



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 31 January, 1, 2, 3 February 2023

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by J P Longmuir BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/W/22/3307710

Land southeast of South Lancashire Industrial Estate, Lockett Road, Wigan WN4 8DE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Glenbrook Industrial Ltd against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref A/21/92036/OUTMAJ, dated 8 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is an outline planning application with details of means of access (partial details of access and details of scale, layout, appearance and landscape are reserved) for the erection of up to 625,000 sqft (58,064sqm) (GIA) of industrial, storage and distribution floorspace with ancillary offices (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)), construction of primary estate road off Bolton Road and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of up to 625,000 sqft (58,064sqm) (GIA) of industrial, storage and distribution floorspace with ancillary offices (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)), construction of primary estate road off Bolton Road and associated works at Land south east of South Lancashire Industrial Estate Lockett Road Wigan WN4 8DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref A/21/92036/OUTMAJ, dated 27 April 2022, subject to the conditions in the conditions annexe at the end of this decision.

Preliminary matters

2. The above address is taken from the application form, but the proposed site access would be off Bolton Road rather than from Lockett Road.
3. The application is in outline with all matters except access reserved. Details of the proposed access onto Bolton Road were provided but not for the rest of the access road through the site, which I return to latterly. A Land use and Building Heights parameters plan was submitted for consideration at this outline stage and a compliance condition is suggested by the Appellant. An illustrative masterplan was also submitted but I have only considered this as titled.
4. The Section 106 agreement signed on 22 February 2023 makes provision for improvements to the existing right of way to the southwest of the site, travel

plan monitoring, bus stop improvements on Bolton Road and off-site biodiversity enhancement measures at Westwood Flash SBI¹. I consider the agreement latterly.

5. Keep Ashton Green (KAG) participated in the Inquiry as a Rule 6 Party.

Main Issues

6. At the Case Management Conference² (CMC), the Council clarified that the reason for refusal related to the effect of the proposal on the operation of the local road network, in particular congestion, with inadequate mitigation proposed. The Statement of Common Ground on highway matters confirms that the Council had no objection on safety grounds.
7. KAG raised pedestrian safety at the CMC, and I also include this as part of the main issue on the operation of the local road network.
8. Part of the appeal site is within the Greater Manchester Green Belt. Whilst the Council did not object to the proposal on the basis that it conflicted with Green Belt Policy, nonetheless, it is a particular consideration in relation to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which I am obliged to consider.
9. I therefore consider that the main issues are:
- the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the operation of the local road network, in particular congestion and pedestrian safety, notwithstanding the mitigation proposed.

Reasons

Green Belt

10. The appeal site was allocated as employment land in 1996 as part of a larger development. The northern part of the allocation has been developed and is accessed off Lockett Road. However, that access has not been extended into the appeal site and I am advised that this would be at the behest of another landowner. The inability to achieve access from the northern part of the site has meant that the appeal site has not been developed. This proposal seeks an alternative access to the south, off Bolton Road.
11. The Council³ mapped the boundaries of the appeal site and the Green Belt. The Bolton Road junction, the access road, drainage ponds and associated landscaping would be within the Green Belt boundary whilst the substation and other buildings would be outside. The road junction works also include a pedestrian pavement extension along Bolton Road⁴, which would be within the boundary of the Green Belt.

¹ Westwood Flash SBI as stated in definitions of legal agreement

² Case Management Conference note for 7 December 2022

³ Council Statement of Case Appendix A

⁴ S278 General Arrangement

12. Policy CP8 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) makes reference to the Green Belt but largely defers to national policy, which is the Framework. Paragraph 137 refers to the essential characteristics of the Green Belt being openness and permanence.
13. The Greater Manchester Green Belt Assessment 2016 was undertaken by landscape consultants on behalf of the Councils within the Manchester Green Belt including Wigan. This considers how the designation contributes to the area in terms of national policy. The Assessment finds that for this area, sprawl has been generally avoided, merger of settlements has been prevented but the designation has been weak in terms of encroachment of development.
14. Paragraph 150 of the Framework acknowledges that engineering operations and local transport infrastructure may not be inappropriate in a Green Belt location. It also requires that engineering operations and local transport infrastructure preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it
15. The proposed drainage pond, road, footway and junction would be engineering operations due to the nature of the works involved. The Glossary to the Framework does not provide a definition of 'local transport infrastructure'. However, the proposed access road would be built to adoptable standards for vehicles as well as cyclists and pedestrians.
16. The wording in the Framework is very generalised and the proposal is a locally orientated road for all modes of transport. I therefore find that the proposal constitutes engineering operations and local transport infrastructure.
17. Paragraph 150 also has a criterion that such works demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location. The appeal site is a long standing substantial employment allocation which has not been implementable due to land ownership. I find that the now intended access through the Green Belt would be necessary.
18. Paragraph 138 of the Framework describes the five purposes of the Green Belt: check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and assist in urban regeneration.
19. The drainage pond would be low lying and potentially a naturalised shape which with boundary planting would allow it to be perceived as part of the landscape.
20. The pedestrian pavement extension would be adjacent to Bolton Road and would be perceived as part of it rather than an encroachment into the countryside.
21. I find that the drainage pond and pavement extension would preserve the Green Belt openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it, so would not be inappropriate.
22. The access road would be likely to be lined by planting as indicated in the parameter plan which would be akin to new field boundaries. However, the

