

Lancashire County Council

Development Control Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 6th December, 2023 at 10.30 am in
Committee Room 'B' - The Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston**

Present:

County Councillor Matthew Maxwell-Scott (Chair)

County Councillors

B Yates	M Pattison
J Berry	E Pope
S Clarke	P Rigby
A Cullens BEM	D Westley
M Dad BEM JP	S Serridge
S Holgate	

1. Apologies for absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Temporary replacement

County Councillor Serridge replaced County Councillor Hindle.

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

County Councillor Pattison declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5 as she was a Lancaster City Councillor and the City Council was a statutory consultee.

County Councillor Michael Green declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5 as the application was in his electoral division.

3. Minutes of the meetings held on 18 October 2023 and 8 November 2023

Resolved: That the minutes of the meetings held on 18 October and 8 November 2023 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.



4. Update Sheet

The update sheet was circulated prior to the meeting (copy attached).

5. **South Ribble Borough: application number LCC/2022/0044 Application for outline planning permission (with all matters reserved save for access from the public highway to Development Zones A, B and D (M65 Terminus Roundabout, A49 Wigan Road and Stanifield Lane) and strategic green infrastructure/landscaping) for a mixed-use development including the provision of Employment use (Use Classes B2/B8/E(g)); retail (use Class E(a)); food, drink and drive-through restaurant use (Use Class E(b)/Sui Generis Drive-Through); hotel use (Use Class C1); health, fitness and leisure use (Use Classes E(d)/F(e)/F2(b)); creche/nursery (Class E(f)); car showrooms (Use Class Sui Generis Car Showroom); Residential use (C3) the provision of associated car parking, access, public open space, landscaping and drainage. Cuerden Strategic Site, east of Stanifield Lane, north of Clayton Farm, west of Wigan Road, Lostock Hall**

A report was presented on an application for outline planning permission (with all matters reserved save for access from the public highway to Development Zones A, B and D (M65 Terminus Roundabout, A49 Wigan Road and Stanifield Lane) and strategic infrastructure/landscaping) for a mixed-use development including the provision of Employment use (Use Classes B2/B8/E(g)); retail (use Class E(a)); food, drink and drive-through restaurant use (Use Class E(b)/Sui Generis Drive-Through); hotel use (Use Class C1); health, fitness and leisure use (Use Classes E(d)/F(e)/F2(b)); creche/nursery (Class E(f)); car showrooms (Use Class Sui Generis Car Showroom); Residential use (C3) the provision of associated car parking, access, public open space, landscaping and drainage at Cuerden Strategic Site, east of Stanifield Lane, north of Clayton Farm, west of Wigan Road, Lostock Hall.

It was clarified to Committee that Lancashire County Council had submitted a joint application with Maple Grove Developments Limited for the areas of land they owned that sat within the comprehensive Master Plan site.

The proposed development was subject to Environmental Impact Assessment and the application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

The report included the views of South Ribble Borough Council, Chorley Borough Council, Preston City Council, Farington Parish Council, Clayton-le-Woods Parish Council, the Environment Agency, Natural England, National Highways, LCC Highways Development Control, County Archaeological Service, County Landscape Service, Lead Local Flood Authority, The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside, United Utilities, LCC School Planning, British Horse Society and the Brookhouse Group Ltd. No comments had been received from Blackburn with Darwen Council, Historic England, Lancaster City Council, Cuerden Parish Council, National Grid Gas and Electricity, LCC Public Rights of Way Team and the Ramblers Association. Eight representations objecting to the application had been received.



Copies of the letters from Stantec UK Ltd and Town Legal LLP which had been emailed to the Committee were handed out at the meeting.

A site visit had taken place on 24 November 2023.

The Principal Planner presented a Powerpoint presentation showing the application boundary, site location plan and aerial view with the nearest residential properties, Masterplan land use, proposed site access, internal movement and proposed green infrastructure, Parameter Plan development zones, highways and access, strategic landscaping and infrastructure overview, highway improvement works and various photographs.

Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Sheet which included additional consultation comments, details of a further representation from Brookhouse Group Ltd and advice on these issues and amendments to conditions 19 and 44.

Mr Simon Ricketts, acting on behalf of Brookhouse Group Ltd, addressed the Committee and said the following:

'I represent Brookhouse Group Limited, which as you will be aware, owns the balance of the Cuerden strategic site.

