vehicles, as well as keeping lights from vehicles contained below the level of the 3 – 4 metre high earth bunds that would be constructed along the eastern and southern sides of the site.
- The holding capacity of the waste fuel bunker would be equivalent to five days throughput so that the plant could operate without deliveries through the Easter and Christmas holiday periods and during potential short periods of disruption.
- The entry and exit door to the tipping hall would be equipped with manually operated 'rapid closing' doors, which would generally be kept closed when delivery of waste is not taking place.
- The facility would be a twin line plant. Grab cranes would be used to mix the waste fuel in the bunker in order to achieve consistency of fuel supply. The cranes would then load the waste from the bunker into two feed chutes for the furnaces. Odour and dust in the tipping hall would be controlled by fans located above the waste bunker. These would suck air from waste reception / tipping hall into the furnaces to feed the combustion process and prevent odours and dust escaping from the building.
- The feed chutes would both regulate the supply of fuel to two inclined moving grates within the furnace, and allow an air seal to be maintained so that oxygen levels can be adjusted to achieve full burn out of the fuel.
- The moving grates are a conventional combustion technology of a type that is used in many energy recovery facilities around the world and including the UK and would allow for the turning and mixing of the waste to ensure that all waste is exposed to the combustion process.
- Whilst the furnaces are fitted with auxiliary burners, fuelled by fuel oil, these would only be used to start and shut down the plant (typically twice per year) or if temperatures fall below 850oC, which would rarely happen.
- The combustion process will release significant amounts of energy in the gases produced by combustion. These gases will be passed through a boiler (one above each grate) in which water will be converted to high pressure superheated steam. The steam would be used to drive a steam turbine that will turn a generator and produce electricity. The energy recovery facility will capture all available heat energy from combustion and convert it to electricity unless a viable market for heat is created locally, in which case, some steam may also be extracted separately to supply heat energy. This feature would be an intrinsic part of the

development so that the proposed development would be Combined Heat and Power Ready.

- Water used within the boiler is treated to ensure reliable operation using a number of chemicals that would be stored within a controlled area within the main building.
- The steam from the boilers is converted back to water by the air-cooled condensers for re-use in the boilers.
- Gases generated during the combustion process would be cleaned in the flue gas treatment plant before being released into the atmosphere via the stacks. The treatment plant works by using a number of filters and chemicals to remove pollutants including particulates from the gases. Emissions from the stacks would be monitored continuously by an automatic computerised system and reported in accordance with the Environment Agency's requirements for the operation of the facility.
- Two types of solid by-products would be produced from the operation of the waste (approximately 20% of input waste) – Bottom ash and Air Pollution Control residues (approximately 2.4% of input waste). Each of these would have separate handling and disposal arrangements.
- Bottom ash would be transferred from the bottom of the furnace to the ash storage building via a conveyor where it would be stored. The bottom ash will contain true ash, stones, grit, bricks, concrete, glass and metal. Recovered metals would be extracted and stored separately within the building, prior to being taken off site to a suitable permitted recycling facility. The remaining bottom ash would be exported offsite for further processing / disposal.
- Air Pollution Control residues which are produced from the treatment of the gases generated from the combustion of the waste would be alkaline in nature and hence would be classified as hazardous waste and transported off site to a suitably permitted treatment or disposal facility.
- Surface water on site will be classed as 'clean' or 'dirty' water. The 'clean' water would mainly be from the roof of the building and may be used for flushing lavatories and cleaning with the excess to be directed to the surface water swale and attenuation wetland. The 'dirty' water would be that falling on roadways and hard standings and would be stored separately and used in an 'ash bath' to cool and extinguish embers from ash exiting the moving grates.

The plant would generate electricity and/or heat on a 24-hour basis throughout the year except for when the plant would be shut down for maintenance. Typically, such plants produce electricity over 90% of the time.

Waste would be imported to the site between the hours of 0700 and 1900, Mondays to Fridays, and between 0700 to 1300, Saturdays, with no waste imported on Sundays or public holidays.

It is anticipated that the operation of the facility would generate approximately 186 heavy goods vehicle movements per day (93 in and 93 out), Mondays to Fridays, and approximately 96 heavy goods vehicle movements per day (48 in and 48 out) on Saturdays. The figures include the import of waste and export of recovered materials, ash and other HGV movements.

The operation of the facility would provide approximately 40 full time posts with a third of these being night shift workers and the remainder working normal hours. The construction of the facility would be over a period of approximately 2.5 - 3 years, and

is expected to provide employment for up to 500 people over the full duration of construction works.

Of the 47 megawatts of electricity that the energy recovery facility could potentially generate, the plant itself is likely to use around 5 megawatts of electricity with the remainder of up to 42 megawatts of electricity to be made available for export from the site for use elsewhere. The facility would have a minimum life of 25 years.

All of the proposed feedstock would be residual waste; this is the waste from households and businesses that remains after recyclable materials have been removed. The applicant has stated that should they be successful in securing a contract to manage municipal waste, it is anticipated that the significant majority of waste managed at the site would be municipal waste. Municipal waste is waste collected and managed by, or on behalf of, local authorities. A lesser proportion of the waste treated at the facility would be commercial and industrial wastes similar in composition to the municipal waste. Should the applicant not be successful in securing a municipal waste contract then they would have to rely on commercial and industrial waste sources.

Currently in the UK, residual waste is either mainly landfilled, exported abroad or has the energy recovered from it. The proposed development would help to reduce the landfilling and export of residual waste. In Lancashire, most of the residual household waste is currently landfilled at Whinney Hill Landfill Site, Accrington.

Description and Location of Site

The application site is on the south side of the Red Scar Industrial Estate located approximately 3.6km north-east of Preston City Centre. The industrial estate is accessed off the south side of the B6243 Longridge Road. Access to the application site is via private roads within the industrial estate.

The application site has a total area of 9.27 hectares consisting of the energy recovery facility site (7.3 hectares), the land needed for electricity cables for both a connection to the electricity grid and for a private wire electricity supply, and the access roads within the industrial estate connecting the site to the B6243 Longridge Road to the north (0.97 hectares), and a temporary construction compound (1 hectare).

The application site is flat with a spine road and drainage ditch that were built to implement an outline planning permission granted in 2006 for a southerly extension of the Red Scar Industrial Estate. The spine road terminates some 160 metres to the south west of the application site but would be realigned to the west to provide space for the development. The remainder of the application site is rough grass and scrub with areas of surface water ponding and marshy ground along the eastern and southern margins. Palisade boundary fencing on the eastern and southern boundaries of the industrial estate also form the boundaries of the application site. Several units within the industrial estate would border the north and west boundaries of the application site.

The northern-most part of the site is previously developed industrial land (brownfield). There is also evidence of historical landfilling in the north-west corner.

The energy recovery facility site and other buildings and car park would be located in the north side of the application site adjacent to the existing units within the industrial estate. The re-aligned industrial estate spine road and surface water drainage ditch would be on the west side of the application site. The access road to the application site from the re-aligned spine road would be on the south side of the application site with landscaped bunding on the east and south boundaries. This mounding would be constructed from materials excavated during the construction of the waste bunker.

The proposed energy recovery facility site is on land that is subject to an outline planning permission granted in 2006 for a southerly extension of the industrial estate for use as general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) uses. The southern half of the proposed energy recovery facility is designated as Pope Lane Ponds Biological Heritage Site (BHS). The above permission included provision for the creation of replacement habitats to compensate for the impacts on the Biological Heritage Site and the creation of ponds suitable for Great Crested Newt habitat. A mature hedgerow marks the boundary of the Biological Heritage Site with the land to the south that is located within the Greenbelt and is designated as the Pope Land Field Open Space Local Nature Reserve, and that contains a public right of way, a number of general paths and a section of the Guild Wheel cycle way.

Preston Crematorium is approximately 320 metres to the north-east of the application site, being separated by an area of woodland. Roman Way Industrial Estate and then Rough Hey Road Industrial Estates are beyond the crematorium.

To the east and south of the application site, the uses are primarily open space, the River Ribble, farmland and some scattered settlements. A meander of the River Ribble is 170 metres east of the site and is designated as a Biological Heritage Site. The northern and western sides of the river comprise a steep wooded hillside that is located within the Greenbelt and forms a part of the Red Scar and Tun Brook Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest located 60 and 260 metres to the east and south of the site, respectively. The Brockholes Quarry Biological Heritage Site is located 380 metres to the south of the application site and also within the Greenbelt, while the Brockholes Wood Biological Heritage Site is located 550 metres to the south-west of the application site and on the west side of the M6 motorway.

The M6 motorway is 330 metres to the west of the application site. The nearest residential properties to the application site are located to the west of the M6 in the Ribbleton Hall and Grange Park areas within the main urban area of Preston.

The settlements of Grimsargh and Longridge are located approximately 1.7km and 4.5km to the north-east of the application site.

Background

Scoping opinion

The applicant requested a scoping opinion under the provisions of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 to establish the extent of the information required for the Environmental Statement. Following consultation with statutory bodies and other interested parties, a scoping opinion was issued on 13 February 2019.

Environmental Statement

The proposed development is subject to environmental impact assessment and therefore the application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary. Additional Environmental Information in relation to highway impacts has also been submitted in accordance with Regulation 25 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 to supplement the Environmental Statement.

Community involvement

The application is accompanied by information to highlight that the proposed scheme has been through a number of stages of consultation, and direct consultation with local residents. The applicant held a pre-application public consultation event on 14 February - 29 March 2019.

Application site visit

At the Development Control Committee meeting on 24 July 2019, the committee resolved to visit the application site before determining the planning application. The site visit took place on 14th October 2019.

Site visit to an existing facility

On 17 July 2019, Planning Officers and Development Control Committee members visited an operational energy from waste facility at Four Ashes, Staffordshire, to see the nature and scale of a site comparable to that proposed at Red Scar Industrial Estate.

Application site planning history

Outline planning permission (ref. 06/2005/0200) for an extension to Red Scar Business Park to the south and east for general industrial uses (Class B2) and storage and distribution uses (Class B8) including landscaping and creation of ecological habitat, highway access and associated works was granted by Preston City Council on the 20 April 2006. This permission was subject to a Section 106 Agreement to provide a range of measures including local highway improvements and a Habitat Creation and Management Plan on land to the south to mitigate for the impacts on the Biological Heritage site. This permission was implemented.

Planning permission (ref. 06/2009/0263) for a Reserved Matters submission for the siting, design and external appearance of 3no. 333 sq. m Class B2/B8 portal framed units pursuant to outline planning permission 06/2005/0200 was granted by Preston City Council on the 13 August 2009.

Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

National Planning Policy for Waste - Section 7 is relevant in relation to the determination of planning applications.

National Planning Practice Guidance

Waste Management Plan for England (December 2013)

National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014)

Energy from waste - a guide to the debate February 2014 (revised edition) (DEFRA)

Our Waste, Our Resources: A Strategy for England (December 2018)

National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) 2011

National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) 2011

Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Policy CS7 Managing our Waste as a Resource

Policy CS8 Identifying Capacity for Managing our Waste

Policy CS9 Achieving Sustainable Waste Management

Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies

Policy NPPF1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy DM1 Management of Waste and Extraction of Minerals

Policy DM2 Development Management

Policy DM4 Energy from Waste

Policy WM1 Capacity of Waste Management Facilities

Policy WM2 Large Scale Built Waste Management Facilities

Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy Local Development Framework July 2012

Policy MP

Policy 1 Locating Growth

Policy 2 Infrastructure

Policy 3 Travel

Policy 9 Economic Growth and Employment

Policy 10 Employment Premises and Sites

Policy 15 Skills and Economic Inclusion

Policy 17 Design of New Buildings

Policy 22 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy 27 Sustainable Resources and New Developments

Policy 28 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes

Policy 29 Water Management

Policy 30 Air Quality

Preston Local Plan 2012 – 2026

Policy V1 Model Policy
 Policy AD1 (a) Development within (or in close proximity to) the Existing Residential Area
 Policy EP1 Employment Site Allocations
 Policy EP2 Protection of Existing Employment Areas
 Policy ST1 Parking Standards
 Policy ST2 General Transport Considerations
 Policy EN7 Land Quality
 Policy EN9 Design of New Development
 Policy EN10 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation
 Policy EN11 Species Protection

Preston Local Plan 2004 Saved Policies

Policy T21 Development in relation to trunk roads

Central Lancashire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Final Version October 2012

Central Lancashire Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Supplementary Planning Document July 2015

Central Lancashire Employment Skills Supplementary Planning Document September 2017

Consultations

Preston City Council – No objection subject to the conditions covering the following:

- Hours of construction shall be carried out between the hours of 08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 Saturday.
- A remediation strategy and validation report.
- Provision of spaces and facilities for bicycle parking.
- Provision of electric vehicle charging points which shall be retained for that purpose thereafter.

The City Council's Environmental Health Team note from reading the submitted air quality reports that it is likely that the short term hourly Air Quality Objective for Nitrogen Dioxide may be exceeded slightly at locations on the Red Scar Industrial Estate. The influence from this development to this exceedance is small but the Environmental Health Team would like to seek clarification from the applicant as to whether this exceedance could breach the Air Quality Objective by exceeding the limit 18 times a year and therefore triggering the need for an Air Quality Action Plan.

South Ribble Borough Council – No objection.

Ribble Valley Borough Council - No objection.

Grimsargh Parish Council – Express the following concerns:

- Three housing developments in Grimsargh and Longridge have been taken into consideration in the Transport Statement, but there have been a number of

significant housing developments (Story Homes development for 147 houses, Park House Farm development for 34 houses, Wainhomes Phase 2 for 70 houses, Older Person's Village for a 60 bedroom care home plus 60 apartments and 20 bungalows, Eccleston Homes development for 12 houses, another development for 30 houses, Church house farm development for 4 houses and The Vicarage development for 4 houses) that have been granted permission in Grimsargh and Longridge that have not been included but that will severely impact on traffic in the area. The Transport Assessment should be more up to date than 3-4 years old so as to include these.

- There would be an increase in traffic, especially HGV's, during the construction phase of the development. There is no alternative route through Grimsargh and Preston Road, Grimsargh is often gridlocked at peak times during the day with people commuting from Longridge to Preston.
- Emission spikes that may happen after the plant has been shut down for maintenance etc.
- The plant should include a heat recovery CHP system to achieve maximum benefits of the site.
- No homes will benefit from this proposed scheme. It would be better if local people (both residential and commercial) could benefit from cheaper electricity.
- That the mitigating measures that are proposed will ensure the protection of the important adjacent site of Red Scar and Tun Brook Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest and ancient woodland.

Samlesbury Parish Council – No objection.

Lancashire County Council Highways Development Control – A number of concerns were initially expressed along with a request for further information regarding various issues. Following the submission of the requested further highways information, LCC Highways confirm that they have no objection subject to conditions to enable the management of both construction and operational HGV traffic and the undertaking of highway infrastructure mitigation works that could be delivered by the applicant entering into an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 for the provision of works within the highway.