roadside surface together with the adjacent foot/cycleways would be 7.3m wide which would be unlikely to be wholly screened, particularly so when viewed from the point of the Bolton Road junction. Such a hard surface would be an encroachment into the Green Belt, although due to the size of the belmouth, the access would not have a significant impact.

23. In addition, the Planning Practice Guidance Green Belt⁵ refers to the need to consider 'the degree of activity likely to be generated such as traffic generation'. The road would serve a substantial employment area leading to the presence of vehicles, in particular lorries. The movement, colours and texture of these vehicles would harm the sense of openness of the Green Belt.
24. The vehicles would not be a constant feature and would only be experienced for the moment when on the proposed access road. The vehicles would also be perceived from Bolton Road but that itself is a busy road. This would also limit the harm arising.
25. Some lighting would also be expected⁶, and whilst the submitted lighting assessment foresees the hooding of lights and a condition is recommended to limit the spillage, some brightness is inevitable as that is the function of lights. Bolton Road has street lighting so from there lighting would only be marginal in its effect, but not so from the adjacent footpath, which is a dark landscape, although at times of darkness this would be expected to be used by very few people. The columns would be visible during daylight but would be expected to be slender. In these respects, the proposal would harm the visual quality of the Green Belt albeit this would be slight.
26. I find that the proposal would harm the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriate development, and it would also be contrary to Policy CP8. Whilst this harm would be very limited, nonetheless Paragraph 148 requires that substantial weight is given to any harm. Paragraph 147 states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. I consider this latterly together with any other harms.

The effect of the proposal on the highway network

27. The reason for refusal refers to only one Development Plan policy: Policy CP7. This seeks to maximise the capacity, efficiency and safety of the road network reducing as far as practical the adverse impact of transport on communities, town centres and the wider environment.
28. The Council accept that the thrust of Policy CP7 is not higher than that of Paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). This states development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be a new unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual accumulative impact on the road network would be severe.
29. Both parties acknowledge the Hawkhurst judgement⁷ whereby the test of a severe impact is whether the proposal would in itself create a severe impact.

⁵ Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 64-001-20190722

⁶ Mr Page Proof of Evidence paragraph 7.3

⁷ R (Hawkhurst PC) v Tunbridge Wells BC & Ors. [2020] EWHC 3019 Admin) at [138]

Highway characteristics of the area

30. The Council confirm their concern is not a safety consideration but one of congestion. Any congestion needs to be considered over the wide road network beyond the vicinity of the site access.
31. The site is on the edge of Ashton-in-Makerfield (Ashton), on the A58 Bolton Road from Wigan. This is a single carriageway which the Appellant suggests is 8.5m wide⁸. It traverses through the suburbs of Ashton into the town centre via several junctions with other roads which have traffic lights or priority junctions as well as pedestrian crossing points. I am advised that the timing of the traffic lights is set at 120 seconds delay which is unusually long to maintain the flow of traffic.
32. There are pedestrian pavements on both sides of this road and lighting which encourage walking. Similarly, there are bus stops serving various routes including Wigan to Ashton.
33. After several miles beyond the town centre and the far side from the appeal site, the A58 joins the M6 at junction 23. This junction has access in both north-south directions whereas the neighbouring junction, 24, to the north has restricted access.