I'm not going to discuss this morning whether legally the council can determine this application in place of South Ribble Council, though you'll be aware that there's ongoing litigation between Brookhouse and the council as to the legal effectiveness of the development arrangements, which the council says is in place with Maple Grove Developments Limited, and the potential consequences of the litigation, including the initial hearing which the council lost last week. It's only relevant because if my clients claim succeeds and this application is for South Ribble rather than this council, our letter yesterday urged that you defer this decision until the outcome of that litigation.

In any event, I urge that you make sure that a reasonable observer would conclude that this committee is not biased towards a decision which would be favourable to the council in financial terms. Again, I urge caution.

I want to focus on two points this morning.

First of all, Brookhouse's main concern is set out in our letter. Our previous letter states that if permission is granted, there should be a section 106 clause to prevent the councillors, landowner and indeed its successors from refusing Brookhouse access across the access roads that are created, particularly in relation to zone A, ensuring that Brookhouse is not held to ransom, throttled from developing the landlocked parts of its site. The risk of ransom would breach South Ribble Councils requirements in its local plan C4, requiring a comprehensive integrated development, and that was the reason why the site was removed from the green belt.

The Supreme Court recently described anti-ransom provisions as wholly justified. South Ribble is objecting to this application on the same basis. It made sure when



granting the 2017 permission that access would be unfettered. We've given examples to officers from across the country where this has been done. We don't understand why the council is refusing to agree to this provision. I can only think of one reason and is not becoming of this authority. Secondly, the county landscape service has 28 objections to the application. If you see pages 33 to 35 of this report, there's no explanation in the report as to why the committee should ignore those 28 objections. In summary, Brookhouse asks that you defer consideration of this application pending resolution of the litigation. In any event, you must ensure your decision making cannot be said to be unfairly favouring this Council as landowner.

Thirdly, no permission should be granted in any circumstances without the protections from the council for my clients of an anti-ransom provision and lastly, no permission should be granted without an adequate explanation of how the 28 concerns expressed by your landscape officers have been dealt with. Thank you committee members, for hearing me out.'

County Councillor Green, local County Councillor, addressed the Committee and said the following:

'Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good morning fellow councillors.

So clearly for those of you who've actually been on the site visit, you'll realise what a very large development the site is. This is quite unusual for the county council to talk about a site of this scale. The Cuerden site, Mr Chairman, has clearly been earmarked for development for many years and has been included in South Ribble's local plan as a mixed use site and I welcome the Development Control Committee considering this application this morning. I do have some concerns though colleagues - one of the biggest being the access onto Stanifield Lane; this is already a very busy road and I note that similar concerns have been raised by Farington Parish Council, of which I am a member, (although I excluded myself from that item), and South Ribble Borough Councils Planning Committee. Whilst personally I would prefer not to have the southern access point, I do note that the access is required and from what we've seen on the drawings, and it is compliant with the master plan which was adopted by South Ribble Borough Council and I think this is a compliant application.

I am also reassured by the significant agreement to reduce the speed along Stanifield Lane to 30 miles an hour, which will make a massive difference in that area, and I very much welcome that and it's something that I've been asking for. I would ask the developer to consider a request to make a contribution towards traffic calming measures though, to promote respect for the reduced speed limit, which I think will go somewhere and at very little cost for the developer, so I would ask that that be considered. Whilst designs will be considered at the reserved matters stage, I would hope that the site will be developed sensitively, maintaining the valuable trees and other features and reducing the visual impact of the site - this is particularly true for zone D. I note that the proposed widths along the western north are reduced, I think, to 18.5 metres, although I would submit that such a height does remain significant and we've recently had an application of a very similar height elsewhere in Farington West which has received significant criticism of the decision taking by South Ribble Borough Council. I welcome the reduced speed limit on Lostock Lane



and the new crossing which will make a big difference and connectivity for all users will be significantly improved. The application promotes economic growth, but it also considers the impact on our residential amenity and provides some major local improvements and therefore I do not object in principle to the application before us, however, I do hope that my earlier comments will be considered fully as further stages come forward, allowing the development to proceed in a way which protects the amenity of residents, reduces the visual impact of the development, promotes compliance with the reduced Highway speeds and protects valuable trees and other features.

Thank you very much for your time.'

Mr Paul Newton, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee and said the following:

'Thank you, Chair. Good morning members, my name is Paul Newton and I'm the agent for this application. As you'll be aware, the site is one of the most significant economic development sites in Lancashire, and provides the once in a lifetime opportunity to deliver a dynamic, sustainable best in class development that will generate significant economic, social and environmental benefits.