Highways England - No objection subject to the imposition of a condition that the development shall be undertaken in accordance with a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development.

Environment Agency – No objection subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to contaminated land and submission of an appropriate remediation strategy.

It is also advised that the facility will require the benefit of a permit to operate under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (England and Wales) 2016 (EPR2016). This permit will be granted by the Environment Agency if, after due consideration, the Environment Agency are satisfied that the facility will not cause serious pollution and the operator can comply with the permit conditions. The permit conditions will be based on the Industrial Emissions Directive and the EPR2016. This permitting matter can be included on the granting of any permission as an advice note.

Jacobs UK Ltd (Ecology advice) – No objection. The following planning conditions are recommended to secure ecological mitigation and to clarify finer details of landscaping / habitat creation:

- The submission of an amended Reasonable Avoidance Measures report to ensure the avoidance of impacts to the adjacent great crested newt populations.
- The provision of the lighting of the development shall be in accordance with the submitted lighting details.
- To avoid impacts on nesting birds, pre-works bird nesting checks shall be undertaken if the land clearance works commence within the nesting bird season.
- The finer details of the habitat creation, management and aftercare within the submitted landscape masterplan, and along with the specifications for the brown roof, should be submitted for approval in writing and implemented in full.
- A Construction Environmental Management Plan including an Invasive Species Method Statement, should be submitted for approval in writing and implemented in full.

Natural England – No objection. It is considered that the proposal is unlikely to damage or destroy the interest features for which Red Scar and Tun Brook Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified. It is recommend that the proposed landscaping scheme include Wych Elm (*Ulmus glabra*) as a biodiversity enhancement measure as it is a favoured tree for White-letter Hairstreak Butterflies (*Satyrrium w-album*) that are a feature of the Site of Special Scientific Interest, and so as to increase the habitat available for and the resilience of this species.

The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire – No objection and comment that the applicant has addressed their concerns in relation to the uncertainty about the impact of air pollution from nitrogen deposition on part of the Red Scar and Tun Brook Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest, which is also partly within their Red Scar Woods Nature reserve.

LCC Specialist Advisor (Archaeology) – No objection.

Historic England – No objection.

Jacobs UK Ltd (Landscape advice) – Comment that they concur with the conclusions that the applicant has put forward in the Environmental Statement - Chapter 8 Landscape Effects and Visual Amenity, that identifies that the 'Site could accommodate the Proposed Development with only very locally Significant adverse visual effects upon landscape character and visual amenity'. However, there are some areas of clarification required on the assessment and proposed design, as follows:

- Earthworks – an explanation of the maturity of the landscape planting, and the provision of at least one larger scale section across the proposed earthworks bunds to more clearly illustrate the proposed 1 in 3 gradient slopes, together with the proposed planting and boundary fence line.
- Drainage - further information regarding the construction of wetland swales should be provided to ensure they successfully provide biodiversity habitat. A plan view and longitudinal and horizontal sections would be required for the larger wetland swale. A typical horizontal section for the boundary swale would also be required to understand how it integrates with the road, footway and Site boundary.

- Soils – it should be ensured that the soil formation and profile for the landscape bunds is suitable for planting in terms of subsoil and topsoil depth and drainage. Given the several historic landfills in the vicinity of the application site, further assessments are recommended to provide greater certainty with respect to site-won soils to determine suitability for re-use and the precise mitigation measures required. This should be covered by a Material Management Plan, which will form part of a future remediation strategy planning condition requirement.
- Use of any imported soil-amelioration materials, soils or soil-forming materials – prior to the importation to site, any soil, soil-amelioration or soil-forming materials for use in landscaping shall be tested for contamination and suitability for use following BS 3882:2015, and evidence of such provided to the County Planning Authority.
- Fencing – confirmation of the final colour treatment of all fencing.
- Landscaping - some adjustments to species in the provision of new woodland and shrub planting on bunds and through the creation of wetland and grassland areas may be advisable. This could include the use of Wych Elm or a substitute cultivar, which is raised by the applicant due to concerns over Dutch Elm disease. There is some scope to accommodate additional tree planting around the car park and administration building, particularly to soften views to the proposed car park and bus layby. Additional planting should be considered on the grassed area near the substation. It is recommended that the applicant considers a contribution to wider improvements outside of the red line boundary to reduce the localised significance of landscape and visual effects. This could be through an agreed financial contribution to the nearby designated wildlife sites or to the Pope Lane Open Space, and could facilitate new planting or landscape management operations that could further soften localised views.
- Built design - the stated naturally finished aluminium cladding to the upper level of the Longridge Road Energy Centre building will be light reflecting and therefore may be more apparent and visible on the skyline in views where there is direct sun. The applicant should provide assurance that the adverse visual effects from this material choice have been considered in the assessment and that this will not increase the significance of effect.

The above details need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to determination or where appropriate agreed as pre-commencement conditions.

Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to a Final Sustainable Drainage Scheme:

It is also advised that the granting of planning permission would not allow the applicant to divert the ordinary culverted watercourse on the site. Land Drainage Consent will be required to do this and that should be obtained from Lancashire County Council before starting any works on site. This matter can be included on the granting of any permission as an advice note.

National Grid Gas and Electricity – No objection subject to the inclusion of a note on the granting of any planning permission to advise that the contractor should contact National Grid's Electricity and Gas Transmission Plant Protection before any works are carried out to ensure the apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works.

National Grid Company P.L.C. – No objection.

Electricity North West - No observations received.

Cadent Gas— No objection subject to the inclusion of a note on the granting of any planning permission to advise that Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary.

United Utilities – No observations received.

Public Health, England – No objection.

Lancashire Public Health Collaborative – No objection. It is commented that the conclusions of the Environmental Statement that the proposed development "is not predicted to give rise to significant environmental effects on air quality, human health, ecological receptors and odour" are acknowledged, and that it will be required to meet the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive regulated by the Environment Agency through an environmental permit.

The developer should carry out their commitments to promote sustainable travel for staff through cycle storage and washing facilities and ensuring employment opportunities for the local community, together with the developer ensuring ongoing engagement with the local community.

To assist with air quality mitigation, the developer should consider the inclusion of electric vehicle charge points in the staff car park to encourage the move to low emission vehicles, and also consider the use of green infrastructure either on site or at the more sensitive receptor sites.

Ministry of Defence Lands – Safeguardings – No observations received.

Health and Safety Executive - No objection.

Representations

The application has been advertised by press and site notice, and 2915 nearby addresses informed by individual letter.

A total of 421 representations have been received raising objection to the application on the following summarised grounds:

Emissions

- The long term safety aspects and danger from burning materials including plastics should be looked into further, including from Dioxins and Furans, oxides of nitrogen, polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB), particulates, acid gases and heavy metals. Despite there being set permissible levels in existence for dioxins, the science says that there is actually no safe level - if you can detect any level of dioxins, there is too much dioxin.
- The proposal would have an environmental impact releasing up to 14 times more mercury and twice as much cadmium than coal does.
- Particulate matter is a particular concern - that which is less than 10 and 2.5 microns in diameter (PN10 and PM 25) can penetrate lung passageways and enter the bloodstream. Air pollution can lead to reduced lung function, respiratory

infections and aggravated asthma, increased cancer risk, respiratory illness, cardiac disease, reproductive, developmental and neurological problems. MT Green Power state that comprehensive environmental monitoring is to be undertaken throughout the operational life of the Longridge Road Energy Centre as part of the Environment Agency permit but as long as monitoring of particulate matter is not part of the EA requirement the proposed plant should not be allowed.

- The claims that the facility will be environmentally friendly/ efficient should be investigated as the health impacts of incineration are still to be fully determined. It would not be in the public's interest and it could even be deemed reckless to disregard these risks to place an incinerator at this location so close to local communities. The risk of harmful emissions that cannot be caught in the filters is high plus there have been cases of filter bags tearing and releasing extremely dangerous levels of pollution into the air.
- It is impossible to claim that only non-hazardous waste will be incinerated and that there will be no toxic emissions from this site. People cannot even use the recycling systems already in place so unless there are people employed to pick through every single load of waste intended to enter the incinerator then hazardous waste will be incinerated.
- Major advances in particulate emission removal would be required to make it a safe and palatable development.
- The prevailing wind in the area is West-South-Westerly which means that Grimsargh and Longridge will receive most of the emissions.
- If LCC does grant permission for the plant to be built and it is fully aware of the possible dangers involved, then it is equally responsible and possibly liable for the damage to human life as a result. LCC have made a commitment to improving air quality in Lancashire and this facility will in no way improve that. There has been widespread information with regard to other proposed sites and the associated air pollution.
- The proposal is not going to be a valuable addition to the local community and it will not be beneficial in terms of the health of the local population, local schools such as Grange Primary School and users of the Guild Wheel cycle path.
- The fumes from the additional traffic and increased congestion will increase pollution in the area even further. Air quality is already an issue with the motorway.
- The levels of carbon dioxide from the plant, traffic and associated jams with slow moving vehicles, would greatly increase so there is nothing green about this energy plant.
- UKWIN (UK Without Incineration Network) object to this proposal on the grounds of its adverse climate change impacts. UKWIN believes that the applicant's Carbon Assessment is materially flawed with respect to its handling of biogenic carbon sequestration, and that this flaw renders the report's conclusion invalid. The applicant has failed to show that their proposal is likely, with respect to climate change impacts, to be any better than landfill, and the applicant has failed to rule out the realistic possibility that, even when taking account of the release of methane from landfill, sending waste to their proposed incineration facility would result in the release of significantly higher levels of greenhouse gasses than sending the same material to landfill.
- UK Without Incineration Network argue that the anticipated significant adverse carbon impact of the proposal justifies refusal of the planning application in line with local and national planning policies, guidelines and objectives, and indeed the UK's legal obligations to reduce adverse climate impacts. The proposal could be refused in line with Policies NPPF 1 and DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals

and Waste Local Plan, the 2017 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations where climate change is explicitly listed as part of the consideration of the environmental impacts of a proposed development, and Paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- Given the predicted number of lorries a day feeding the site there can be no guarantee that the refuse they will be burning will be checked prior to incineration to ensure what they are burning is not hazardous.
- Will the environment agency undertake regular monitoring/ inspections of the emissions?
- Are the residents in the area going to be subjected to dull smoggy clouds of pollution instead of the clear air?
- The evidence used for the Air Quality Assessment is not complete. It has used data from Blackpool Airport that is over 20 miles away and they have only provided day time data and a lot of cloud coverage data has not been included.
- Residents would be dry washing as it will become contaminated with the fumes.
- Monitoring of the emissions will be undertaken by software that is unreliable.
- One incinerator has already been approved at Blackburn with Darwin and two others are being proposed at Redscar Industrial Estate and Heysham which are all in a fifty mile radius which is the supposed distance that the toxic gases can travel. If the sites at Preston and Heysham are approved there will be a cumulative effect from the toxic gases produced by the incinerators raising air pollution to levels deemed illegal proposing a serious health risk to the residents and wildlife in the area.

Traffic

- The proposal will generate considerable additional traffic each day, especially from the excess of 200 HGV's, through an already gridlocked route and area with residents. In the morning and evening, there is often queuing traffic right back up along the B6243 Longridge Road towards Grimsargh. It is difficult for residents along Longridge Road to access their properties by car due to the volume of traffic.
- This proposal would make an already extremely busy area unmanageable and the roads unsafe for both drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.
- There are concerns about the ability of the local road network to cope and, in particular, Bluebell Way. At present, it can take 10-15 minutes just to leave the Red Scar Industrial Estate at peak time (turning right onto Longridge Road), and a further 20-30 minutes to get from the Longridge Road roundabout to the M6 slip road. It is suggested that the current road network therefore struggles to cope with existing traffic, regardless of how few additional vehicle movements are considered. There are often two main issues preventing vehicles turning right out of the industrial estate: vehicles travelling at 40mph (or more) on the B6243 Longridge Road towards Preston that restrict the opportunity for HGVs to pull out safely, and also vehicles from the direction of Preston waiting to turn into the industrial estate that block the exit. As there is only one lane on Bluebell Way for traffic heading to the M6 then cars can use the left hand lane and cut in at the last minute that has the potential for accidents. The M6 on-slip road often backs up at evening peak times as well. Given these issues, then adding extra capacity to the roads between the business park and the M6 (outbound) would be quite cheap when compared to the cost of the proposed energy recovery plant, and it would benefit the industrial estate and the area as a whole.

- Traffic will increase along Eastway towards Junction 31A of the M6. Eastway is already heavily congested and, even though the application informs that the wagons will not use this road, it will be used as a short cut for the drivers coming from the north rather than going down the M6 to Junction 31 and then travelling north to exit at Junction 31A.
- Junction 31A should be improved so that the traffic heading for the incinerator will be able to access and exit the M6 from both directions without having to use the surrounding roads. The company behind the plans could make a contribution towards the associated costs of the enhancements to the motorway, which surely could be seen as a positive and mitigate some of the concerns raised by residents.
- The application states that the wagons would use the motorway but, if the motorway is blocked for any reason, then all wagons would have to travel through Preston to access Red Scar Industrial Estate.
- Local roads are already overloaded by the building of more houses. The extra traffic caused by this incinerator is going to be totally unacceptable.
- The additional traffic and delays could potentially cause local employers to lose staff that would have a substantial impact on the local economy. It could also mean that businesses may have to relocate outside of the county that would have a detrimental effect on employment within the Preston and surrounding areas.
- The application claims that there would not be an effect upon traffic as people will amend their journeys and travel at other times. Why should we? Many cannot due to commuting to work and travelling to schools.
- How will access to the site only from Junction 31A of the M6 be enforced?
- Can it be assured that there is no way the development would affect the visibility on the motorway if adverse winds are in force?

Odour

- There will be odours from the plant regardless of the intended control measures. The odours would add to those that are already created from the various industrial estates along the B6243 Longridge Road.
- Residents will be unable to open windows and doors in hot weather, at a time when the odour will be worse.
- The obnoxious smells in Ribchester emanating from the plumes from the old Courtaulds factory chimneys at Red Scar when the wind was from the west are well remembered. Ribchester is thus proved to be within the plume profile of any emissions from the stacks of this proposed Incinerator on this site. Concerns are raised at the nature and content of the emissions from this proposal and the effect they may have over time for the residents of Ribchester as well as those much closer to the new facility.
- Will the environment agency undertake regular monitoring/ inspections of the odours?
- Hasn't Preston City Council recently signed up to a zero emission charter?

Dust

- The operation of the plant and associated traffic will increase dust in the area.

Noise

- The additional traffic will increase noise pollution in the area even further.
- The noise from the plant would add to the noise from the already existing problem from recycling facilities in the Red Scar / Roman Way / Rough Hey area.

Litter

- The proposal would add to the litter and debris that are already created from the various industrial estates along the B6243 Longridge Road.

Ecology

- Potential harm to the nearby flora and fauna in the area including to deer and at Brockholes Nature Reserve and the River Ribble from pollutants from the site.
- The local environment's ability to absorb and survive airborne pollutants is overloaded.