The traffic generation of the proposal

34. The Councils' planning and highway officers agreed the Transport Assessment (TA⁹) at the planning application stage. The Council accept¹⁰ that this is the only data before the Inquiry upon which a judgement can be made on the severity of impacts. However, at the Inquiry Mr Riley on behalf of the Council disputed several aspects of the TA which I explore latterly.
35. The TA uses TRICS figures to determine the likely traffic generation, as requested by the Council at the planning application stage. However, in addition the Appellant undertook a manual count of traffic emanating from the adjacent industrial estate, which has very similar accessibility to the appeal site and type of employment proposed, and so is a valid comparison. The TRICS figures show a 1.5 times higher a.m. peak and 2 times higher p.m. peak than the manual count.
36. The TRICS figures are generic data for traffic generation, which is based on the size of the employment floorspace, whereas some traffic is on the road anyway due to out commuting for employment: there is to be expected an element of 'double counting' as people are currently travelling to work. The Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy¹¹ (Core Strategy) refers to out commuting from the area, which would be likely to be reduced by more local employment opportunities.
37. In addition, the TA also makes no allowance for the reduction in vehicles due to walking and cycling and car sharing which are promoted in the submitted travel plan.

⁸ Paragraph 2.2.1 Framework Travel Plan

⁹ Mr Jones letter to PINS

¹⁰ Council closing paragraph 21

¹¹ Paragraph 4.2 Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy, September 2013

38. Thus, I find that the traffic generation figures in the TA represent a worst-case scenario.

Congestion

39. The nearest junction to the appeal site is Bolton Road/Golborne Road. The Appellant acknowledges this is at near capacity and the proposed development would lead to exceedance. The appeal proposal includes provision for the signalisation of this junction and a condition is so proposed. All the parties accept that this would resolve the capacity issue at this point.
40. The overall traffic flow from the appeal site into the town centre has not been modelled, rather the TA calculates the change in flows at each junction, in 2024 for their a.m. and p.m. peaks. The TA's methodology and results were agreed by the specialist Council Officers at the application stage. The Council at the Inquiry did not submit their own evidence to quantify the delay at the junctions but instead relied upon the results in the TA.
41. Bolton Road/Bryn Road which is a signalised junction would be most affected by the proposal with an increase in flow of 11.1% a.m. peak and 8.4% p.m. peak. Gerard Street/Bolton Road also signalled controlled, is the next significant with increases of 7.7% a.m. and 6.2% p.m. The other junctions, Liverpool/Bryn Street and Warrington Road/Lily Lane would have lesser increases. The TA shows the increased traffic hold up and delay movement through each junction would be around a minute or less¹², which I find would be negligible.
42. The potential congestion as an accumulative delay also needs to be considered since that would be the overall effect on the highway. In cross examination of Mr Tucker, the Council asserted the accumulative delay would be 2 minutes 22 seconds at a.m. peak, based on the total of the delays from each junction as shown in the TA. Mr Tucker accepted that total although did state that it would be the worst case, which I return to shortly.
43. In the absence of any other submitted evidence to the contrary, I find that 2 minutes 22 seconds would be the total peak delay. Whilst any delay is a nuisance and annoyance, I conclude that this would not be significant.
44. Moreover, for longer journeys beyond the town centre, this delay would be a small component. The Appellant¹³ reproduces times from 'Google' for a journey from opposite the appeal site through the town centre to the M6 junction 23, a distance of 2.4 miles. This is a representative route for through traffic. It is shown for a Monday and whilst this is a snapshot it is nonetheless based upon Google's extensive data research. The existing journey times are typically 12 minutes with 22 minutes at the morning peak. I find that the additional delay due to the proposal would not be significant.
45. In any event the 2 minutes 22 seconds delay, being the sum of the total delay at each junction, would be likely to be the worst case, as delay at one junction at traffic lights would open a gap at a subsequent junction which then would be utilised once that traffic has moved on. This was indeed the case on three of my four site visits which were at peak times.

¹² Transport assessment/ Mr Tucker Proof of Evidence

¹³ Mr Tucker Proof of Evidence page 36. As measured at the Holiday Inn.