We're pleased that your officers are supporting the application and recommending it for approval. The officers report provides a comprehensive and balanced assessment of the application proposals and considers all relevant matters. Importantly, and despite what you've just heard from Mr Ricketts, it provides a legally robust basis upon which to make your decision.

The Cuerden strategic site has been allocated for employment led development in successive development plans. It is the subject of an adopted master plan and has previously received planning permission for development. However, for various commercial and land ownership reasons, the site has never been brought forward.

The application proposes the development of 51 hectares, or 70% of the wider site allocation, and will provide up to 160,000 square metres of employment and commercial floor space, along with 116 new homes including affordable homes. Importantly, it will provide all of the onsite and offsite road infrastructure necessary to service the development and the wider allocation. The applicant controls all of the land necessary to deliver the scheme and after years of uncertainty, it presents the best opportunity for the site to come forward.

To be clear, it will not in any way preclude or restrict the future development of the remaining land within the allocation that sits beyond the applicants control, as the officer report notes the application accords with the site specific policy and the other policies within the development plan. The application has been the subject of a comprehensive pre and post submission programme of engagement and consultation with local residents, key stakeholders and your offices. As a result, the application has the support of the Environment Agency, Natural England, National Highways LCC as Highway Authority, Historic England and the lead local flood authority. There are no technical reasons why the application should not be supported. Further, the application has been subject to very little public or resident



objection. Whilst Brookhouse has been particularly vocal, their comments are clearly commercially driven and, as the officers report robustly sets out, are without foundation. Finally, the site was allocated to deliver economic benefits. This scheme does that by creating up to 5,600 jobs across a number of employment sectors and adding an estimated £390,000,000 to the Lancashire economy. We therefore have a scheme that your officer has supported and that will deliver significant and far reaching benefits. It fully accords with the national and local planning policies and there are no technical objections that would stop its delivery.

I therefore respectfully request that you endorse your officers recommendation and support the application.'

The Chair referred to Mr Rickett's calling into question of the motivation of Members of the Committee and re-iterated that, at the beginning of the meeting, with the exception of County Councillor Pattison referring to being a member of Lancaster City Council (as a statutory consultee), no Committee member declared any pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda.

County Councillor Holgate made the point that Committee Members needed to be clear that they were not representing Lancashire County Council for this application but that they were interpreting planning legislation as Members of Development Control Committee and that any statement made by the county council as the applicant should be taken on its merits.

The Officer answered questions from Committee.

It was reported that, should the Committee be minded to approve the application, this was for outline planning permission and that the detailed conditions would come back to Committee for their consideration, as was common practice.

After a discussion, it was Proposed and Seconded that:

"the application be deferred subject to details of the biodiversity net gain plan being received".

Upon being put to the Vote, the Amendment was lost.

It was therefore:

Resolved: 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:

- (i) conditions controlling time limits (full permission and reserved matters), working programme, development parameters, phasing, affordable housing, building materials, landscape and ecology, pollution control, highways and transport, and surface and foul water management as set out in the Committee report.
- (ii) The following condition revisions as set out in the Update Sheet:



Condition 19

Replace paragraph (f) as follows to account for missing text:

(f). appropriate measures to control the emission of noise and vibration during construction in accordance with guidance set out in British Standard BS 5228: 2009 +A1 2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites.

Condition 44

Following revision to account for the most recent drawing revision:

There shall be no occupation of built development within Zone A until the Initial Site Infrastructure (within that Zone) has been constructed as shown on drawing no. 21017-FRA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-9112-**P20** - Parameter Plan 2: Highways and Access.

Reason: to provide access to the wider Cuerden Strategic site as set out in the Adopted Masterplan and to comply with Policy C4 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

6. Fylde Borough: Application number LCC/2022/0065 Proposed Anaerobic Digestion plant including digester/gas holder and associated equipment, relocated flare, new earth banking/perimeter landscaping and underground gas export pipeline. Stanley Villa Farm, Back Lane, Weeton with Preese

A report was presented on an application for a Proposed Anaerobic Digestion plant including digester/gas holder and associated equipment, relocated flare, new earth banking/perimeter landscaping and underground gas export pipeline at Stanley Villa Farm, Back Lane, Weeton with Preese.