Visual

- The plant and tall chimneys will be an eyesore and will ruin the views from the surrounding countryside. Another factory building in the area is not wanted.

Other matters

- This will be the UK's largest and most dangerous incinerator and will blight the nearby residential areas and it would not be safe to the community.
- This is a short sighted application focused only upon financial gain - similar plants have caused noxious fumes and often been shut down months later.
- Preston City Council have worked very hard to bring the Guild Wheel to fruition. It is a great achievement. A 3 storey building the size of Deepdale would blight the Guild Wheel and affect its use that it turn will affect the well-being and health of people.
- Property prices will reduce and it will prove difficult, if not impossible, for owners to sell their houses once this plant is operational.
- The proposal will seriously impact on the learning of children who attend a nearby children's nursery that utilises the woodland off Roman Way Industrial Estate near to the site.
- LCC failed to send letters to all affected/local people, which is unacceptable. LCC only delivered 550, while the developers sent 5575 - is this a sign that the County Council want this to go ahead without many objections, or that the authorities are obviously trying to keep it quiet? The development was only heard about through the website 'Nextdoor' from other concerned residents.
- There will be a problem with flies, vermin and gulls due to the waste at the site. More gulls will be attracted to the area that will increase by ten-fold the already 300 to 400 gulls that live on Red Scar, and that will in turn cause major nuisance issues. The gulls are already a nuisance in the local areas and at nesting times gulls are prone to become aggressive to protect their young.
- While the plant would assist with the short term reduction of waste going to landfill, LCC needs a determined commitment to reducing household and commercial waste through education and incentives; the incinerator will do nothing to help this as it will just further reinforce a throwaway attitude towards waste. Companies supplying products in non-recyclable packaging should be

made to use ready to recycle products; that way, we would have a sustainable process that is not harmful to anybody.

- The earliest estimated operational start of the Longridge Road Energy Centre is 2023 but the upcoming National Resources and Waste Strategy is expected to prevent more unrecyclable waste entering the environment in the first place. Waste to Energy plants reduce business and local authority incentives to adopt sustainable waste practices and the public are already producing less waste. They are demanding that producers take responsibility and make less toxic products and businesses especially supermarkets reduce unrecyclable products particularly plastics. Bans on certain plastic products have already been agreed. Burning rubbish will become obsolete as zero waste policies are adopted.
- Around 60 per cent of the fuel stock at the proposed Longridge Road Energy Centre is to be residual waste. However if indeed recyclables (including paper, plastics and textiles) are removed from the waste, the fuel stock will need to be supplemented to the higher calorific value (of 7MJ/Kg) which is presumably required to produce the energy to make the plant viable. What other fuel stocks does the applicant intend to use in light of this calorific shortfall? If the deficit is to have any quota of virgin wood this would seriously call into question the 'renewable energy' argument for the Longridge Road Energy Centre as we should be doubling tree acreage, not burning the ones we have.
- The incinerator applicants claim that no recyclables will be burned at the site but have not implemented any sorting process into their planning application indicating that recyclables are going to be burned illegally.
- Existing recycling sites/ plants that are not at full capacity, such as at Farrington, Leyland, should be reopened and used so as to reduce waste.
- It is appreciated that facilities such as this are necessary, as is the need to stop shipping UK rubbish around the world, especially when the population is increasing at such a rate, but does it really need to be so close to a residential area when there are surely other brownfield sites available away from residential areas? There is a site at Exeter that is located on an industrial estate miles from any residential housing. The plant should be built on waste lands far from areas that could ever be considered as residential areas. A location somewhere near the coast seems more adequate as it would provide better air exchange and dilution of odours, or other locations should be considered where the risks to human health can be minimised or alternative means of waste disposal should be investigated. A remote and isolated brownfield site is the only suitable location for this development. Perhaps the site of the proposed Ikea next to Junction 30 would be better suited to industrial traffic, or alternatively somewhere further north of Junction 32 where a site could be located without impacting mass numbers of people? Surely there is land near existing power plants and factories such as Heysham and North Wales or next to an existing landfill site where the impact of HGVs is already known. Alternatively somewhere that is already heavily industrial like Trafford Park with far better motorway access. The existing £4million LCC incinerator facilities in South Ribble should be reopened to provide the necessary capability.
- It is understood that the biggest benefactors of this development are Samlesbury Aerodrome and the surrounding area. It is known that there is huge scope for development in this area so build it on their doorstep.
- Recent developments which have been successful have seen an increase of animals born with disabilities, an increase of miscarriages and an increase of cancer victims. Asthma and allergies could be exacerbated. The local NHS services will not be able to cope with the increase in patients.

- The country should be considering green energy.
- Incinerating trash is not an effective way of producing energy.
- Not enough permanent jobs will be created.
- The area should be looked at for what it could be used for and what Preston people really need, such as a new school or new hospital.
- Overall, there are more disadvantages than benefits for the communities living nearby.
- A similar proposal has already been rejected in Runcorn because of problems to health, traffic, odour, pollution and noise. LCC should follow their example and refuse this planning application.
- There will be a potential impact to public health due to emissions and odour. In Runcorn, where there is a very large garbage incinerator, the incidence of conditions like COPD (Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) and respiratory cancers is above the national average. In Wirral, the local residents cannot even open their windows due to the smell from the incinerator. The incinerator in Runcorn has generated over 1,000 complaints to the Environment Agency regarding noise, dust and odour, despite assurances at the planning stage that these would not be problems, so there can be no certainty that this will not be a problem here.
- There is a risk of a chemical fire, general fire or industrial accident.
- The electricity generated will not be offered to the residents as a cheaper energy source.
- There are other waste sites in the area that have planning permission but have been a complete nuisance on the local community with the noise, dust and odour that they emit. The Environment Agency has been working with one of the waste sites for over 2 years and issues still persist. With these kind of issues, along with a study on a Dutch modern incinerator that has proven to emit dangerous pollutants far beyond EU toxic emissions limit, what guarantees are there that the site will run as predicted?
- There has been so much development in Longridge and Grimsargh of which we have not yet had chance to see the impact on infrastructure.
- There are better ways of disposing of this waste, for example, plastic eating bacteria.
- Waste from all over the country, and maybe even from the world, will be accepted at the facility.
- The Councils are only interested in the increased revenues from business rates gained from this development and not the welfare of the community at large.
- The environmental impact assessment has not been made public at this point in time.
- In the government's 25 Year Environment Plan, 'an incineration tax should be introduced to ensure polluters pay their fair share for the harmful emissions arising from waste incinerators'. In the absence of such a tax objection is raised in principle to the Longridge Road Energy Centre which would worsen environmental inequalities and increase the health burdens on residents in the vicinity which are already higher than the national average.
- The proposal does not seem to fit in with the Lancashire Waste Management Strategy for 2018-2020 that states that "This strategy confirms the Authorities stance regarding the alternatives to incineration. Accordingly the county council continues to oppose the siting of any proposal for mass burn incineration of municipal waste in any Lancashire District". I urge you to think and consider all viable options as opposed to this solution.

- Incineration is not a form of renewable energy; the feedstock does not in fact naturally and repeatedly occur in the environment and so is not 'renewable'. Incineration relies upon fossil fuels such as plastic and is contributing to the creation and use of plastic which we are becoming increasingly aware is immensely harmful to wildlife and the health of ourselves.
- The development is only being situated in this location due as it is viewed as less than appealing. The character of the area is in need of boosting and displayed as more positive. This proposal will not help this. The development would not be proposed for an area such as Penwortham.
- The development has already commenced with roads being built and cables being laid.

Preston City Councillor Jonathan Saksena for Ribbleson Ward objects to the application, for the following reasons:

- The consultation by Longridge Road Energy Co did not cover a large part of the catchment area;
- The personnel involved in the consultation sessions held earlier year gave one explanation to residents' concerns, but the Planning Consultants who met the Cabinet and the Ward Councillors at a later date said something quite different, leading to questions of trust;
- There was no proper technical or scientific advice available at the consultations because the process has been managed by Planning Consultants whose prime concern is to obtain Planning Permission;
- Despite all assurances to the contrary, he is highly sceptical about the traffic management proposals, and in particular about the ability of the site operator to police the delivery traffic;
- The Planning Consultants dismiss problems with other similar plants (e.g. Runcorn) as being caused by the processes and equipment being out-of-date, but the facts do not bear this out;
- Projections about the amount of employment likely to be generated vary widely from document to document and it is hard to judge which may be true;
- There is a very widespread tendency to try and locate processes like this in an area of high social deprivation, under the assumption that the population will be less "articulate" and will make fewer objections.

Preston City Councillor Ron Woolam for Preston Rural East Ward objects to the application, for the following reasons:

- The location of this facility is totally unsuitable for the number of HGVs that will be entering and leaving the site each day, which will have a major impact on the already heavily congested highways leading to the M6 motorway slip road and in turn will result in long delays through Grimsargh.
- Extremely concerned about the environmental impact on the highly populated surrounding residential areas. The site will give rise to toxic dust and odour which will have an impact on the general health of children and older people living in the area. There is also the issue of high noise levels.
- Request that planners reject this application and look at an alternative site away from highly congested and populated areas and to consider the health risks to residents living within the surrounding area.

Preston City Councillor Brian Rollo for Ribblesdale Ward objects to the application, for the following reasons:

- The proposed building is 37.1m high and that the proposed height of the two stacks is 85m. This is a very large building which will dominate its surroundings. Tulketh Mill Chimney by comparison is less than 55m and in a flat area.
- The proposal will have an overbearing appearance and visual impact on Pope Lane nature reserve adjoining the site, Preston Guild Wheel, Preston Crematorium, Boilton Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest and Brockholes Nature reserve.
- There will also be an increase in large heavily laden vehicles which will travel on Longridge Road carrying waste material to the site and returning empty.
- It will be a carbon dioxide production plant at this time of climate change and of the likelihood of the escape of noxious sulphurous and nitrogenous oxides into the area in which my constituents live and exercise.
- As chair of governors of Moor Nook Community Primary School, Cllr Rollo is extremely concerned about the health of school children playing in the nature reserve and Boilton Wood.

Preston City Councillors John Browne and Philip Corker for Brookfield Ward object to the application, for the following reasons:

- Serious concerns about the traffic management proposals particularly relating to the site operator being able to police the situation.
- The company want to locate the application in this area in part because of its social deprivation making it harder for residents to have the wherewithal to articulate their obvious objections. The local residents have more than enough to put up with, without this business being foisted upon them and the people of Ribblesdale generally.

Ben Wallace MP for Wyre & Preston North Constituency objects to the application for the following reasons:

- The proposed location is unsuitable for an energy recovery facility. The transport assessment commissioned by the applicant states that 498,700 tonnes of fuel would be brought to the site in vehicles with a capacity to transport either 19 or 11 tonnes of fuel per journey. This equates to at least 26,248 return journeys per annum. The movement of this number of heavy goods vehicles will have a detrimental impact on surrounding roads. The local highway network is already heavily congested and the impact of the additional heavily goods vehicles will be intolerable to my constituents and others who travel through the area.
- I also fear that the energy recovery facility will generate an unacceptable odour, noise and light pollution (particularly as the facility is to operate continuously) and potentially dust. The Red Scar Industrial Estate is located on the edge of a residential area of Fulwood and close to the village of Grimsargh. This is not an appropriate location for the type of facility proposed.
- I was also greatly concerned to read the applicant's assessment of the potential health impacts of the proposed facility. The applicant states "it is possible that the local community as a whole, or individuals living within these communities, are more sensitive to environmental changes associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development." Given that there are similar facilities in Thornton and Grimsargh, I question the requirement for this facility in this location

and do not believe the benefits will outweigh the risks to the health of my constituents, traffic congestion or odour, noise, dust and light pollution.

Mark Hendrick MP for Preston Constituency objects to the application for the following reasons that have been expressed by a number of constituents:

- The consultation does not appear to have been publicised well by Miller Turner and there has been some confusion as to when the statutory consultation was undertaken. I understand that the developer has claimed it has contacted 5575 households, yet according to an e-mail from Lancashire County Council to a resident; LCC have advised that letters were sent to just over 500 addresses, making there a clear disparity.
- Traffic and environmental factors: I have deep concerns about the traffic implications the proposals may have on roads around the site. I understand that once complete, there will be around 180 Heavy Goods Vehicle movements for up to six days per week which will mean that journey times around Junction 31a of the M6 and Longridge Road through Red Scar Industrial Estate could be impacted; both of which are extremely busy routes at present. The pollution that would be emitted from the site and from the transport to and from the facility would also have serious adverse impacts well beyond the immediate locality.
- Information on the official website of the Energy Centre only includes details about combustion and not information about plans for an incinerator on the site. The projected plume model shows that areas to all directions for up to 50 miles could be affected by air quality at ground level. Environmental concerns from the plume could impact local wildlife and grassland.
- Given that the proposed site is located in close proximity to residential areas, a plant of this scale is not appropriate as residents could face issues such as vermin and flies. There is worry about odour pollution and smell coming from the plant with some referring to other projects in the North West to which have caused concern, such as similar developments in Runcorn. This is particularly worrying as I believe the plant will be operating 365 days per year. We therefore do not know the short or long-term health and environmental impacts that an approved plant in Preston would have on the local and wider population.
- Whilst I agree that we should be looking for alternative forms of energy and that we should decrease the amount of landfill produced, I do not believe that the Energy Centre provides the answer and does not provide enough incentive for the people of Preston. Incineration should be seen a retrograde step given the various amounts of recycling and re-use of plastics currently available and I believe more emphasis on this should be taken by both the Government, supermarkets and local authorities.

Support summary

One representation of support has been received but does not elaborate further.

Other representations summary

Two other representations have been received that do not specifically object to the application and think that the development would, in principle, be a positive move for the area, but refer to impacts of traffic.

Advice

Introduction

The proposal is for the development of an energy recovery facility in which up to 395,000 tonnes of residual non-hazardous household, commercial and industrial waste, and refuse derived fuel, would be imported and combusted within the plant. The facility would have an electricity generating capacity of 47 megawatts per year (with 42 megawatts for export and 5 megawatts retained for the running of the site). The average UK household consumes around 3.1MWh of electricity per year and therefore the proposed development would generate an amount of electricity approximately equivalent to the demands of 108,000 households. 2015 data indicates that there were approximately 62,600 households in Preston at that time.

There is also the potential for waste heat to be exported from the plant for utilisation by other businesses within the surrounding Red Scar Industrial Estate or further afield should opportunities be identified.

Residual waste is the waste that remains after practicable measures have been taken to remove material that is suitable for re-use or recycling. Refuse derived fuel is a fuel that has typically been produced by the shredding of various types of waste such as non-hazardous municipal, commercial and industrial waste.

This application raises a wide range of issues including the general requirement for waste management and energy generation facilities, climate change issues as well as local impacts including air quality, traffic and visual impact.

Principle of development

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies and is a material consideration in planning decisions.