46. In addition, this delay would also be expected to be a worst-case scenario due to the reliance upon the TRICS figures, the assumption that the proposal would be all new drivers travelling to work and not counting the saving of out commuting as well as the benefits from the promotion of cycling, walking and car sharing in the Travel Plan.
47. The Council suggest that improving the Bolton Road/Golborne Road junction would release more traffic thereby potentially moving the congestion. Whilst more traffic would flow at any one time, the current delay at one of the worst points of the highway would be reduced, so that overall, a net benefit would be expected.
48. Similarly, KAG submitted several videos which showed stationary traffic at various points on Bolton Road. However, these were from single viewpoints which can only show snapshots of that part of the road at that particular time, so whilst the traffic may have stopped at that point, it may well be moving elsewhere on Bolton Road. The videos do not show that the delay would any greater than that of the 2 minutes 22 seconds above.
49. The Council at the Inquiry also argued that HGV rates into the town centre were underestimated as the signage consistently directs M6 southbound traffic through the town centre. However, the Appellant's uncontested evidence¹⁴ shows even if all vehicles used the town centre route, the a.m. peak would be a further 14 vehicles/hour inward and 11 vehicles/hour outward. This would amount to an extra 9 vehicles/hour westbound and 7 per hour eastward. I do not find that this accumulatively would be significant.
50. The Council also suggested on street parking at both ends of the Bryn Road/Bolton Road junction can obstruct the existing flow as it impairs 2 lanes from operating. However, I observed that the immediate areas of both sides of the junction have double yellow lines to restrict parking which would if enforced allow flow and in any event the proposal would not be significant.
51. The Council suggests the alignment of Bolton Road/Bryn Road South junction has an overly tight turning for HGVs. Whilst this is challenging, it nonetheless has been plotted and found feasible. Indeed, it is part of the adopted road network and used on an everyday basis by HGVs so any additional disruption from this proposal would be likely to be minimal, especially as the Council foresee most resulting traffic would go through the town centre rather than this route.
52. The M6 is the other side of Ashton from the appeal site. The junctions' capacity and the demand from this proposal were modelled. The Highways England had no objection and I similarly concur.

Peak spreading

53. The TA shows that the traffic would be distributed over a wider time and the proposal would increase the flow outside of peak hours.
54. The Council's concern is that peak time conditions would be prolonged, and the quieter times encourage residents to walk and allow shops to load goods.

¹⁴ Mr Tucker paragraph 6.7.4 Proof of Evidence

55. However, I noted above that the delay at peak times would not be significant and therefore at other times it would also be insignificant. There may well be some residents who make a conscious choice to go out at quieter times, but no compelling evidence was submitted to demonstrate that such decisions are due to journey times.

Safety

56. The roadside footpaths provide dedicated and segregated routes for pedestrians, which are protected from any hazard on the carriageways. In terms of crossing the roads, there are defined crossing points at most of the desire lines across the A58. Whilst there is a 690m gap at one point, a pedestrian could make the decision to cross the road early.
57. There are a couple of primary schools between the appeal site and the town centre but generally they are away from the appeal site. Secondary schools are located the other side of Ashton from the appeal site. Thus, although some school children may well be walking in the vicinity of Bolton Road, the most likely school footfall would be expected to be concentrated away from the appeal site environs.
58. KAG reproduce statistics of incidents for the area, which are also considered in the Transport Assessment. Whilst the several incidents referred to are regrettable, these are few and do not appear out of the ordinary. No demonstrable evidence was produced to show that they are any different to any other suburban area.
59. The statistics also show the incidents are away from the intended site access, which indicates that the immediate environs are relatively safe. The site is within a 30mph limit, appropriate visibility splays¹⁵ can be provided, and pedestrian crossing points are shown. The pavement extension would provide segregated access to the bus stops.
60. In addition, no evidence was submitted to the Inquiry to show that delay in traffic flow arising from the proposal would lead to poor driver behaviour, thereby harming safety of road users or pedestrians.
61. Whilst the existing traffic, including HGVs, may be noisy and obtrusive to the experiences of pedestrians, no demonstrable evidence was presented to the Inquiry that pedestrian safety would be jeopardised by the proposal.
62. The signalisation of the Bolton Road/Golborne Road junction would help pedestrian movements by formalising that crossing point.
63. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm pedestrian and highway safety. The Council confirmed that safety was not a concern and I similarly concur.

Conclusion

64. The mitigation measures proposed would be proportionate and appropriate to address the effects of the proposed development. The proposal would not be harmful to the operation of the local road network and accords with Policy

¹⁵ 2.4 by 59m visibility splay.

CP7 in so far as it maintains the capacity, efficiency and safety of the road network, whilst minimising as far as practical the adverse impact of transport on the community and town centre. Similarly, the proposal would accord with paragraph 111 of the Framework in so far as it would not lead to an unacceptable impact on highway safety or lead to severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.