This planning application had originally been reported to the Committee meeting on 18 October 2023. A copy of that report was attached to the Agenda papers. At that meeting, the Committee:

'Resolved: That the application be deferred, subject to:

- (i) a site visit taking place; and
- (ii) more detail to be provided by the applicant on the highway plans, the details of which would be included in the next Committee report.'

The site visit had been held on 21 November 2023.

The October 2023 report had included the views of Fylde Borough Council, Weeton-with-Preese Parish Council, Greenhalgh Parish Council, the Environment Agency,



LCC Highways Development Control and the Lead Local Flood Authority. Five representations objecting to the application had been received at that time in addition to an email from County Councillor Singleton and two additional letters from local residents objecting to the application, which had been detailed in the Update Sheet.

This latest report updated Committee on further representations that had been received since the report to the October 2023 meeting had been prepared, and also to respond to various issues that were raised during the debate on this planning application. The further consultation exercise sought views from 14 addresses on Greenhalgh Lane.

Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Sheet which included further consultation responses and representations and a proposed additional condition in relation to any hedgerows removed being planted in the first season following the completion of the development.

Photographs from a local resident were circulated to the Committee.

The Head of Development Control presented a Powerpoint presentation showing site location plans, an air photograph of Stanley Villa Farm, proposals for the screen mound and digester vessel, cross sections and landscaping proposals. Also shown were photographs of the view along Back Lane looking towards the site entrance, the view of Back Lane looking east towards the application site and the view of Back Lane looking west towards the site entrance.

Councillor Richard Nulty addressed the Committee and said the following:

'Good afternoon, Mr Chairman and Members. I'm Richard Nulty, parish councillor from Greenhalgh with Thistleton. The Greenhalgh parish boundary is Back Lane in this location, and this application is of concern to our residents. Our earlier concerns over safety and visual intrusion have been largely met by the suggested conditions in the officers report.

However, our concerns over road safety matters on these rural roads remain and are informed not by desktop statistics, but by real life experience of daily users on the road network. In this location, much of the vehicle traffic associated with this site will enter the area via the M55 Junction 3, then to the A585, with four potential routes to the application site. The preferred route, and the safest, is Weeton Road from the Wesham bypass to Weeton crossroads, then right into Back Lane for a kilometre or so to the site. The other three are Bradshaw Lane, which is South of Junction 3, which is technically impossible for HGVs, and to the north Greenhalgh Lane and Back Lane, both off the A585 trunk. SATNAV instructions will indicate Greenhalgh Lane as the shortest direct route. Your officers accept that this unclassified lane is quite unsuitable for HGV traffic. However, your conditional requirements to curb such use are less than satisfactory. Similar conditions and signage have already been applied in regards to the potato processing plant at Stanley Villa, and this has not stopped quite a large percentage of heavy goods vehicles using the narrow lane with consequential damage to the verges, inconveniencing pedestrians and endangering them. Even the optimum route via Weeton Road and west via Back Lane is unsatisfactory, as it's still too narrow for an HGV to easily pass an opposing car, let



alone an agricultural vehicle or another HGV. Practical experience shows that the present level of HGV use is already causing damage to the verges and the newly resurfaced highway here is being broken up at the edges as vehicles nudge past each other.

Your highway engineers say the road is lightly trafficked, but your own figures show that a further 3,600 HGV visits a year will be necessary for this project over a five day working week. That equates to 29 movements each day. Allowing for loading and unloading and travel to and from time, the actual window of transit through the area is likely to be 5 hours a day, which would see something like 6 movements an hour, one every 10 minutes. It takes 2 minutes to cover the section from the application site to Weeton Road, and therefore there's a 20% chance of a confrontation between a car and HGV, or worse, an HGV and a tractor, or HGV and HGV. This is in addition to the existing unsatisfactory movements on the road.'

Ms Kat Kuczynska, local resident, addressed the Committee and said the following:

'Councillors, Mr Chair. It doesn't matter whether you're in Lancashire or Somerset or abroad. For as long as a large scale anaerobic digester, such as the proposed one, is in the wrong location, it will have significant impact and cause significant harm to the local area. The core impacts are the same – an area that is permanently locked into the constant operation of HGVs, problems with damage to the roads impacting road safety, loss of amenity and quality of life, noise pollution, air pollution, heavy reliance on fossil fuels.