The proposed development spans three key areas of government policy which seek to direct the management of waste up the waste hierarchy, promote the decentralisation of energy production, and use fuels and energy sources other than primary won fossil fuels. Along with the National Planning Policy Framework there is the Waste Management Plan for England (December 2013), National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014), and Our Waste, Our Resources: A Strategy for England (December 2018). In terms of energy policy, the National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) 2011 and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) 2011 contain relevant policy guidance.

National Planning Policy for Waste sets out the Government's ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management. A key part of this is to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy, this principle being derived from the Waste Framework Directive, which is the European Union legislation that governs waste management. The waste hierarchy sets out the following order of preference in waste prevention and management legislation and policy: a) prevention; b) preparing for re-use; c)

recycling; d) other recovery, (for example energy recovery); and e) disposal as the least preferable option.

Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when determining planning applications for renewable and low carbon development, local planning authorities should not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, and recognise that even small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions. The National Planning Policy Framework defines renewable and low carbon energy as including energy for heating and cooling as well as generating electricity. Renewable energy covers those energy flows that occur naturally and repeatedly in the environment – from the wind, the fall of water, the movement of the oceans, from the sun and also from biomass and deep geothermal heat. Low carbon technologies are those that can help reduce emissions (compared to conventional use of fossil fuels).

The National Planning Policy for Waste refers to the Waste Management Plan for England in which the Government supports efficient energy recovery from residual waste to deliver environmental benefits, reduce carbon impact and provide economic opportunities. The National Planning Policy for Waste sets out the national planning policies for waste development and should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework. It sets out the Government's continuing ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management including by driving waste up the hierarchy and minimising waste. This includes helping to secure the re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment and recognising the need for a mix of types and scale of facilities, and that adequate provision must be made for final waste disposal.

The National Planning Policy for Waste sets out specific considerations to be taken into account in determining planning applications. These include only expecting applicants to demonstrate the quantitative or market need for new or enhanced waste management facilities where proposals are not consistent with an up-to-date local plan; and ensuring that waste management facilities in themselves are well-designed, so that they contribute positively to the character and quality of the area in which they are located. Additionally, Waste Planning Authorities should not concern themselves with the control of processes, which are a matter for the pollution control authorities. It should be assumed that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. It is also recognised that new facilities will need to serve catchment areas large enough to secure the economic viability of the plant.

A Government document entitled '*Energy from waste - A guide to the debate February 2014*' (revised edition) provides useful background commentary on the subject and is helpful in exploring some of the main issues. The key points are as follows:

- Residual waste usually involves waste that is a mixture of different items. Part of residual waste will come from items made from fossil fuels such as plastics, and part from things that were recently growing and are biodegradable such as food, paper, or wood. It is only the energy generated from the recently grown materials that can be considered renewable. Energy from residual waste is therefore a partially renewable energy source, sometimes referred to as a low carbon energy source.

- There is often concern that energy from waste discourages greater recycling counter to the Government's goal to move waste up the hierarchy. However, throughout Europe there are examples where energy from waste coexists with high recycling, ultimately delivering low landfill.
- It is stressed that councils have a duty to cooperate to ensure that waste needs across their respective areas are handled properly and appropriately. They need to have regard for the proximity principle, which requires all waste for disposal and mixed municipal waste (i.e. waste from households) to be recovered in one of the nearest appropriate facilities. However, this principle must not be over-interpreted. It does not require using the absolute closest facility to the exclusion of all other considerations. There is nothing in legislation or the proximity principle that says accepting waste from another council, city or region is undesirable and indeed in many cases it may be the best economic and environmental solution and/or be the outcome most consistent with the proximity principle.
- The Government sees a long term role for energy from waste both as a waste management tool and as a source of energy. This long term role needs to be based on energy from waste that at least constitutes recovery not disposal. This should therefore be a key consideration for both new and existing projects. To be classed as recovery, energy from waste facilities must meet the requirements set out in the Waste Framework Directive, for example through attainment of R1 status.
- Fossil fuel based residual wastes, such as plastics that cannot be recycled, do not decompose in the same way as biogenic material in landfill. For these waste streams conventional energy from waste will almost always deliver a negative carbon balance compared to landfill as the combustion of these materials will give rise to CO₂ emissions. However, they represent a potential resource that in line with the hierarchy should ideally be recovered and not disposed of to landfill where no energy recovery from these materials is possible. Advanced processing into energy sources that deliver lifecycle benefits compared to use of raw materials offer a potentially sustainable way to do this.
- The potential for energy from waste to consume materials, which could otherwise be managed higher up in the waste hierarchy is a legitimate concern. This applies to prevention and reuse but is most commonly identified in relation to recycling. This is not a fundamental issue arising from energy from waste as a process, but rather as a result of opportunities not being taken to separate and remove materials from residual waste. Provided the right action is taken to ensure separation and pre-treatment options are optimised, it is a risk that can be effectively addressed. Energy from waste can and should support, not compete, with effective recycling.

National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) 2011 – although principally relating to nationally significant infrastructure projects, recognises that there is a pressing national need to move away from out-dated fossil fuel based generation and develop forms of renewable energy generation. National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) 2011, which is designed to be read in conjunction with EN-1, recognises that the recovery of energy from the combustion of waste, where in

accordance with the waste hierarchy, will play an increasingly important role in meeting the UK's energy needs.

In terms of strategic development plan policy, the site is located within the Red Scar Industrial Estate on land that is allocated as existing employment area and proposed employment area within Preston Local Plan 2012 – 2026 (Policies EP1 and EP2). The proposed employment land is protected for business, general industrial, or storage and distribution uses (Use Classes B1, B2 or B8, respectively). The proposed development is also on land that is allocated for individual large scale built waste management facilities within the Policy WM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies.

Policy WM2 sets out that large scale-built waste management facilities including energy from waste (thermal treatment) will be supported on identified strategic sites subject to the total capacity of all new waste management facilities within the catchment not exceeding the need within the catchment, as set out within the policy. The proposed development would be located on an allocated site within the Central Lancashire Catchment Area, which at the time that the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan was prepared was calculated to require an additional 500,000 tonnes per annum waste management capacity through the plan period to 2021. However, this policy specifically excludes the need for municipal waste capacity because at the time, Blackpool Council and Lancashire County Council secured a long term private finance initiative backed contract to recycle, recover and dispose of all waste collected within their administrative boundaries. Under that contract, planning permission was granted for four major strategic municipal waste management facilities at Leyland, Thornton, Middleton and Huncoat with a number of supporting waste transfer stations. This contract is no longer in place but municipal waste continues to be managed via the Leyland and Thornton sites. Blackburn with Darwen was not part of this private finance initiative.

More recently, the nature of the treatment processes carried out at these facilities has changed, and Policy WM2 should be considered in light of this. There has been a drive towards reducing the amount of Lancashire municipal waste going to landfill by processing residual waste to produce refuse derived fuel at the County Council's existing waste technology parks at Leyland and Thornton. These sites were initially established for the sorting and bulking up of recyclable waste, and mechanical biological treatment of residual waste. However, the mechanical biological treatment process is now less cost effective than producing refuse derived fuel so refuse derived fuel is now produced instead through the sorting and shredding of residual waste. This element of the total waste is currently exported to energy from waste facilities in Runcorn. Furthermore, the Thornton site also reintroduced a biological treatment process approximately 2 years ago. However, rather than composting the waste as was originally envisaged, the process is now simply used to drive off moisture to reduce landfill disposal costs.

Looking at available data, approximately 886,000 tonnes of commercial, household and industrial waste arising in Lancashire in 2017 was sent to non-hazardous landfill both within and outside of Lancashire. In the same year, approximately 74,000 tonnes of waste arising in Lancashire was incinerated both within and outside of Lancashire, and the UK. (2017 Incinerator Waste Returns, Environment Agency data). This waste was categorised as 'Refuse Derived Fuel' and 'other wastes from

mechanical treatment of waste'. However, not all incinerators are required to report inputs so this figure is not necessarily complete. Although the applicants are not an established waste operator with existing waste management contracts in the north west, they have sought to establish the general requirement for new capacity based upon the location and age of existing energy from waste plants and the current reliance on landfill as the predominant form of waste management, particularly for municipal waste produced in Lancashire.

In relation only to municipal (household) waste, (excluding Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen), figures indicate that around 576,000 tonnes of such waste was produced in Lancashire in 2017/2018. This includes residual waste, dry recyclables collected from households, and waste deposited at household waste recycling centres. Approximately 285,000 tonnes of this waste was deposited at Whinney Hill Landfill site. Approximately 242,000 tonnes was reused, recycled or composted and some 46,000 tonnes was recovered as Refuse Derived Fuel. More recently the figure for recovery has increased to 100,000 - 150,000 tonnes.

The applicant indicates that the proposed development has been scaled to be economically viable, to take account of the uncertainties over predicted waste arisings (particularly from commercial and industrial sources), and to potentially provide treatment for residual municipal waste. The facility could provide an option for the management of commercial/industrial waste within the region and also for municipal waste depending on the outcome of future contractual arrangements. As can be seen from the above, there is a significant volume of potentially available residual waste in the Lancashire area alone that could be redirected to energy recovery. It should be noted that depending on contracts and/or economic viability waste could also be sourced from outside Lancashire. This does not mean that the proposed development would not be complying with the European Waste Framework Directive regarding the proximity principle, which requires all waste to be recovered in one of the nearest appropriate facilities, because it does not require using the absolute closest facility to the exclusion of all other considerations. It is acceptable to take waste from other regions particularly if this represents a better environmental solution.

It should be noted that planning permission has recently been granted for a similar energy recovery facility in the Blackburn with Darwen administrative area (reference number 10/19/0495). Similarly, a resolution to grant planning permission for an energy recovery facility at Lancaster West Business Park at Heysham (reference number. LCC/2019/0021) was made by Lancashire County Council's Development Control Committee on the 16 October 2019. However, it must be understood that in determining planning applications, National Planning Policy for Waste makes it clear that waste planning authorities should only consider the extent to which the capacity of existing **operational** facilities would satisfy any identified need. The fact that there are other unimplemented planning permissions for such facilities should not mean that further permissions should not be granted on the basis of a lack of need.

Policy WM2 refers to a catchment need for additional waste management capacity for the plan period up to 2021, excluding Lancashire County Council's municipal waste management needs. In consideration of more up to date figures regarding the availability of commercial and industrial waste that could be diverted away from landfill as referred to above, the need for alternative management options for residual municipal waste, and given that national policy recognises that new facilities

will need to serve catchment areas large enough to secure the economic viability of the plant, the proposal should be supported in this respect.

In addition, the National Planning Policy for Waste requires that applicants should only be required to demonstrate the quantitative or market need for new waste management facilities where proposals are not consistent with an up to date local plan. In this case, the proposed development would be located on a site allocated for industrial and waste management uses in the development plan. Therefore the principle of the development on this site is acceptable in terms of general planning policy and the need for new waste management facilities.

Policy DM4 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan concerns energy from waste. The policy specifies that all developments that include processes capable of recovering energy from waste will be required to include measures to capture any heat or electricity produced directly or as a by-product of the waste treatment process and either use it on site or export it to the national grid or a local energy or heat consumer. The primary aim of the proposed development is to recover energy from residual waste and the potential energy efficiency of the operation of the facility can be assessed through the Environment Agency R1 accreditation scheme. This would consent the operation as a recovery operation (rather than a disposal activity) if it achieves R1 status. To ensure that the proposed development would genuinely be designed as a recovery facility and thereby allow for the management of waste at a higher level in the waste hierarchy than landfill, it is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring R1 status to be demonstrated prior to the commencement of development.

The recovery credentials of the development could be further enhanced by utilising the waste heat from the site. This could be used by an adjacent industrial user or in a district heating scheme. At the time of the application, no end user for the heat had been identified. However, the site is located on an existing industrial estate and therefore it is reasonable to expect that end users for some or all of the heat produced by the plant could be identified in future. In order to maintain a review of this matter, it is considered that it should be the subject of a planning condition, should planning permission be granted.

The applicant states that nearest point where they could make a connection into the local electricity distribution network is in Blackburn. Therefore they will need to lay a cable from the application site to the substation in Blackburn. Given this fact it is considered appropriate to attach a condition to any permission to require that the facility shall not accept waste until confirmation has been provided that the cable link is in place. Without this condition, it is possible that the site could burn waste without generating any power in which case it would only be disposal at the lowest level of the waste hierarchy.

Many local residents who have made representation are concerned that the proposed development would discourage recycling or waste prevention. However, the primary means of encouraging recycling and waste prevention is through fiscal measures and economic drivers that aim to promote the management of waste further up the waste hierarchy and provide opportunities to do so. This includes for example: landfill tax; plastic bag charges; statutory recycling targets; waste minimisation initiatives; and legislative controls on waste management. The recent Government Policy Paper 'Our Waste – Our Resources' provides an important

indication of the future direction of waste policy and sets out further ways in which the Government intends to reduce waste and to increase recycling such as improving the separation of materials from residual waste at source. There are also materials where there is currently no technology or market for recycling to be viable. It should be noted that the County Council has recently expanded the range of plastic materials that are collected from households in Lancashire to include HDPE and PP as well as the PET materials that have been historically collected and it is entirely possible that the range of materials collected could be expanded further in future with technological advances and market changes. It is therefore considered that the development of energy from waste facilities does not necessarily prevent such measures from being implemented to secure further increases in waste prevention, reuse or recycling.

Alternatives

The Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations place no specific obligation on an applicant to study alternatives, but simply to describe them in the manner specified. In this instance, the applicant identified the Lancashire area as being one with a shortage of infrastructure for the recovery of residual waste. They considered an alternative site location at the Hillhouse International site at Thornton. However, this location was rejected because it is substantially less central to Lancashire as a whole, is further from the strategic road network, and would inevitably require vehicles to pass through residential areas to access the Hillhouse site. Instead, the proposed site at Red Scar Industrial Estate was chosen because of the location within an industrial estate in the centre of Lancashire that is in close vicinity to significant potential energy customers whilst also being close to the strategic road network of the M55, M6, M61 and M65 corridor for the delivery of fuel.

In terms of technology choice, the applicant has chosen a standalone direct waste combustion process (thermal treatment) using twin moving grates. This would have the ability to export electricity, heat or a combination of both, which could provide a credible and proven solution, capable of meeting environmental standards and being delivered both financially and technically by the private sector.

The applicant also evaluated alternative design solutions including site layout and building design. The shape of the site and the nature of the process undertaken at the facility dictated the basic site layout along with other factors such as the presence of the nearby receptors both inside and outside the industrial estate, the relationship and potential engagement with the industrial estate, transport access onto the site, and noise and visual impacts. Additionally, various architectural techniques have been considered to mitigate the visual presence of the building including different roof forms and building envelopes, fragmentation of building components and use of different colours and materials. These issues are explored further in a later section of this report.

Employment

The operation of the facility would provide employment for approximately 40 full time people, with a third of these being night shift workers and the remainder of approximately 27 people working normal daytime hours. The construction of the facility would provide temporary employment for up to 500 people over a period of

approximately 2.5 - 3 years. This would be a significant economic benefit for the area.

The Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy Local Development Framework July 2012 is accompanied by an Employment Skills Supplementary Planning Document September 2017 that sets out various criteria to ensure that the right skills and employment opportunities are provided at the right time to benefit both the developer and local population. The applicant is amenable to a condition requiring the submission of an employment and skills plan and this is recommended accordingly should planning permission be granted.

Site Design and Layout, and Landscape and Visual Impact

The design of the proposed development has a major bearing on how successfully it can be integrated into the landscape. The National Planning Policy Framework has a chapter on achieving well-designed places and notes that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Policy EN9 of the Preston Local Plan 2012 – 2026 states that all new development proposals should be designed with regard to the following principles as set out and explained in the Central Lancashire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document: movement and legibility, mix of uses and tenures, adaptability and resilience, resources and efficiency, and architecture and townscape. The policy states that applications will be approved where they: accord with the principles and guidance set out in the Design Supplementary Planning Document, the relevant policies in the Core Strategy (Policy 17), national policy on the historic environment and the relevant Design Council Cobe guidance; take the opportunity to make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the area through high quality new design that responds to its context; and are accompanied by a satisfactory Design and Access Statement that fully explains and justifies the design approach for the scheme.

The applicant has engaged an architectural practice to assist with the broad layout of the site and the specific design of the building and has submitted a design and access statement to accompany the planning application. The document seeks to explain the key design decisions that have been made to enable interested parties to understand the logic of the design for which planning permission is sought. The design process has utilised 3D design modelling in combination with local viewpoint assessment. Building configuration has been assessed in terms of site operation considerations, site layout constraints, and impact on the surrounding environment.

The design justification highlights that a range of alternative site layout studies were developed. These studies explored the potential distribution and orientation of the various process functions across the site, together with consideration of alternative access strategies to optimise rerouting of the existing spine road, segregation of operational and non-operational vehicles, and to establish efficient and safe traffic movements within the site.

Initial site layout studies reviewed the overall shape of the site and the footprint of the energy recovery facility building footprint. This study concluded that due to the narrowed width of the southern portion of the site only the wider northern part of the

site would be suitable for locating the energy recovery facility building. The northern location for the proposal offered other benefits including ensuring that the largest built components of the development were located as far as possible from sensitive visual and ecological receptors to the south and south-west of the site, and better engaged with the Red Scar Industrial Estate directly to the north. This design choice best utilised the narrower southern part of the site to accommodate sufficient internal HGV queuing arrangements without compromising the spine road, and for locating the required 'in and 'out' weighbridges and gatehouse control point.

Once an ideal layout was established, consideration was given to the massing, form and appearance of the energy recovery facility building. Incorporated within all of the design concepts was the recognition that the building will be seen on two distinct levels. The lower level of the building and its adjoining buildings and plant will be viewed against the scale of the adjoining existing and future developments within the industrial estate, whilst the upper level of the building will be more visually prominent from nearby and distant views. The various design concepts explored different roof forms and, as part of this design evolution to improve the wider views of the energy recovery facility, it was decided that both the waste storage bunker and floor level of the central boiler hall parts of the building would be sited below ground. This considerably reduces the overall massing and height of the building.

The design studies also explored various architectural finishes to the building in terms of material colour and pattern. The lower level 'plinth' would consist of contrasting dark grey colours of alaska grey (RAL 7000) and anthracite (RAL 7016), while the upper level 'linear' form would consist of light reflecting mill finished standing seam aluminium cladding. The twin emissions stacks would have a metal stack casing to be coloured oyster (RAL 7035). The refined light grey colours of the upper levels of the building and the emissions stacks are considered the most successful in reducing the apparent scale of the building by better blending with the sky. The design and indicative choice of materials are considered acceptable. Preston City Council have not objected. Jacobs (Landscape) comment that the stated naturally finished aluminium cladding to the upper level of the energy recovery facility building would be light reflecting and therefore may be more apparent and visible on the skyline in views where there is direct sun. This viewpoint has some merit and hence the above details need to be submitted and approved prior to being erected.

The applicant has provided an assessment of the predicted impacts and resulting effects of the proposed development on landscape and visual receptors. The assessment does not attempt to illustrate every location where the proposed development may be visible as this is not required by best practice guidance and would not be a proportionate approach. However, an assessment has been undertaken from a wide range of representative viewpoints including from locations close to the site and those at most distance including from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The site and surrounding area are not located within any landscape designations. It is located within National Character Area 35 Lancashire Valleys and at a county level within the Lower Ribble Landscape Character Area. The site is broadly level. The landform plan illustrates the immediate landscape context showing the site on a relatively level plateau with gentle undulations. To the east the land steeply slopes away to the River Ribble and its floodplain.

The assessment has concluded that direct effects on the landscape fabric of the site during construction and operation would be not significant, and the landscape has the capacity to accommodate the scale of development proposed with some beneficial effects on landscape fabric resulting from proposed native planting.

The twin stacks would be the main elements of the proposal with the potential to affect the landscape character of the locality. There would be locally significant effects on the 'Lower Ribble' landscape character area covering the Pope Land Field Open Space Local Nature Reserve which is the land immediately to the south of the proposal. Further afield, the broad scale of the landscape along with the wooded slopes above the River Ribble, and with the Red Scar Industrial Estate as a backdrop, has the ability to accommodate the proposal and which would not result in the underlying scale and patterns of the landscape at the urban fringe being unacceptably impacted.

The development would be visible from parts of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Beauty above Longridge. However, these viewpoints are located over 7km to the northeast of the site and therefore the impacts would not be significant. There would be no significant effects upon the visual amenity of residents to the west of the site immediately beyond the M6 within the Ribblesdale and Grange Hall housing estates in Preston. At medium to long range, no significant effects upon visual amenity are predicted, with typically intermittent views of the upper parts of the stacks experienced by some users at the edge of settlements, public rights of way and roads.

The most significant views would be from the land directly to the south including the Pope Lane Playing Fields and the Guild wheel cycleway. The visual impacts of the plant from these views would be significant although they would be seen against the backdrop of the existing industrial estate. Jacobs in their landscape comments have suggested that some additional planting should be explored on land to the south of the site. These comments are noted. However, the applicant has already attempted to address these impacts by sinking the main building into ground and using the excavated materials to form landscaped mounding around the southern and eastern boundaries of the site. Given appropriate landscaping, it is considered that the visual impact from these locations could be mitigated to an acceptable degree. The bunds and the area around the front (west side) of the energy recovery building where the administration building and car park would be located would be planted with trees while, elsewhere, a native wildflower meadow mix would be sown. The indicative landscape scheme is considered acceptable subject to a condition requiring further details of planting mixes, cultivation methods, establishment of habitats, and general maintenance and management of the landscaping while the facility is operational.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant cumulative landscape or visual effects with any other development, although it is accepted that the proposal would result in some significant very localised landscape and visual effects.

The applicant has submitted an indicative lighting scheme and provided a lighting assessment to demonstrate that a lighting scheme could be compliant with applicable guidance relating to illuminance and light spill. The site would be operational 24 hours a day and lighting would be required inside the building and for

the external car park and site access roads. There would be no lights on the emissions stacks as they are only required for structures with a height exceeding 90 metres AOD; the emissions stacks would only be 85 metres high.

An acceptable lighting scheme could be achieved through the use of lighting with minimal to zero direct contribution to upward light by careful aiming and positioning of lighting heads; the use of optimal optics for their specific location and orientation; optimisation of mounting heights; the adoption of the lowest intensity LED modules practicable; and minimising the task illuminance level. The applicant has demonstrated that it is likely that an acceptable lighting could be achieved. However, final details of the lighting arrangement and lighting manufacturer are only likely to be confirmed through subsequent contractual arrangements. Therefore, it is considered appropriate that should permission be granted, a condition be imposed for further details of the chosen lighting arrangement and corresponding lighting assessment to be submitted and approved prior to being erected.

Transport / Traffic Issues

Paragraph 108 of the National Planning Policy Framework relates to transport issues and states that planning applications should be assessed to ensure that appropriate opportunities have been taken to promote sustainable transport; that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and that any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. Paragraph 109 makes it clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Policy T21 of the Preston Local Plan 2004 has been saved within the replacement local plan for development control purposes. The policy relates to development in relation to trunk roads and states that where development is likely to generate a material increase in traffic which would directly or indirectly affect the motorway system, a transport assessment will be required and that developments which would result in the access or the main line of the trunk road becoming overloaded will not be permitted. The policy also requires that development will be approved where it can be demonstrated where any increases in traffic can be satisfactorily accommodated without improvements to the network or where improvements can be designed to provide additional capacity to accommodate the projected traffic level for 15 years after the completion of the development.

The Environmental Statement includes a chapter which examines the impact of the development on the local highway network including issues of traffic capacity and safety on the local and trunk road network. The assessment has been based upon traffic data contained in the planning application and Environmental Statement for the existing consented B2 / B8 use development on the application site together with manual and automated traffic counts on the local road network and accident data for the junctions and links affected. The assessment has also taken account of the impact of significant committed but unimplemented / partially implemented development in the Grimsargh / Longridge area to enable modelling of the traffic impacts during the period when the proposed facility would be under construction and operational.

The application site is accessed through the internal roads within the Redscar Industrial Estate which provide access to the B6324 Longridge Road via two separate priority junctions. The B6324, which links Preston with Longridge / Grimsargh, joins with Bluebell Way at a three arm roundabout. Bluebell Way is a 3 / 4 lane single carriageway highway incorporating a number of priority junctions and a traffic light controlled junction which provide access to a number of storage and distribution units / car show rooms and future development sites. Bluebell Way terminates at a four arm roundabout which is partially traffic light controlled and which provides access to the southbound M6 via junction 31A and also serves a filling station and large distribution warehouse and includes a link (B6242) under the M6 to a further partially signalised Fulwood roundabout which links with the M6 northbound off sliproad. The M6 junction 31A only has south facing sliproads and therefore any traffic wishing to access and leave the site to and from the north via the motorway network would need to utilise M6 junction 31 and return up the opposite side of the motorway or use roads within the main urban area of Preston.

The application includes information setting out the likely traffic impacts during the construction and operation of the development. During construction it is estimated that there would be a maximum of 340 HGV two way trips per day (maximum of 34 two way trips in the peak hours). In terms of cars / light goods vehicles, it is estimated that construction would generate a maximum of 518 two way movements per day with a maximum of 65 cars / light vehicles during the peak hour. It is estimated that the peak traffic levels during construction would occur in year one, quarter four for HGV traffic and year two, quarters two and three for car / LGV traffic. Vehicle movements associated with construction workers have been assumed to take place during the hour before start on site (06.00 – 07.00 hours) and during the three hour period up to the end of the working day plus one hour afterwards (16.00 – 20.00) to take account of the different trades that would be required during construction. In terms of construction workers, the applicant has based the assessment upon a 1.5 occupancy rate per car as well as 25% of construction staff using minibus transport which is part of the applicant's proposals for reducing the construction traffic impacts of the development. This figure is based upon data from other similar construction schemes. It is anticipated that 67% of construction worker traffic would access the site via the M6 with the remainder coming from the main urban area of Preston and other local areas. For HGV construction traffic it has been estimated that 90% would access the site via the M6 with the remainder using the local road network.

During operation, based upon the anticipated waste input of approximately 395,000 tonnes per year, it is estimated that the development would generate a maximum of 186 two way HGV movements per day (93 loads) with a maximum in the peak hour of 18. The total employment during the operational period would be around 40 with a third of these working night shifts with the remainder working a standard day. It is estimated that operational staff movements would give rise to approximately 80 movements per day with a maximum of 40 of these being in the peak hour.

The applicant's study area for the purposes of assessing traffic impacts from this development includes the Redscar Industrial Estate access, Longridge Road, the B6324, Bluebell Way and the M6 (S). Taking into account the existing baseline flows, the anticipated traffic generation from the development and the traffic that would result from the committed development in the area, the applicant has assessed that the increases in traffic flows would be as follows:

During construction (Annual Average Daily Totals):-

Link description	Total Vehicles			HGVs		
	2021 Baseline	2021 baseline+ construction	% Change in total vehicles	2021 Baseline	2021 Baseline + construction	% Change in HGVs
Redscar access road	3838	4449	14	531	774	31
Longridge Road (w)	13524	13679	1	191	216	11
Longridge Road (e)	15726	16184	3	889	1107	20
B6242	19252	19710	2	1097	1315	17
Bluebell Way	18856	19085	1	1308	1418	8
M6(S)	186,036	168,494	0.3	15455	15674	1

During operation (Annual Average Daily Totals):-

Link description	Total Vehicles			HGVs		
	2023 base	2023 + operation	% change in total vehicles	2023 base	2023 +operation	% change in HGVs
Redscar access road	3921	4136	5	543	689	21
Longridge Road (w)	13826	13859	0	423	423	2
Longridge Road (e)	16039	16221	1	1202	1338	10
B6242	19651	19833	0.9	1247	1383	10
Bluebell Way	19273	19364	0.5	1482	1482	5
M6(S)	171789	171,971	0.1	15886	16022	1

On the basis of these percentage increases the applicant considers that the traffic impact on the local highway and motorway network is acceptable and that any remaining impacts can be further mitigated through a construction traffic management plan together with, if considered necessary, HGV routing controls.

Given that the traffic impacts of this development would affect both the motorway network and the local highway network, consultations with Highways England and Lancashire County Council Highways have been undertaken to validate the applicant's transport assessment.

In their initial response to the application, Highways England recommended that planning permission not be granted due to several issues with the modelling that was carried out to predict the transport impacts and assessment of the impact on the Bluebell Way and Fulwood roundabouts. In particular, Highways England considered

that in the AM and PM peak periods, the lanes off the Bluebell Way roundabout which provide access onto the M6 exceed practical capacity which suggests that this part of the existing network does not have capacity to support the proposed development in the opening year and therefore mitigation might be required. Highways England have also reviewed the modelling for the Fulwood roundabout and concluded that this junction operates satisfactorily apart from in the AM peak when the Preston bound lanes slightly exceed capacity. The lanes towards Redscar that would be affected by the proposed development are shown to operate within capacity.

LCC Highways also considered that the applicant's assessment should have included a greater number of committed housing developments in the Grimsargh and Longridge area in order to ensure that the assessment of future traffic was robust. LCC Highways also made several observations regarding the trip distribution and the ability to accurately assess the impact on the local highway network.

It can also be seen from the summary of representations presented above, that traffic impacts are one of the most significant concerns of local residents and businesses. In particular they are concerned about peak time congestion on the local road network particularly in relation to being able to access the motorway network using Bluebell Way and Longridge Road towards Grimsargh.