Other matters

65. Air quality is a concern of many residents and Yvonne Fovargue, the local M.P. There is an air quality management zone 300m to the northeast. However, the Appellant submitted a study quantifying the existing situation and the air borne emissions from construction activity and traffic resulting from the operational development, at various receptor points in the area including the through roads in the town centre. The study showed that effects of the proposal would not be significant. This was considered by the Council's environmental health officer who had no objection and I similarly concur.
66. Local residents and the local M.P. also have concern about noise disturbance. A noise impact assessment was submitted at the application stage, to consider the effect on the living conditions of nearby residents. In accordance with its recommendations acoustic fencing is proposed around the edge of the development where it borders residential properties and noise limits on the boundaries are also suggested in terms of a condition. The land use and building heights parameters plan also shows an area of landscaping between the development and the rear gardens, which would provide separation. The Council had no objection on this aspect, and I similarly concur.
67. KAG and local residents referred to the loss of part of a coppice inside the eastern boundary of the appeal site. These are mixed species and immature, which the submitted Preliminary Arboriculture Impact Assessment categorises¹⁶ these trees as largely C and U values, the lowest ratings. Some B valued trees would be lost but these are few and are away from public view. Part of the coppice would be retained and reinforced/replanted to form a 'robust screen' as part of the managed landscaped boundary around the site as shown on the parameters plan¹⁷. The above assessment identifies some trees have structural issues and there are others with ash dieback. The Council had no objection to the proposed tree removal, and I similarly concur.
68. Local residents also express concern about the effect on ecology. An ecological assessment has been submitted which did not find notable species or habitat. In addition, a safeguarding condition for final surveys prior to development is suggested and areas of landscaping are available for any potential mitigation. The proposal also makes additional provision for off-site biodiversity improvements to ensure that an overall biodiversity gain would be achieved. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not be harmful.

¹⁶ Criteria provided in BS 5837:2012

¹⁷ Notation in landscape strategy proposals. The landscaped area is shown in the land use and building heights parameters plan for consideration at this stage.

69. Several objections have been made about the loss of opportunities for dog walking and recreation use, which has health and well-being benefits for local residents. However, with the exception of peripheral footpaths which would be maintained, there are no public rights of access across the site.
70. There is also comment about the potential impact on the landscape. The new buildings would be located within sight of the adjacent existing development on three sides and would appear part of the settlement. On the open (east side) the main focus for views is towards the open countryside rather than the appeal site. Consequently, in principle the presence of buildings would not harm the landscape and their design and landscaping would be subject of consideration at the reserved matters stage.
71. Comments have been made about inadequate parking provision however the layout at this stage is indicative only and the Council's standards would need to be considered latterly in the detailed layouts at reserved matters stages¹⁸. Flooding is also raised but the site is within Zone 1 which is the lowest area of risk. Surface water run-off could be suitably attenuated so that there is no significant risk to the surrounding area.

Planning Obligation

72. The 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL) and Paragraph 57 of the Framework, provide the tests for planning obligations. They should only be sought where they are: a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
73. The legal agreement has a blue pencil clause¹⁹ for an offsite highway contribution whereby that can be struck out if I am not so minded in terms of the above tests.
74. At the application stage, it was agreed that the Section 106 agreement would provide funding for additional road markings at junction 24 of the M6 to help direct traffic and improve flow. Subsequently the Tritax Symmetry Ltd proposal²⁰ was allowed and made such provision, so this was no longer required from this proposal. The Council sought to instead seek a £227,500 'Off site Highways Contribution' for works elsewhere. The Appellant argued at the Inquiry that such measures are not compatible with the CIL tests.
75. The CIL Compliance Statement submitted 1 February 2022 sets out the 'Off site Highways Contribution'. This includes greening the town centre which would not be related to congestion. In addition, the other potential measures include a review of TRO²¹, signage and road marking, pavement build outs and pedestrian improvements which were not clearly demonstrated to be needed for safety as a result of this proposal and I have found that the proposal would not significantly exacerbate congestion. Accordingly, I do not find that the 'Off Site Highways Contribution'²² meets the CIL regulations in that it is not necessary or reasonably related to the proposal.

¹⁸ Paragraph 4.4.1 of the Transport Assessment

¹⁹ A blue pencil clause allows certain provision(s) in an agreement to be struck out whilst other provision(s) may be found to be enforceable.