Last year, Bath and North East Somerset Council rejected a large scale anaerobic digester project, referencing both the National Planning Policy Framework and local policies. They believed that there were cleaner and better yielding ways to achieve renewable energy targets. You have seen the damage to the roads that the existing operation at the development site is causing, in an area that is supposed to be designated as countryside. It is not going to get better by putting thousands more unsuitable vehicles on them. This development site has already exceeded what the local road network can support, many years ago. The proposed development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 110, 111, 112, 174, 180, 185 and the Fylde local plan policies GD4, GD7, ENV1, ENV2, CL1 and CL2, Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework promoting sustainable transport. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on Highway safety. The residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The proposal fails to promote sustainable travel and conflicts with Section 5 conserving and enhancing the natural environment and Paragraph 174 as the characteristic of the countryside would be permanently damaged and thousands of heavy vehicles is not representative of the countryside. Existing development would be put at unacceptable risk and adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air and noise pollution. Paragraph 180 habitats and biodiversity - there will be significant harm to biodiversity resulting from the development that cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or compensated for.

Therefore, this planning permission should be refused. Paragraph 185 a, b and c ground conditions and pollutions - there would be adverse impact from the new development and its supporting infrastructure including the heavy use of HGVs both



in transit and loading and unloading. This would impact upon the health and quality of life of residents and visitors. The location is still prized for its recreational and amenity value, and it is essential to maintaining the established tourism economy. Light pollution from the site will impact upon amenity. There are also ongoing breaches of planning permission on site and various conditions and recent unlawful development, and the Council should not be promoting these actions.'

Ms Linda Johnson, local resident, addressed the Committee and said the following:

'The proposed development is effectively a power plant, 22,900 square metres in size, bigger than three Wembley football pitches. The existing digester application was 2,127 square metres, so this one is more than 10 times bigger. The proposed digester is more than double the volume of the existing one, which already services the waste produced by the potato processing factory. It is located in an area that is supposed to be designated as countryside. The quantity of material to be brought to support it on an old country lane is ridiculous. It's 18,000 tonnes, 6,300 of which is animal excrement, which will be stored and processed on the site. It does not create any new jobs and it will further erode the characteristics of the countryside. I set up my caravan park, respecting the countryside that I grew up in and was on the farm, the land on which the site is to be situated, but the applicant just sees the countryside as a blank canvas to develop more and more, and the roads can't handle it. This has to stop, otherwise the taxpayer is going to be burdened with not only unsafe roads, but even more resurfacing costs. We should be conserving the roads and not breaking them up with inappropriate development.

The proposed plan conflicts with the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 policies GD4, GD7, ENV1, ENV2 - development in the countryside, achieving good design in development, landscape and biodiversity. The development will damage the rural economy through tourism enterprises that rely on the characteristics of the countryside. There's no consideration for pedestrians and cyclists that use it. The heavy good vehicles are increasing and damaging the road. The caravaners will not be prepared to drive on narrow country lanes that are filled with thousands of potholes. I have lived in the area all of my life and the tractors that my father used to drive on the lanes were small and smaller than today's cars. The lanes have not changed, but the vehicles that drive on them have and it is little wonder that they are falling apart because of it. They were not built with the intention of HGVs and articulated lorries using them, to the level that the applicant is subjecting them to. The roads are as much a characteristic of the countryside as an amenity for everybody and should be retained for everybody and not altered to accommodate large vehicles that they cannot support or are not representative of the countryside.'

The legal officer read out the following written representation from Mr Paul Jackson, local resident:

'I object to the proposed development, and I am concerned that the negative impact that it will have on the local area is not being adequately assessed. I moved to the countryside several years ago and love being here but was very quickly shocked to hear the operation of what is a factory in an area designated as 'countryside' next door. It is a factory that operates 24 hours a day. We hear heavy machinery and large vehicles operating at all hours and this is not representative of an area



designated as 'countryside'. To add a further industrial development will only make it even worse and cause more damage.

The current site is lit up like Blackpool Illuminations all night and the local road network is in such a state of decay and disrepair that it is evident they cannot cope with the volume and weight of vehicles that the factory currently uses – they are old country lanes so it is ridiculous to consider that they ever could. I fail to see how writing 'slow' on the roads twice, or constructing a single passing place stops them from further deteriorating due to heavy use. The solutions put forward do very little to also deliver an acceptable level of road safety – what are people supposed to do when they are not near the 29.3m passing place on narrow and bendy country lanes – drive in hedges? Reverse back to the passing place? The increase in the number of vehicles on the lanes makes reversing dangerous.