To respond to the issues raised by Highways England, LCC Highways and local residents, the applicant has undertaken further transport assessment work. This further assessment work has been advertised under Regulation 25 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation 2017. The revised assessment has been based upon a more comprehensive list of committed development, includes a future year assessment for 2029 to show the traffic impacts of the development over the longer term and has attempted to address the other questions raised by both Highways England and LCC Highways in terms of the traffic modelling and forecasting techniques used. The applicant's conclusions from the further assessment work that they have undertaken is that traffic from the proposed development would only represent a small proportion of overall flows and that the development would generate similar levels of traffic to the existing permitted B2 / B8 uses on the application site and which Highways England have already considered to be acceptable.

In response to the further information, Highways England maintain their view that there are existing operational issues with the Bluebell Way roundabout, particularly in the PM peak and which is reflected in the applicant's modelling. Whilst Highways England do not totally agree with the applicants assessment of likely traffic increases, they do consider that the proposed development will only add approximately 1 additional vehicle to the M6 J31A on – sliproad every 120 seconds in the AM peak and 1 additional vehicle every 90 seconds in the PM peak and as such it can be concluded that the operational traffic impact on the sliproad would be relatively modest. However, Highways England note that any capacity issues appear to relate to the roundabout itself which is part of the County Council's network and therefore it is for LCC to assess the proposed level of growth in this area and to identify any mitigation measures including physical improvements to this junction. Highways England maintain that they are willing to engage with LCC in any discussions on mitigation measures. In addition, Highways England consider it essential that an appropriate planning condition is added to any grant of planning

permission to require a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted and in place prior to the commencement of works.

In response to the further information, LCC Highways note and accept that the local highway network is congested at peak times but consider that even applying worst case assumptions to the traffic flows, the operational traffic would still have a negligible effect on the operation of the Longridge road roundabout and the Fulwood and Bluebell Way roundabouts that connect with M6 junction 31A. However, with regard to construction traffic it is considered that there is a level of uncertainty about the volume and timing of this traffic as the figures in the transport assessment are indicative and could therefore result in an increased impact on the Bluebell Way roundabout which is the critical junction in terms of capacity. LCC Highways therefore consider that the applicant should be asked to provide appropriate mitigation works at this junction to improve the operation of this roundabout to include remarking of the lanes and use of box markings to improve circulation and capacity. This matter could be subject to a suitable planning condition with the works to be secured through an agreement under s278 of the Highways Act 1980. In addition LCC Highways also consider that it is essential that the construction traffic impacts are managed through a suitable planning condition. On this basis LCC Highways raise no objection.

The concerns of local residents and businesses with regard to existing congestion problems in this area are noted and recognised. However, paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The application site is allocated in the Preston Local Plan as an existing employment site for B2 and B8 uses and an outline planning permission was previously granted on the application site and adjacent land in 2006 for the same uses. Some highway improvements to the junction of the Redscar Industrial Estate access with Longridge Road were carried out as a requirement of this permission and other improvement have been undertaken since this date particularly in relation to the M6 off slip road and the Fulwood roundabout. If the proposed development were not to proceed, it is reasonable to expect that the application site would be developed for similar general industrial and storage and distribution uses which would have very similar or possibly more severe traffic impacts as those attributable to the proposed development in its operational phase. Given the relatively slight increases in the existing traffic levels arising from the operation of the facility, it is considered that the traffic impacts would not be severe and are therefore acceptable in relation to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is acknowledged that there would be some residual short term traffic impacts particularly from construction activities and it is therefore appropriate to consider the mitigation measures that should be applied should planning permission be granted. LCC Highways have requested that some improvements be undertaken to improve the operation of the Bluebell Way roundabout. There is also an existing County Council proposal under development to improve public transport and sustainable travel reliability on the Grimsargh to Preston corridor which includes works to the Longridge Road roundabout. This roundabout would be affected by the traffic from the proposed development and it is considered both reasonable and necessary to require the works to this roundabout to be undertaken as part of this development. The applicant is willing to fund these works which include provision of a new toucan

crossing on the south western arm of the roundabout and other improvements to the carriageway / roundabout itself to provide additional vehicle stacking space as well as the works to the Bluebell Way roundabout. These works can be the subject of a planning condition with the implementation to be secured through a section 278 agreement.

In relation to the construction traffic impacts, the applicant is proposing a traffic management plan to include the routing and timing of HGV movements and the management of staff travel in order to promote car sharing and other sustainable travel modes such as the use of minibus transport to promote the use of public transport for construction works to reach the site. This can be the subject of a planning condition. Whilst such a condition cannot force site construction staff to car share or use the other proposed sustainable travel modes, the applicant maintains that such measures have been used on other sites with some success. It is considered that any condition requiring such measures should include provision for regular review during the construction period to ensure that the effectiveness of the measures proposed in the plan are maximised. In terms of operational HGV traffic, the present applicant is not an established waste operator and therefore has no existing contract for the management of waste which can be used to accurately predict the sources of waste delivered to the site. However, given the location of the site, it is reasonable to expect that most deliveries would be to and from the M6 junction 31A and would not affect the local road network including the highways within the main urban area of Preston. However, for any deliveries from the north, the situation is more problematic as there is no north facing slip roads at junction 31A. Traffic could therefore seek to leave the M6 at junction 32 and access the site via the Broughton roundabout and Eastway which it is considered would be less preferable to using junction 31 of the M6 to reverse direction and then exit the M6 at junction 31A to access the site. It is therefore considered that the operational traffic management plan should include measures requiring the applicant to implement measures to control the routing of general HGV traffic and also for waste vehicles arising from the Preston City area. These matters can be addressed through a suitably worded planning condition.

In summary whilst there are some issues with peak time congestion on some parts of the network that would be affected by traffic from this development, it is considered that such impacts would not be severe and are therefore acceptable in relation to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy T21 of the Preston City Local Plan. Any residual impacts of the development can be controlled through conditions designed to manage the traffic impacts and also to require local improvements to the highway network.

Air Quality and Climate Change

The applicant has provided an assessment of the effects of the proposed development on air quality. From a construction perspective there is the potential for dust generation but mitigation measures could be employed to minimise the likelihood of any unacceptable impact. This aspect could be incorporated into a recommended condition relating to a construction environmental management plan as referred to elsewhere in the report.

During the operational phase of the development, impacts on air quality could arise from emissions from the two proposed stacks, odour emissions from waste and from road vehicles. The applicant has undertaken detailed dispersion modelling of emissions, using a number of conservative assumptions to demonstrate that there would be no unacceptable effect on the local environment or human health.

In relation to road traffic, the increase in vehicle numbers would be at levels that would not cause a significant change in roadside pollutant levels. Furthermore, the applicant has carried out a human health risk assessment to determine the long term impact of pollutants which can accumulate within the body. This has shown that the impact of emissions on human health would be negligible and not significant. The proposal would not include the management of waste in the open air and therefore impacts such as gulls, odour and vermin are not considered to be a concern given the nature and design of the development.

The National Planning Policy for Waste advises that waste planning authorities should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessment of epidemiological and other health studies and that they should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. Paragraph 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework reinforces the latter assertion by stating that the focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively.

An Environmental Permit would be required for the facility and it would have to operate in compliance with prescribed emission limits, and noise and odour controls. The permit would also specify the waste types that could be accepted.

The incineration process is tightly regulated and controlled by the Industrial Emissions Directive and the Environmental Permitting Regulations. The facility would have to meet or go beyond and improve on the strict emission limit level controls by reflecting modern best practice standards so that human health and the environment would be protected. The Environment Agency closely regulate the operation of energy from waste plants through the application of conditions and requirements imposed on Environmental Permits to ensure that operations do not lead to harm to the environment and human health.

An environmental permit would be monitored in accordance with the conditions set out within it. If the Environment Agency is of the view that the proposal could not operate within the emissions limits, then it would not issue a permit and the plant would be unable to operate. If the Environment Agency granted a permit and subsequently found out through its monitoring process that the plant was operating with emissions above prescribed limits, then it would revoke the permit and the plant's operation would cease until the matter had been resolved.

In order to meet the strict controls, the gases from the facility would undergo a number of clean-up stages before being released into the atmosphere. This would include controlling the quality of combustion thereby reducing emissions of some pollutants and also treating acid gases (hydrogen chloride, sulphur dioxide), nitrogen

oxides, dioxins, and filtering out particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals.

Although the Environment Agency and Preston City Council's Environmental Health Officer have not raised objection to the application, in view of the large number of representations that have been received in relation to air quality issues the County Council has sought the views of its framework consultant (Jacobs UK Ltd) to further validate the findings of the applicant's air quality assessment. Jacobs have undertaken a comprehensive review of the applicant's air quality and human health assessments. Jacobs overall assessment is that the applicant's air quality modelling is an acceptable overall approach to the assessment of these impacts and that the predicted changes in the concentrations of heavy metals would be negligible when compared to the relevant air quality standards and guidelines. Jacobs note that there is no air quality standard for dioxins and furans but that these impacts were assessed as part of the Human Health Risk Assessment which showed that the impacts from these pollutants would again be negligible. Jacobs identify that there are some issues with regard to the modelling techniques, baseline data and assumptions that have been used particularly in relation to the calculation and impacts of NO_x emissions. However, Jacobs conclude that the modelling work that was undertaken on this issue was suitably conservative and that the conclusions of the applicant's assessment of NO_x impacts are acceptable and reasonable. Furthermore Jacobs have commented on the use of the Plume Plotter app that has been cited by many objectors as demonstrating that the emissions from this development would affect sensitive populations in the surrounding area including local schools. Whilst Jacobs acknowledge that the Plume Plotter app uses similar dispersion modelling methods to that used by the applicants, they state that care is needed with how the Plume Plotter results are interpreted. In particular Jacobs comment that Plume Plotter does not provide any assessment of the impact of the predicted concentrations and could lead to a misinterpretation of the predicted increases in pollutants.

Fundamentally, the Environment Agency will only issue a permit for the site if it can be demonstrated that air pollution impacts can be controlled to satisfactory levels in accordance with the relevant legislation and guidance. Taking into account these factors and the location of the site, it is considered that the development is acceptable in relation to local air pollution and human health considerations.

Preston City Council have raised an issue with regards to NO_x levels within the Redscar Industrial Estate and whether they would breach the short term 40 µg/ m³ level on more than 18 occasions in one year such that the City Council would have to designate the area as an air quality management area. This issue relates to combination of NO_x emissions in this area including from the M6, three gas powered electricity generation schemes that the City Council have granted planning permission for on adjacent site and the proposed development itself. The assessments carried out for the proposed development and for the gas peaking plants shows that any potential exceedance would be caused by the peaking plants themselves due to their low stack heights which means that emissions are close to ground level and would have greater impact particularly in calm weather conditions. By contrast the stack height for the proposed development would ensure the wider dispersal of emissions and would not result in significant increase in NO_x emissions close to the site.

In relation to climate change impacts, the Environmental Permit would not include limits on carbon dioxide emissions as this gas is considered to have no local impact. The Environmental Permitting Regulations do not consider climate change.

National Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework raises the question of how the challenges of climate change can be addressed through Local Plans in line with the statutory duty on climate change and ambition in the Climate Change Act 2008. Of relevance, it identifies opportunities for emission reduction by providing opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy technologies and providing opportunities for de-centralised energy and heating.

Residual waste typically contains many items that will have come from biological sources and the carbon stored within them is known as biogenic carbon. Other items that will be present such as plastics are manufactured using fossil fuels such as oil and the carbon embedded in them is known as fossil carbon. Biogenic carbon is also termed short cycle carbon because it was only recently absorbed in growing matter. On the other hand, fossil carbon was absorbed millions of years ago and would be newly released to the atmosphere if combusted. Such waste if landfilled releases carbon at a much slower rate than if it is disposed of by incineration. Therefore, the extent to which the energy produced by the proposed facility could be classed as renewable would depend on the proportion of biogenic material in the residual waste stream that would be treated.

Managing mixed waste by either combustion in an energy from waste plant or deposit in a landfill will release gases to the atmosphere. Whether energy from waste produces a lower volume of greenhouse gases than landfill is a complex subject with many variables. UK Without Incineration Network in their representation to this application have sought to provide evidence to demonstrate that the proposed facility would not in fact reduce carbon emissions when compared to sending the same waste to landfill and therefore they object to this proposal on the grounds of its adverse climate change impacts.

The assessment of climate change impacts of the proposal compared to landfill is not easy to conclude as many of the factors involved cannot be confirmed at the planning application stage as the precise nature and proximity of the feedstock cannot be ascertained. Likewise, every landfill site has unique operating conditions, which change over time. The proportion and type of biogenic waste is key with high biogenic content making energy from waste inherently better and landfill inherently worse. Secondly, the more efficient the energy from waste plant is at turning waste into energy (in the form of electricity and heat), the greater the carbon offset from conventional power generation.

The proposed facility would produce electricity that could be fed into the grid and this would be relatively straightforward given the proximity of local infrastructure. In order to maximise the efficiency of the plant, it is also necessary to utilise the heat that would be produced. However, the use of heat energy is dependant upon heat customers being found. No customers have been confirmed but that is not unusual at this stage of the overall planning process. A lack of heat customers would mean that the site would operate in the less efficient electricity-only mode but given the location of the site adjacent to an existing industrial estate and land allocated for industrial and storage purposes, there appears to be a reasonable chance that a heat customer could emerge. The facility could supply steam or hot water, or be

used to drive absorption chillers, thereby providing cooling. The site is also located reasonably close to the main urban area of Preston and therefore it is possible that the development could be used to supply a district heating scheme should the appropriate incentives materialise.

One representation has been received which questions the methodology used to calculate the carbon benefit of the development. The resident considers that the relevant comparison that has been used for this calculation should more closely relate to the carbon emissions from wind or solar power as those generation sources will become the norm during the period of the proposed development. He considers that the use of the different comparator would produce a different outcome showing that the proposal would be more carbon intensive. The applicant has used the carbon emissions from a typical gas fired power station as the relevant comparator. This matter has been discussed at a recent planning appeal for an energy from waste site at Ratty's Lane in Hertfordshire. In this case, the relevant figure to be used as a comparison in carbon assessments for such plants was considered to be gas fired generation and which was accepted by the Secretary of State.

Furthermore, there are no planning policies to seek to specifically limit greenhouse gases from individual development proposals of this nature in relation to climate change. The key focus of overarching policy is to provide opportunities for holistic change by promoting a move away from landfill, promoting the decentralization of energy production and reducing the reliance on primary won fossil fuels such as oil, coal and gas. With this in mind it is considered that there are no grounds for refusal in relation to climate change matters.

Overall, it is considered that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed development would have no likely significant impacts on air quality subject to the mitigation controls that would be built into the process and would be controlled through an Environmental Permit. The Environment Agency, Public Health England and Preston City Council have raised no objection in this respect. The latter request conditions in relation to electric vehicle charging points, and the provision of spaces and facilities for bicycle parking, which are all considered reasonable and necessary to make the proposed development acceptable.

Noise

Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. New development should mitigate and reduce to a minimum the potential adverse impacts resulting from noise and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life.