²⁰ A/18/85947 and APP/V4250/V/20/3253242

²¹ Traffic Regulation Order

²² Schedule 2 contributions clause 3

76. Whilst some biodiversity measures would be achieved on site, they would be supplemented by provision of £125,000 towards ecological works/measures at the nearby Westwood Flash SBI to allow an overall positive biodiversity net gain. This would meet the requirements of paragraph 180 of the Framework and Policy CP12. Other contributions of £10,000 for improvements to the existing right of way to the southwest of the appeal site, £2,500 for travel plan monitoring, £10,000 bus stop improvements on Bolton Road would promote non-vehicular access to the employment as supported by paragraph 8 of the Framework and Policy CP7. I therefore conclude these provisions would meet the CIL tests: being necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
77. The works to signalise Bolton Road/Golborne Road junction are suggested as a condition, which I consider latterly.

Other considerations

78. Paragraph 148 of the Framework requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt together with any other harm from the proposal.
79. I have found that the proposal would lead to very limited harm to the Green Belt, but that is the only harm arising.
80. The site has been identified in Policy EM1A as a primary employment land allocation since 1996 and remains allocated as such as confirmed in Wigan Replacement Unitary Development Plan Remaining Policies, April 2006. It is clear that access cannot be found from any other location and given the delay of nearly 30 years, there is a pressing need for a solution.
81. The Council accept that the site is free of fundamental constraints to prevent development, if this new access arrangement is allowed. The Appellant foresees implementation would be expeditious.
82. The Council's Monitoring Report (AMR)²³, shows it is very short of employment land provision which threatens its growth and economic prospects. Policy CP5 commits to make provision for around 200 hectares of new employment land to meet needs to 2026, equating to around 13.33 hectares per annum. However, implementation has been significantly below this with only 24.65 hectares developed during the period 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2022, equating to just 2.24 hectares per year.
83. The table at Figure 4.1 of the AMR shows a clear picture of meagre employment development. However, paragraph 4.4 of the AMR states 'good quality sites are quickly developed when they become available in the borough'. In addition, the Locket Road part of the allocation has been largely completed which shows the potential attractiveness of the immediate vicinity for employment development. The application details²⁴ show that 871 new jobs would be created on the site when fully operational and a further 281 jobs in existing supporting businesses, which even taken as a ballpark would be important for the area.

²³ Wigan Authority Monitoring Report for 2021/22, published January 2023

²⁴ Planning Statement paragraph 8.21 and Economic Impact Assessment paragraph 4.3

84. Based on data from the English Index of Multiple Deprivation (2019)²⁵, the environs of the appeal site are one of the top 30% most deprived areas nationally, whilst neighbourhoods close by are ranked amongst the 10% and 20%.
85. The Core Strategy considers the out commuting of the Wigan Borough residents for employment as one of its key issues, which the AMR²⁶ quantifies currently as 44%. The Council at the Inquiry confirmed that the shortage of employment opportunities is contributing to such out commuting. The proposal is readily accessible to an extensive residential area which would provide alternatives to such out commuting.
86. In addition, the AMR at paragraph 4.6 notes the overall loss of 76.51 hectares of employment land within Primary Employment Areas since 2011, with the vast majority being for housing. Substantive evidence of other available alternative employment sites outside the Green Belt was not presented to the Inquiry.
87. Whilst KAG questioned the need for the employment, the AMR is the Council's robustly researched document which quantifies the situation in planning terms.
88. The appeal proposal would be a substantial and deliverable contribution to the Council's employment land provision. This is important for the economic prosperity of the area; it would support the social well-being of the community and environmentally would place jobs close to residents without the reliance upon private vehicles²⁷. Indeed, a condition is suggested for submission of a Training and Employment Management Plan with the aim of promoting the prospects for local people. Similarly, the submission and implementation of a Construction Training Plan would also benefit local people in construction. Both measures are supported by Policy CP5.
89. The suggested conditions include BREEAM rating and electric vehicle charging which would also be an environmental benefit by promoting low carbon development.
90. Whilst giving substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt, I therefore find that the very considerable benefits of the proposal would clearly and demonstrably outweigh the potential harm. I therefore find that very special circumstances exist.