A development of this type and size and the infrastructure required to support it will only ever be in conflict with its surroundings. It reaches a point where you have to consider if the cumulative impact of proposed solutions to try and accommodate it are themselves damaging the characteristics of the countryside and in this instance, they are – it is the wrong location and should not be approved. This development is not required in this location to support the applicants' existing on site activities, as all of the material a 2nd digester requires is 100% imported to it as confirmed by your planning officer – it is not needed. What the applicant wants is the money it will generate. However, the proposed scheme will permanently damage the amenities enjoyed by many and the tourism developments in the local area. Whatever the perceived benefits of the renewable energy delivered are, these are significantly outweighed by the negative impact on the local area and the heavy reliance on fossil fuels that the heavy goods vehicles infrastructure to support it requires. The application has to be assessed on what is now and not pipe dreams – it is fossil fuel reliant.

I ask the planning committee that if the words designated countryside and protection of it means anything to them as it does to so many people who either live in or visit this area of Lancashire and enjoy the amenities it offers, then they be minded to reject this planning application.'

The legal officer read out the following written representation from Mr Dan Galea, local resident:

'I object to this application and cannot believe that serious consideration is being given to adding further HGVs in the thousands onto roads that are not suitable for them. Equally, the size and type of the development proposed is huge and completely uncharacteristic of the countryside. It should be rejected.

I live at the bottom of Greenhalgh Lane and like many people I drive a car, not a 4 x 4 or SUV. The roads around here are breaking up at such a rate that it is alarming and this is due to the number of large and heavy vehicles that are on what are country roads and the roads cannot cope with it. The vehicles causing this are mostly from the operation at Stanley Villa Farm. Cars are impacted by the condition of roads before lorries and HGVs. Other uses for recreation such as cycling and walking are impacted upon even sooner. Myself and my wife like to walk the lanes



with our dog and further increasing the number of large vehicles will make this a more dangerous and less appealing activity to undertake. Our quality of life and well-being will be impacted by it.

In late November, the AA gave advice to drivers regarding potholes and said *“Our advice to drivers and those on two wheels is to avoid puddles where safe to do so”*. This is because of the dangers and damage caused when driving through potholes. Potholes are often caused by water entering cracks in the road surface and these lanes are covered in them from the heavy vehicles and it is getting worse. The constant freezing and thawing of water in icy winter weather weakens the structure of the road and material eventually comes loose causing the holes. When it rains, Back Lane and Greenhalgh Lane are covered in water with numerous puddles and floods and you only have to walk along them to see the damage that is being caused to the roads. When the roads are in this state of disrepair and it is ongoing, it makes no sense to be looking for ways to accommodate even more traffic that will further damage the roads. There is already significant damage and further cracks appearing along the lanes and there are so many places where vehicles have had to leave the road and drive on the grass verges to avoid the large oncoming vehicles that it should be a concern. The roads are not wide enough or suitable and a passing place does not change that.

I don't agree that the Lead Local Flood Authority's recommendation for refusal is ignored. They have said that there is not an acceptable surface water strategy proposed for what is a development that is going to be storing and processing over 6,300 tonnes of excrement on the site. I agree with the flood authority that this should be addressed before it can be approved and the applicant has had several opportunities to do this but has not. There is no comfort whatsoever in a condition to address this, when the risk being considered is sewage potentially entering the fresh water network. When you are told to reject a development that is managing excrement of a weight equivalent of over five and a half thousand Ford Fiesta Cars per year, what will happen to the surface water on the site during rainy conditions should be taken seriously such as it has been by the Council's own department. When considering what is involved, if the Committee Members have any reservations regarding this then they should include it as a reason to reject it.

There are so many other less intrusive and cleaner alternative renewable energy schemes that there is very little value in supporting one that causes so much damage to the area it would be located and to so many people.'