The applicant has provided an assessment of noise and vibration in relation to the construction and operational phases of the proposed development. Relevant and appropriate noise and vibration guidance and standards have been used to determine the impact. The assessment has been undertaken to inform and guide the design of the proposed development, such that any likely noise and vibration impact on existing and potential sensitive receptors is minimised.

The site is affected currently by road noise from the M6 motorway. Other noise generating activities include existing waste transfer and recycling activities, concrete batching plants, fabrication and other manufacturing activities, as well as vehicle traffic on Red Scar Industrial Estate and nearby public roads. Residential receptors are present to the west of the M6 motorway at a distance of at least 460 metres.

The undertaking of fixed position noise monitoring at a number of noise sensitive receptors around the site found that, during the construction period, there would be a neutral level of noise effect on all residential receptors that are considered to have the highest sensitivity to noise. There would be some impact on Red Scar Industrial Estate and the nearby woodland.

The applicant states that during the construction period best practical means would be employed to control noise and vibration generation, in accordance with appropriate British standards. Measures taken may include restriction on operating hours, sensible routing of equipment to site and careful choice of piling rigs to minimise noise. Measures to control noise and vibration would be defined within a Construction Environmental Management Plan that would be operated throughout the construction phase.

A condition is recommended for further details of the Construction Environmental Management Plan and this would also include matters relating to dust, parking arrangements, and drainage. A further precautionary measure is recommended by way of a condition to control the majority of construction working operations to the typical working day, with assessment and control of working outside typical hours covered in combination with the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Subject to the recommended conditions it is considered unlikely that noise from construction activities would have any detrimental impact on neighbouring landowners or local residents given the industrial nature of the area and the separation from sensitive receptors.

In relation to the operational phase a number of potential mitigation measures have been proposed to ensure that the resultant operational noise levels are within appropriate guidance and standards. The measures would be based on the employment of best available techniques to mitigate any potential peak noise sources, and include the following:

- The majority of plant with potential to create noise will be housed inside the main building. The building design will include measures to contain noise from the noisiest elements of the proposal.
- Surplus spoil from the excavation of the parts of the plant below ground level will be used to create bunds for noise and visual screening.
- Very high levels of acoustic insulation will be installed around the turbines and generator sets. Other potentially noisy equipment such as fans and motors will also be insulated. Unloading and loading of vehicles will be within the main building.
- Vehicle access for delivery of waste fuel or collection of ash will be restricted to a twelve hour working day on Monday to Friday and six hours on Saturday.
- The part of the proposed development with the greatest potential to create noise perceivable beyond the site boundary during normal operations will be the low speed fans on the air-cooled condensers. The site layout will reflect the need to

reduce the effects of this noise both by ensuring sufficient distance between the fans and noise receptors and by ensuring an appropriate location of the condensers relative to the other buildings and structures on the site.

The control of noise through the operation of the facility would be a matter for the Environmental Permit that is issued by the Environment Agency. Operational noise limits for both day and night time operations have also been agreed with the Environmental Health Team at Preston City Council.

Biodiversity and Nature Conservation

Paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that, when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- Development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Policies EN10 and EN11 of the Preston Local Plan 2012 – 2026 cover similar matters relating to biodiversity and nature conservation, and species protection, respectively. Policy 22 of the Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy Local Development Framework also refers to biodiversity.

The site is located on vacant land that has been partially cleared and prepared for redevelopment. The southern portion of the site lies within part of Pope Lane Ponds Biological Heritage Site, but this has not prevented the grant and implementation of a planning consent for use as general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) development, as part of which approved habitat mitigation and enhancement measures have been set in place, including a habitat management area and the creation of new ponds on land just south of the site that are suitable for Great Crested Newt habitat.

The site has been subject to an ecological desk study and extended Phase 1 habitat survey, and largely comprises low ecological value semi-improved grassland habitat with scattered scrub. A permanent Great Crested Newt exclusion fence runs along the southern and eastern boundaries of Red Scar Industrial Estate installed under a European Protected Species Mitigation licence issued by Natural England and

associated with the consented extension to the industrial estate. The application site itself does not support populations of protected species.

The Red Scar and Tun Brook Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest is located east and south of the proposed site (60 metres from the site at its closest point). The site is a Site of Special Scientific Interest as it is ancient woodland. There are no trees present on the application site and no trees within the nearby Site of Special Scientific Interest will be directly affected by the proposal. The nearest sites covered by European Habitats Directive designations or other international protections are 12 kilometres away. Natural England initially had concerns about the impacts of nitrogen deposition on the Site of Special Scientific Interest and suggested that further emissions mitigation should be explored to make the development acceptable. However, following further discussions with the applicant, their objection was withdrawn.

Jacobs (Ecology) recommend planning conditions to secure ecological mitigation and to clarify finer details of landscaping / habitat creation. Precautionary measures for the protection of wildlife that may be encountered on site, including avoidance of impacts on nesting birds and an amended Reasonable Avoidance Measures report to ensure the avoidance of impacts to the adjacent great crested newt populations, are included within the condition to require a Construction Environmental Management Plan. An additional measure to require details of the type, number and location of bird boxes and other habitat features to be provided at the site are included within the landscaping condition.

Subject to these requirements, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in relation to the effects on biodiversity and nature conservation and complies with policies EN10 and EN 11 of the Preston City Local Plan.

Water Management

Paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority; have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and, where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.

Planning Practice Guidance accompanying the National Planning Policy Framework promotes the employment of sustainable drainage systems that are designed to control surface water run off close to where it falls and mimic natural drainage as closely as possible. Generally, the aim should be to discharge surface run off as high up the following hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practicable. Firstly, into the ground (infiltration); secondly, to a surface water body then to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system and finally to a combined sewer. Particular types of sustainable drainage systems may not be practicable in all locations.

Policy 29 of the Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy Local Development Framework July 2012 refers to water management and seeks to improve water quality, water management and reduce the risk of flooding by a number of measures

including appraising, managing and reducing flood risk in all new developments, and encouraging the adoption of sustainable drainage systems.

The proposal is on land located within the River Ribble catchment area where the surface water currently drains to Eaves Brook, a tributary of the River Ribble. The Brook rises in low ground to the south west of the proposal and adjacent to the M6 motorway.

The application includes a Flood Risk Assessment and an assessment that covers a range of components including surface water hydrology (including flood risk), surface water and groundwater quality, water abstractions and other environmentally sensitive receptors which potentially interact with the water environment. The Flood Risk Assessment confirms that there is no significant flood risk within the present site boundary, the site is remote from surface watercourses within the site, there is minimal likelihood of ground water emergence, and the location is served by an existing consented sustainable drainage system to manage surface water.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have raised no objection subject to a condition for further details of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme that should include details of the proposed surface water swale and attenuation wetland. The condition is recommended accordingly.

The management of surface water flows and containment of potentially contaminated water through the construction phase could be satisfactorily dealt with through inclusion in the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Foul water would be directed to existing United Utilities foul sewer.

Ground Investigation

Paragraphs 170, 178 and 179 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land contamination. Where a site is affected by contamination issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

Policy EN7 of the Preston Local Plan 2012 – 2026 has very similar requirements.

Due to the site history, there are land contamination issues. When the site was developed in the late 1930s, a former valley and surface water feature crossing the northern part of the site from east to west appears to have been culverted and infilled and the land levelled as part of the construction and expansion of the adjacent Rayon Mill between the 1930s and 1950s. A historic landfill that is present in the northwest corner of the site received waste between 1982 and 1984 including inert and special waste and bagged asbestos.

The applicant has provided a report relating to a ground investigation at the site that recorded asbestos, but only within the area of the historical landfill on site. No detectable asbestos was recorded in soils in the rest of the site.

Both Preston City Council and the Environment Agency have not objected subject to a condition that no development shall commence until a site investigation method statement and remediation strategy have been submitted and approved. Subject to

this requirement, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in relation to land contamination and remediation issues.

Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that, in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

The applicant has provided a Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment to meet this requirement.

LCC Specialist Advisor (Archaeology) has not objected. They comment that the historic assessment indicates that the proposed development site does not contain any designated heritage assets or archaeological remains that are considered to be of sufficient importance to require preservation in-situ. The assessment determines that the site holds little potential to contain buried remains of archaeological interest and states that previous evaluation work across the site did not find any features of archaeological interest, noting the work demonstrated there was widespread disturbance across the northern part of the site in the shape of a deeply cut feature, filled with modern debris. The assessment goes on to say that trenching elsewhere on the site failed to find evidence of pre-Industrial agricultural activity and the site had large numbers of 19th century field drains.

The assessment identifies that there will be a neutral/slight adverse visual impact on the setting of St Michael's Church and a neutral/slight adverse visual impact on the setting of Lower Samlesbury Hall (which are both Grade II listed). It assesses the visual effects are in all cases minor and are not considered to constitute significant adverse effects. It concludes the effects on Heritage Assets are therefore at most considered to be less than substantial harm.

In conclusion, the assessment suggests that due to the fact that there is very low potential for archaeological remains to survive within the site, it may be anticipated that no further archaeological works would be required, and no archaeological conditions are required on any planning permission that may be granted. Lancashire County Archaeology Team is in agreement with this conclusion and hence they do not recommend any further archaeological work.

Cumulative Impacts

Each application should be considered on its own merits. However, there may be occasions, when other existing or approved development may be relevant in determining whether significant effects are likely as a consequence of a proposed development. In this instance, there does not appear to be any existing or approved development or in combination effects arising on the site that could give rise to significant effects on the environment.

Decommissioning

The proposed development would include a very large building and stacks along with technically specific plant, machinery and equipment. This arrangement would not be

particularly adaptable for future site development should the use as an energy recovery facility cease. On this basis, a planning condition is recommended requiring that the facility would be removed from the site in the event of a continuous 3 year period of non-operation.

Human Rights

Article 1 of the 1st Protocol and Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 refers to protection of amenity and property.

Rights under Article 1 of the 1st Protocol concern the protection of property and state that everyone is entitled to the enjoyment of possessions and that no one should be deprived of possessions except in the public interest.

Article 8 provides that everyone has the right to respect for family and private life. Interference in this Right can only be justified where it is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society for the economic wellbeing of the country or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

In terms of this site, the construction and operation of a new energy recovery facility could have the potential to affect landowners/land users in the vicinity of the site. However, it is considered that the mitigation measures within the proposal and the imposition of planning conditions would not result in the infringement of any Human Rights identified under these articles.

Overall Conclusion

The application is for an energy recovery facility on a site within the Red Scar Industrial Estate that is allocated as an existing employment area and on land that is allocated for proposed employment purposes within Preston Local Plan 2012 – 2026. The proposed employment land is protected for business, general industrial, or storage and distribution uses (Use Classes B1, B2 or B8, respectively). The proposed development is also on land that is allocated for individual large scale built waste management facilities within the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

A recommended condition requires the scheme to demonstrate that it would achieve and operate to R1 standards thereby meeting the required standards to be treated as a recovery facility. On this basis, the proposal would provide an opportunity to move the management of waste up the waste hierarchy, potentially diverting a substantial volume of residual non-hazardous waste from landfill. It is anticipated that a significant proportion of the electricity and potentially heat that would be generated by the development would be classed as a low carbon energy source and would contribute to non-fossil fuel, decentralised energy production. The principle of the development is acceptable, it would represent an appropriate use of the application site and would comply with national and local policy that promotes the management of waste up the waste hierarchy away from landfill, promotes the decentralisation of energy production, and the use of fuels and energy sources other than primary won fossil fuels.

The proposal does include a very large structure that would be visible within the landscape from both local and more distant elevated viewpoints. However, given the

location and context of existing industrial estates in the area, it is considered that the development would not be incongruous. Furthermore, the most significant local views would be mainly from the land immediately to the south of the proposal. The twin stacks would be the main elements of the proposal with the potential to affect the landscape character of the locality. However, the treatment of the external finish of the buildings has evolved through the determination process to ensure that the development would be integrated into the landscape in the most effective way such that there would be no significant landscape or visual impacts.

The facility would require an environmental permit to operate and it is for the Environment Agency to regulate the combustion process and emissions in the interests of preventing pollution and protecting public health. On this basis, it should be assumed that there are unlikely to be any unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment, neighbouring occupiers of land or local residents in terms of noise, air quality, odour or water. Outside permitting controls, recommended conditions, particularly relating to drainage, lighting, ground investigation and construction working would ensure there are no unacceptable environmental effects.

Whilst there are some local highway concerns, these relate to peak time traffic and the development would not add significantly to such flows. It is considered that there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts on the highway network and measures have been recommended to contribute towards sustainable means of transport.

Potential ecology and nature conservation issues have been fully investigated and scrutinised by Lancashire County Council's ecology advisor, Natural England and The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire. It is considered that it is unlikely that there would be any significant impact on any protected habitat sites or protected species.

Overall, it is considered that subject to the recommended conditions, the proposed development would comply with relevant national planning policy and the development plan as a whole.

Recommendation

That, after first taking into consideration the environmental information, as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, that planning permission be **granted** subject to the following conditions:

Time Limits

1. The development shall commence not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Imposed pursuant to Section 91 (1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Notification in writing shall be provided to the County Planning Authority within seven days of each of the following events:-

a) Commencement of the construction of the development

b) Commencement of the export of electricity on a commercial basis at the site.

Reason: To enable the County Planning Authority to monitor the development to ensure compliance with this permission and to conform with Policies CS7 and CS8 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document, and Policies DM1, DM2, DM4 and WM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies – Part One.

Working Programme

3. The development shall be carried out, in accordance with the following documents:

a) The Planning Application validated by the County Planning Authority on 12 June 2019.

b) Submitted Plans:

Drawing Number 1377 PL101 - Site Layout
Drawing Number 1377 PL100 - Site Analysis
Drawing Number 1377 PL102 - Fencing Layout
Drawing Number 1377 PL110 - EC Ground Floor Plan
Drawing Number 1377 PL111 - EC First Floor Plan
Drawing Number 1377 PL112 - EC Second Floor Plan
Drawing Number 1377 PL113 - EC Third Floor Plan
Drawing Number 1377 PL114 - EC Fourth Floor Plan
Drawing Number 1377 PL115 - EC Floor Plan +86.1m AOD
Drawing Number 1377 PL116 - EC Floor Plan +137m AOD
Drawing Number 1377 PL120 - Admin and Workshop Block Ground and First Floor Plans
Drawing Number 1377 PL121 - Admin Block Second and Third Floor Plans
Drawing Number 1377 PL122 - Admin Block Fourth Floor Plan
Drawing Number 1377 PL201 - Proposed Site Sections
Drawing Number 1377 PL300 - EC North Elevation
Drawing Number 1377 PL301 - EC East Elevation
Drawing Number 1377 PL302 - EC South Elevation
Drawing Number 1377 PL303 - EC West Elevation
Drawing Number 1377 PL304 - EC East Elevation (Without ACCs)
Drawing Number 1377 PL310 - ACC Elevations
Drawing Number 1377 PL311 - Gatehouse Elevations and Plans
Drawing Number 1377 PL312 - Fire Water Tank and Pump House Elevations
Drawing Number 1377 PL313 - Fuel Oil Tank Elevations
Drawing Number 1377 PL314 - Tanks and Silos Elevations
Drawing Number 1377 PL315 - Substation / Switchyard Elevations

c) All schemes and programmes approved in accordance with this permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, to enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise the impact of the development on the amenities of the local area, and to conform with Policies CS7 and CS8 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document, and Policies DM1, DM2, DM4 and WM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies – Part One.