Planning balance and compliance with Development Plan

91. The proposal would conflict with Policy CP8 by reason of its very limited harm to the Green Belt. However, in all other respects the proposal would not be harmful. Indeed, I have found that the proposal would maintain the capacity, efficiency and safety of the road network, and so would not conflict with Policy CP7.
92. The site is allocated for employment development for which there is a proven and pressing need, in an area with acknowledged out commuting. The proposal would generate a substantial number of jobs in a location

²⁵ Economic Impact Assessment paragraph 4.3 and figure 2.1

²⁶ Page 12

²⁷ Mr Tucker Proof of Evidence Table 1: 13,519 people live within 2km

readily accessible by non-vehicular transport. Indeed, the proposal includes training opportunities for the local community and a Travel Plan. Policy CP5 supports employment development. The proposed BREEAM rating and electric charging are also benefits. I therefore find the proposal would not conflict with the Development Plan when taken as a whole.

93. Section 38(6) of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is reiterated in paragraph 2 of the Framework. Paragraph 11(c) of the Framework states that decision making means approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay. As the proposal accords with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate otherwise, I therefore find the proposal acceptable.

Conditions

94. Paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provide the tests for the imposition of conditions. Both parties have collaborated on the suggested conditions and are in agreement. However, the Framework is clear that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning, and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. I have assessed the suggested conditions accordingly. Pre-commencement conditions have been minimised and agreed by the main parties.
95. The condition listing the approved plans would provide clarity and certainty. The details for the Bolton Road access were submitted as part of the details for consideration at this outline stage²⁸. However, the remainder of the road system has not been designed. All main parties agreed at the Inquiry that access should be a reserved matter with the Bolton Road junction details covered in the condition requiring compliance with approved plans. I concur with this approach but have prefixed the access with internal for clarity.
96. The signalisation of the Bolton Road/Goldbourne junction is suggested by a Grampian²⁹ condition. The PPG advises that such conditions should not be used where there are no prospects at all of the action in question being performed within the time-limit imposed by the permission. A plan was submitted with the application showing feasibility of the works and I am advised that the works would be within the public highway and the highway authority are supportive. I therefore find that in principle the condition is necessary.
97. However as discussed at the Inquiry, the clarity of the condition is important so implementation would be ensured as this is necessary to mitigate the impact of the development. The condition as suggested³⁰ requiring approval of details could lead to potential delay and uncertainty which could undermine the deliverability of the access: the condition must be clear in its

²⁸ Part 4 application form indicate access is for consideration at this stage

²⁹ A condition requiring off site works, outside the Appellant's ownership, usually highway matters, prior to the development

³⁰ The scheme shall detail the new junction arrangements, vehicle tracking and include traffic signals and pedestrian controlled crossings within the adopted highway, plus any works that are necessitated by the development.

intention and requirement. The broad form (at 1:500 scale) of the junction has been agreed in the submitted plan and the finer details and specifications within the public highway would be a matter for the road adoption process. The condition is re-worded to simply focus on the delivery of the access.

98. The Appellant and Council agree that it is physically possible to join the existing access at Lockett Road to make a through route. Whilst this would need land outside their control and the wishes of another landowner cannot be assumed, nonetheless they recommend a condition to safeguard this potential. I find that the implementation of both accesses, if it did take place, would help the accessibility of both employment areas to the surrounding residential areas for pedestrians and cyclists and help traffic go in their preferred direction. Accordingly, I impose this condition.
99. The suggested condition to require access, manoeuvring and parking is unnecessary as those would be shown in the reserved matters and implementation would be expected as a matter of course for the user's own benefit. This is not imposed.
100. A condition to require the submission of the details of external lighting would ensure that light pollution is limited to that necessary for the safety of highway users as well as security around buildings, whilst minimising spillage to the surrounding area and disturbance to wildlife. The suggested condition is re-worded for simplicity.
101. The archaeology condition would ensure that any potential remains on this greenfield site are properly recorded and the results are available to be appreciated by the public.
102. The travel plan condition would require submission of details for each unit. It would be based on the Travel Plan Framework which seeks to promote car sharing, walking and cycling and bus use. This would help maximise the accessibility of the site to encourage low carbon travel to work. This is re-worded to require timely implementation for each particular building.
103. The condition requiring submission and implementation of Construction Training and Employment Management Plans would help employment and skills of local people which would support the social and economic wellbeing of the local community. As I found earlier these would be a material benefit of the proposal in accordance with Policy CP5. The requirement is re-worded to require timely implementation for each particular building.
104. A condition requires the reserved matters applications for layout and landscaping include a biodiversity strategy and targets. The specific reference to the DEFRA metric is amended to allow for future update. Similarly, accepted by all parties, the condition requires wildlife surveys to provide a check before development to avoid any harm. This is re-worded to ensure that the surveys are timely and undertaken to an approved methodology. Mitigation if needed could be arranged within the landscaping areas.
105. The condition confirming the reserved matters submissions includes landscaping. An additional condition refers to the management and retention of the landscaped edge around the site as shown on the land use parameters