The legal officer read out the following written representation from Mr Dave McMonagle, local resident:

'First, may I start by saying having read through the planning application and looked at the photographs regarding the transport issues, how LCC highways cannot raise any objections to this application is ludicrous. None of the photos have been taken outside my property which is where the main issues should be raised. It seems that widening the verges by two feet to allow the vehicles more room on the road has been a solution from somebody at LCC who hasn't even looked at this road! The problem isn't making enough room for the wagons to run faster and easier, its having more wagons running down a lane that isn't capable of withstanding the wagons that are already using it. We have articulated wagons running at all times of day from



5am in the morning to very late at night, which is also not noted in the noise pollution section of the application. Only 6 weeks ago, I had two opposing wagons stopped outside my house at 10pm on a Sunday night chatting for half an hour!! Not only do we have to deal with the HGV issues but the tractors and trailers using the roads have made a terrible mess of all the grass verges. Having Simon Leaver ring my company for a road sweeper for the day before your planning meeting to 'tidy it up before the meeting' does not constitute a true representation of what is happening down this road. And even the idea that Stanley Villa farms will put a sweeper on does not fill me with encouragement as none has ever been on before in the years I have been at this property. The verges are ruined, the hedges are black instead of green, no longer can we walk down the road with our dogs / family due to the heavy weight of traffic down our road and this application wants to add over 3,000 more trips with faster, wider roads? The days of taking my children on bike rides in our area is no longer a safe possibility. I am not against progress, but the original digester was installed to use waste generated by Stanley Villa Farm. This new digester system is to have all the food stock imported from elsewhere only to generate energy for financial gain at the cost of our local environment.'

In relation to concerns about HGVs on the highways, the officer confirmed that the applicant had already put measures in place to ensure the HGVs used the relatively short section of Back Lane. Condition 8 sought to impose a number of different measures to ensure that was the case which included some works to the site entrance to direct traffic that way, management measures to ensure they informed hauliers of the correct route to use, and disciplinary measures in place should hauliers be seen to not be observing traffic management measures.

Also in terms of HGV usage, Committee were reminded that there was already existing HGV usage on the roads so it was important in Committee's deliberations to concentrate on what the extra HGV movements were from this application, in addition to what already existed. It was estimated that this development would result in approximately a 10% increase on that which already took place so was not seen as a substantial increase.

The officer answered questions from Committee.

It was Proposed that a separate condition be imposed on the hours of importation of materials and to limit these to normal hours of operation.

After a discussion, the Proposal was Withdrawn and residents were advised to report any incidents of environmental nuisance.

Resolved:

That planning permission be **granted** subject to:

- (i) conditions controlling time limits, working programme, design of the development, hours of construction, highways matters, drainage details and landscaping, as set out in the Committee report.
- (ii) The following additional condition, as set out in the Update Sheet:



'Any hedgerows that are removed to construct the gas export pipeline shall be replaced in the first planting season following the completion of the development. The replacement planting shall use the same species as those removed and the planting shall thereafter be maintained for a period of 10 years from the date of its implementation including replacement of failed planting, weed control and maintenance of protection measures.'

Reason : To ensure the proper landscaping of the site in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

7. Fylde Council: Application number: LCC/2021/0061 Application to raise levels of field using imported inert materials. Ream Hills Farm, Mythop Road, Weeton with Preese

A report was presented on an application to raise levels of field using imported inert materials at Ream Hills Farm, Mythop Road, Weeton with Preese.

The report included the views of Fylde Council, Weeton-with-Preese Parish Council, Staining Parish Council, LCC Ecology Service, LCC Highways Development Control, Lead Local Flood Authority, Natural England and the Environment Agency. No comments had been received from LCC Public Rights of Way or Bae Systems. Comments had been received from County Councillor John Singleton objecting to the proposals and representations included one letter of objection on behalf of eight properties plus one further letter of objection.

Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Sheet which included observations from Lancashire County Council Estates and further comments from the applicant on the officer's report.

The Senior Planner presented a Powerpoint presentation showing site location plans, aerial view of the application site and the location of the existing bund, access details, proposed restoration and photographs of the existing view towards the eastern and northern boundaries, view to the western boundary and site access of Mythop Road.

The officer answered questions from Committee.

Resolved:

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed raising of the field levels is essentially required for the continuation of the agricultural use of the land, contrary to policy GD4 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating partial review).
- (ii) The proposed development would have unacceptable landscape and visual impacts which would be harmful to the character of the countryside,



contrary to policies GD4 and ENV1 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating partial review).

- (iii) The need for the inert landfill capacity in this area is insufficient to outweigh the conflict with Policy GD4 and the adverse landscape and visual impacts of the development.

8. Ribble Valley Borough: Application number LCC/2023/0023 Erection of two storey detached teaching block and additional staff car parking. Longridge High School, Preston Road, Longridge

A report was presented on an application for the erection of two storey detached teaching block at Longridge High School, Preston Road, Longridge.

It was reported that the reference to additional staff car parking could be disregarded as this had now been omitted from the scheme.