Design and Construction of the Development

4. With the exception of the erection of perimeter fencing around the boundary of the site, no development shall commence until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include details of the following:
 - a) Arrangements for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles during the period of construction.
 - b) Control of noise from construction operations in relation to residential and ecological receptors, and neighbouring businesses.
 - c) Control of vibration from the site.
 - d) Control of dust from the site.
 - e) Wheel cleaning for vehicles leaving the site.
 - f) Drainage control measures including oil interceptors and bunds.
 - g) Artificial site illumination (including proposed hours of use).
 - h) Provision of an Invasive Species Method Statement
 - i) Precautionary measures for the protection of wildlife that may be encountered on site, including avoidance of impacts on nesting birds and an amended Reasonable Avoidance Measures report to ensure the avoidance of impacts to great crested newt populations.
 - j) Management of construction waste.
 - k) Hours of working for external construction activities and HGV deliveries and collections during the period of construction, which shall normally be 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays and 0700 to 1300 Saturdays with no external construction and no HGV deliveries and collections on Sundays or Public Holidays.
 - l) A mechanism for allowing abnormal loads to enter and leave the site outside of the hours stated in (k) and for allowing external construction working outside of these in unusual circumstances.

m) A mechanism for the review and modification of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

The approved Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and applied throughout the construction phase of the development.

Reason: To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of local amenity, and to comply with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Policy EN10 of the Preston City Local Plan.

Building Materials

5. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, no external cladding or finishes to any building or structure shall be applied until details of the building materials (including colour and finish) to be used for the external elevations and the roof of all buildings and fencing, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, only those materials approved by the County Planning Authority shall be used.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area and to conform with Policy 17 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy.

Safeguarding of Watercourses and Drainage

6. No development shall commence until details of a surface water sustainable drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The details shall include:
- a) Details of the sustainable drainage infrastructure to be installed including details and dimensions of all pipes and structures, design levels and finished floor levels at AOD with adjacent ground levels, details of wetland swales and the boundary swale next to the internal site access road.
 - b) Details of any surface water culverts or drains to be diverted and details for the design, alignment and cross sections of new drainage measures to be provided and connections with existing drainage infrastructure.
 - c) Cross sectional plans of permeable paving.
 - d) Sustainable drainage flow calculations for 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 + climate change return periods to demonstrate that the peak surface water discharge from the development does not exceed the maximum permissible discharge rate for the land on which it will occupy.
 - e) A plan identifying areas contributing to the drainage network.
 - f) Measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving ground water and/or surface waters, including watercourses.

- g) A management and maintenance plan for the sustainable drainage system for the lifetime of the development.

The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of the operational phase of the development. Thereafter, the drainage system shall be retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the final drainage designs are appropriate following detailed design investigation, to ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained, to ensure that there is no flood risk on or off the site resulting from the proposed development, to reduce the flood risk to the development as a result of inadequate maintenance and to comply with Policy 29 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy.

Employment and Skills Statement

7. No development shall commence until an Employment and Skills Strategy (ESS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The Strategy shall include details of the measures that will be adopted in recruiting staff and contractors during the construction and operational stages of the development to encourage employment of local staff and shall include consideration of the following:-

- a) Creation of apprenticeships/new entrants/graduates/traineeships.
- b) Recruitment through Job Hub and Jobcentre plus and other local employment vehicles.
- c) Work trials and interview guarantees.
- d) Vocational training (NVQ).
- e) Work experience for ages groups of 14-16 years, 16-19 years and 19+ years
- f) Links with schools, colleges, and universities.
- g) Use of local suppliers.
- h) Supervisor Training.
- i) Management and Leadership Training.
- j) In house training schemes.
- k) Construction Skills Certification Scheme (CSCS) Cards.

The approved Employment and Skills Strategy shall be adhered to throughout the construction and operational phases of the development.

Reason: To support local employment and comply with the Central Lancashire Core Strategy Employment Skills SPD

Landscaping

8. Within 12 months of the commencement of development, a landscaping and habitat establishment and management plan for the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The submitted details shall include:

a) Heights and gradients of the perimeter bunds, and the source, nature and depth of any soil making materials to be used to create the bunds. The bunds shall not be created from any materials that would otherwise be managed as contaminated spoil.

b) The design, construction and landscaping of waterbodies.

c) Details of native tree and shrub planting including the number, type, species and sizes of plants, layout of planting, planting techniques and protection measures. The proposed planting mix shall include the use of Wych Elm (*Ulmus glabra*).

d) The seed mixes to be used on the amenity and habitat landscaping areas.

e) Detail of habitat establishment (including seasonal timing), management, monitoring, and review and reporting methods.

f) Details of the type, number and location of bird boxes and log or turf pile refuges for invertebrates and foraging birds.

Thereafter, the approved landscaping and habitat establishment and management plan shall be implemented within the first available planting season as defined in this permission following the completion of construction and thereafter maintained for a period of five years including replacement of failed plants, weed control, maintenance of tree protection measures and works to ensure the establishment of a full grass sward over the full extent of any screening mounds.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory landscaping and surfacing of the site, to provide biodiversity interests and mitigation, and to comply with Policy 17 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy.

Lighting

9. No lighting columns or lights (excluding lighting for construction of the development) shall be erected or fitted on site until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The details shall include the following:

a) Location, type and intensity of lights.

b) Types of masking or baffle at head.

c) Type, height and colour of lighting columns.

d) Number and size of lighting units per column.

e) Calculation of light levels at the site and at sensitive locations immediately adjacent to the site to demonstrate that there would be no unacceptable impact.

f) Control of the times of illumination of the lighting.

Thereafter, the lighting shall be erected and maintained in accordance with the approved details throughout the duration of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Remediation strategy

10. No development shall commence until a Site Investigation Method Statement and Remediation Strategy to deal with the risks associated with any contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The strategy shall include the following components:

a) A site investigation scheme based on a desk top study to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

b) The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (a) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

c) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (b) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

The scheme shall be implemented as approved during the construction of the development.

If during development, contamination not previously identified by the Site Investigation Method Statement and Remediation Strategy is found to be present at the site then no further excavation of materials shall be carried out until an addendum to the Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Upon completion of the remediation detailed in the Method Statement a report shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority that provides verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out as approved. Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the report to demonstrate that the required remediation has been fully met.

Reason: To ensure that the development is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels water pollution and to comply with Policy 17 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy.

Recovery (R1) status

11. No development shall commence until details confirming verification that the Energy Recovery Facility has achieved Phase 1 R1 Status through Design

Stage Certification from the Environment Agency, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

The facility shall thereafter be configured and operated in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To seek to ensure that the development contributes towards the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy as a recovery operation and to comply with Policy DM4 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Electricity export

12. Except for during the commissioning and pre-operational testing of the Energy Recovery Facility, no waste shall be accepted at the site until written confirmation from the District Network Operator has been submitted to by the Energy Recovery Facility operator to the County Planning Authority that the electricity produced at the site can be exported via an established connection to the District Network Operator's system.

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes towards the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy as a recovery operation and to comply with Policy DM4 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Ash storage and loading

13. No construction of the ash storage and loading facilities shall commence until a scheme and programme detailing the design of the ash storage and loading facilities including the methods of containment to prevent dust nuisance, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

Thereafter ash shall only be stored and loaded via a facility which conforms with the approved details.

Reason : In the interests of local amenity and conform with Policy CS9 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy DPD, Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies – Part One.

Site Operations

14. A copy of this permission and all the documents referred to in condition 2 shall be available for inspection at the site office at all times throughout the operation of the development.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the site operator is aware of the planning conditions and approved documents and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

15. No waste other than residual non-hazardous household, municipal, commercial and industrial waste, and refuse derived fuel shall be accepted at or brought onto the site.

No more than a total of 395,000 tonnes of such non-hazardous waste and refuse derived fuel shall be delivered to the energy recovery facility in any one calendar year.

The site operator shall maintain a record of the tonnage of waste delivered to site per day and the record shall be made available to the County Planning Authority upon written request. A report of the total tonnage of waste imported to the site in each calendar year shall be provided to the County Planning Authority by 1 February of the following year.

Reason: To ensure that the development is representative of that granted permission and because acceptance of materials outside these categories might raise environmental and amenity issues which would require consideration afresh; and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

16. No external construction and no HGV deliveries or HGV collections for both the construction and operational phases of the development shall take place outside the hours of 0700 and 1900 Mondays to Fridays, and between 0700 to 1300 Saturdays, with no such development/activity on Sundays or Public Holidays.

This condition shall not however operate so as to prevent other operations specifically assessed and agreed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan, as required by Condition 3, abnormal loads, the internal fitting out of the development and the carrying out of essential repairs and maintenance to plant and machinery used on the site.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

17. The office and visitor energy centre shall only be used for business, community, and educational visits in association with the Energy Recovery Facility.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

18. Prior to the commissioning of the development, an updated CHP Feasibility Review assessing potential opportunities for the use of heat from the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The Review shall provide for the ongoing monitoring and full exploration of potential opportunities to use heat from the development, and shall provide for the subsequent reviews of such opportunities at three yearly intervals beginning from the date of submission of the initial review. Where viable opportunities for the use of heat in the initial or subsequent reviews are identified, a scheme for the provision of the necessary plant and pipework to the boundary of the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority and, subject to its approval in writing, implemented.

Reason: In order to maximise the recovery of energy in order to conform with the waste hierarchy and to conform with Policy DM4 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

19. All waste materials to be used as fuel in the Energy Recovery Facility shall only be stored in the fuel reception facilities within the building.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenity and the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users, to contain odour, and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

20. Except for when access is required, all vehicular and pedestrian openings to the following areas of the Main Energy Recovery Facility building shown on Drawing Number 1337 PL 110 EC Ground Floor Plan, shall remain closed at all times to prevent the migration of noise from within the buildings:

- Ash storage;
- Waste Reception Hall;
- Boiler Hall;
- FGT;
- Turbine Hall

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

21. All plant, equipment and machinery used in connection with the operation and maintenance of the site shall be equipped with effective silencing equipment or sound proofing equipment to the standard of design set out in the manufacturer's specification and shall be maintained in accordance with that specification at all times throughout the operation of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Highway Matters

22. No development shall commence until a scheme of off-site highway improvements has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall contain details of the following:

- a) The improvements to be undertaken to the roundabout on Bluebell Way at its junction with the M6 southbound on- sliproad to improve vehicle circulation and reduce congestion.
- b) The improvements to be undertaken to the roundabout at the junction of Longridge Road and Bluebell Way including widening of the eastern entry to the roundabout and provision of a toucan crossing on the south western arm of the roundabout.
- c) Details for the phasing of implementation of the highway works contained in the approved scheme.

Reason; In order to minimise the impacts of the development on the highway network and to improve sustainable travel provision and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

23. Within 12 months of the commencement of development, details of parking and vehicle manoeuvring areas shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The details shall include information on the following:

- a) The layout of car parking areas including surfacing and numbers and locations of disabled parking spaces to be provided
- b) Facilities for secure cycle parking including associated changing facilities
- c) Details of electric charging points for cars and waste collection vehicles

Thereafter the development shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate vehicle parking, and to promote alternative and zero/low carbon means of accessing the site and to comply with Policy

24. All vehicles transporting recovered materials and ash from the site shall be adequately sheeted, covered or contained to prevent the discharge of such materials during transport.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Construction Travel Plan

25. No development shall take place until a Construction Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The Construction Travel Plan shall include details of the following:-

- a) Measures to encourage sustainable travel with a target of 7.5% of construction workers arriving at the site by non car modes (walking, cycling and public transport)
- b) Provision of a minibus shuttle service for construction workers including details of the public transport hubs and off site car parks that would be served by such a service
- c) Provisions to be implemented to encourage car sharing by construction workers including on site car parking controls
- d) The timings of construction hours with respect to peak periods.
- e) The controls that will be applied in relation to construction HGV traffic including timings of movements, HGV routing and the controls that will be applied to suppliers requiring adherence to these controls.
- f) Provision for the monitoring of the effectiveness of the measures set out in the construction travel plan including submission of a monitoring report to the County Planning Authority at six monthly intervals during the construction period detailing the levels of compliance with the objectives of the travel plan and measures to be implemented to encourage take up and compliance with the Construction Travel Plan.

Reason: In order to minimise the impacts of the development on the local highway network and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Operational Travel Plan

- 26 Prior to the date of commencement of commercial operations as notified to the County Planning Authority under the requirements of condition 2b, an Operational Travel Plan, containing the following, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing:-
- a) Targets and measures to encourage sustainable travel for staff during the operational phase of the site
 - b) Provision for consultation with staff and incorporation of results into the review of travel plan
 - c) The provisions that will apply in relation to the routing of HGVs transporting waste and recovered materials to and from the site including the routes to be followed by such vehicles, the measures to be taken by the operator to ensure that hauliers are informed of the approved routes and the measures to be taken by the operator in the event that HGVs do not comply with the routing requirements.
 - d) Provision for the monitoring of the effectiveness of the measures set out in the operational travel plan including submission of an operational travel plan review to the County Planning Authority at two yearly intervals beginning from the date of approval of the initial travel plan. The review shall detail the levels of compliance with the objectives of the travel plan and measures to encourage take up of sustainable travel modes.

Reason: In order to minimise the impacts of the development on the local highway network and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Restoration

27. Following a continuous 3 year period of no waste being imported to the site, all buildings, chimney stacks, associated plant, materials, and waste shall be removed from the site.

Reason: To ensure the timely removal of the development should it no longer be required and so as not to compromise any future development of the site, and to comply with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Definitions

Heavy Goods Vehicle: A vehicle of more than 7.5 tonnes gross weight.

Planting Season: The period between 1 October in any one year and 31 March in the following year.

Notes

The grant of planning permission does not remove the need to obtain the relevant statutory consents/licences from the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency have advised that the facility will require the benefit of a permit to operate under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (England and Wales) 2016 (EPR2016).

The grant of planning permission would not allow the applicant to divert the ordinary culverted watercourse. Land Drainage Consent will be required to do this and that should be obtained from Lancashire County Council before starting any works on site.

This consent requires the construction, improvement or alteration of the public highway. Under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980, the County Council, as Highway Authority, must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works. Before any works to the access commence you should contact Lancashire County Council Highways quoting the planning permission reference.

Due to the presence of National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC apparatus and National Grid Gas Transmission PLC apparatus in proximity to the specified area, the contractor should contact National Grid's Electricity and Gas Transmission Plant Protection before any works are carried out to ensure the apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works.

Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance. If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays. If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required. All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 **List of Background Papers**

None

Reason for Inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A