The report included the views of LCC Highways and United Utilities. No comments had been received from Longridge Town Council and comments were awaited from Ribble Valley Borough Council. Two representations objecting to the proposal had been received.

Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Sheet which included amended text to the second paragraph on page 194, details of the construction method statement provided by the applicant and proposed changes to the design and appearance of the building which were considered to be acceptable to officers as they did not materially alter the proposals. Also included were proposed amendments to conditions 2, 4, 5, 6 and 8.

The Senior Planner presented a Powerpoint presentation showing site location plans and an aerial view of the site of the proposed building, proposed site layout, proposed elevations and floor plans, cross section and photographs of the view of the site looking towards the northern boundary (Singletons Dairy), the view to the east towards the houses on Little Lane, the school entrance and the view of the site from Preston Road.

Resolved: That planning permission be **granted** subject to:

- (i) conditions controlling time limits approved drawings, materials, highway matters, drainage details, landscaping, hours of working and construction management plan as set out in the Committee report.
- (ii) Amendments to the following conditions:

Condition 2

2. The development shall be carried out, (except where modified by the conditions to this permission), in accordance with the following documents:



a) The Planning Application and supporting statement received by the County Planning Authority on 6 July 2023

b) Submitted Plans and documents:

Design and Access Statement received 30th November 2023

Arboricultural Assessment received 6th July 2023

Ecological appraisal received 6th July 2023

School Travel Plan 6th July 2023

Document ref. E230030 received 20th November 2023

Construction Method Statement received 30th November 2023

Drawing No. P2-00-DR-A-40_50_63-0001 Rev. S4-P01 Site Plan - Location (received 20th November 2023)

Drawing No. P2-00-DR-A-40_50_63-0002 Rev. S4-P03 Site Plan - Existing (received 30th October 2023)

Drawing No. P2-ZZ-DR-A-40_50_63-0004 Rev. S4-P05 Plans - Proposed (received 30th November 2023)

Drawing No. P2-ZZ-DR-A-40_50_63-0005 Rev. S4-5 Elevations - Proposed (received 30th November 2023)

Drawing No. P2-00-DR-A-40_50_63-0006 Rev. S4-P03 Site Plan Masterplan – Proposed (received 30th October 2023)

Drawing No. LA02 Rev H General Arrangement Plan (received 30th October 2023)

Drawing No. LA07 Section - Showing new teaching block and surrounding buildings (received 30th October 2023)

Drawing No. LA08 Rev A Temporary car park and reinstatement (received 30th November 2023)

Reason: To minimise the impact of the development on the amenities of the area and to conform with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Local Plan.

Condition 4

The external elevations of the building hereby approved shall be constructed from the following materials:

- Brick - Windmill Orange Mixture RG1889 by RGB North West
- External Windows and door frames, roof fascia, soffits and rainwater pipes in PPC aluminium RAL 5011
- Hyperion cladding Sentinel colour Walnut, by Envirobuild
- Roof - Pantile 2000 colour Mid Grey by Britmet

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area and to conform with policy DMG1 Ribble Valley Core Strategy.



Condition 5

The construction operations shall take place in accordance with the approved Construction Method Statement (received 30th November 2023) and document E230030 (received 29th November 2023) throughout the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Condition 6

Within two months of the occupation of the building hereby permitted the proposed temporary car parking area shall be restored in accordance with plan ref. LA08 rev. A received 30th November 2023.

Reason: In order to ensure that the final details of the highway scheme/works are acceptable before work commences on site and to conform with Policy DM12 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Condition 8

No construction development, delivery or removal of materials shall take place outside the hours of:

07:00 to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday (except Public Holidays)

08:00 to 18:00 hours on Saturday.

No construction development, delivery or removal of materials shall take place at any time on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users and to conform with Policies DMG1 DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

9. Planning decisions taken by the Director of Environment and Planning in accordance with the County Council's Scheme of Delegation

It was reported that, since the last meeting of the Development Control Committee on 18th October 2023, six decisions had been taken on development control matters by the Director of Environment and Planning, in accordance with the county council's Scheme of Delegation.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

10. Urgent Business

There were no items of Urgent Business.



11. Date of Next Meeting

Resolved: That the next meeting of the Committee be held on Wednesday 17th January 2024 at 10.30am in Committee Room B – The Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston.

H MacAndrew
Director of Law and Governance

County Hall
Preston