plan. The suggested wording is amended to require this area to be the subject of a prompt reserved matters application detailing the landscaping works, implemented to an approved timetable so as to soften the development. Tree retention within this area is also included. A condition is foreseen in the Preliminary Arboriculture Impact Assessment for the submission and approval of the arboricultural management and protection measures, I concur that its measures would be needed to help the health and contribution of the trees to the site and surroundings. This condition includes tree protection measures, so the suggested additional condition is unnecessary. The measures need to be in place at the outset of development hence the pre-commencement trigger.

106. A condition on the compliance with the height parameter plan is necessary to confirm this consideration at this outline stage and in the interests of the appearance of the development. Equally a condition to agree existing and proposed ground levels is necessary.
107. Two conditions are suggested for measures to protect the living standards of residents during construction. I find that they are necessary to minimise the disturbance but have combined them in one requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Method Statement. Similarly, as I found earlier the provision of the acoustic fence and noise limits would be necessary to maintain living conditions of local residents. Operational conditions on the management of dust, fumes and odours are also necessary to ensure these potential nuisances are minimised to respect the nearby residents. The condition on Japanese Knotweed is necessary to avoid risk of spreading a potential invasive problem.
108. The condition on drainage plans would ensure that provision is made for this essential need and the prevention of problems in the vicinity. The condition is worded as pre-commencement as other matters such as landscaping could constrain opportunities. Similarly, a condition on the use of SUDS is necessary in the interest of efficient water management.
109. The conditions requiring provision of cycle parking facilities and cycle/pedestrian connectivity would encourage low carbon travel to the development. Similarly, the submission of the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy would ensure that adequate provision is made for employees, visitors and delivery vehicles. The condition requiring compliance with the submitted energy efficiency measures is similarly needed in respect of the wider low carbon environment. The BREEAM requirement is included in the same condition as a compliance matter rather than submission of certification to ease administration.
110. The inclusion of crime prevention measures in the reserved matters proposal would help the safety and security of people, property and the community. The conditions on coal mining and land contamination would ensure that the potential is investigated and if necessary remediated so that there are no resulting problems for the site and surroundings.

Conclusion

111. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the conditions annexe below and the provisions of the section 106 agreement but without the 'Off Site Highways Contribution' in Schedule 2 clause 3.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR

List of appearances

For the Council

Mr Freddie Humphreys Counsel	Kings Chambers
Mr Kevin Riley BSc (Hons) MSc PGCertMan	Director WSP
Mr Michael Jones BA (Hons) Dip EP	Principal Planning Officer Wigan BC

For the Appellant

Mr Christopher Katkowski KC	Kings Chambers
Mr Martin Carter Counsel	Kings Chambers
Mr Simon Tucker BSc (Hons) MCIHT Director	DTA Consultants
Mr Dominic Page BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Partner Gerald Eve

Rule 6 Party: Keep Ashton Green

Mr Hardy local resident

Mr Jones local resident

Mr David Lowe Branch Secretary Wigan Trades Council

Interested parties (local residents)

Gary Gallaher

Katherine Bryne

Elaine Gate

Mike Mills

Gordon Gelling

Sandra Thompson

Michael Bentley

Jane Stonehouse

For the planning obligations round table

Mr Ward, Group Lawyer Wigan Council

Ms Louise Burnett Managing Associate Freemans

Documents submitted to the Inquiry

ID1 Appearance list for the appellant
ID2 Appellant opening statement
ID3 Council opening statement
ID4 KAG opening Statement
ID5 Additional working for condition 24 noise
ID6 Council CIL compliance statement
ID 7 list of amended planning conditions
ID 8 Council list of appearances
ID 9 Council closing statement
ID10 KAG closing statement
ID10 Appellant closing statement.

Conditions annexe

1. Applications for all reserved matters shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 3 years of the date of this planning permission. The development hereby approved shall commence within 2 years of the last reserved matters approval.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details indicated on plan references:

- Location Plan B9812-AEW-SI-XX-DR-A-501 Rev P1
- Site Access - Priority Junction Drawing No 19479-02-GA Rev C
- Site Access - Priority Junction Vehicle Tracking Drawing No 19479-02-TRACK Rev D
- Land Use and Building Height Parameters Plan - B9812-AEW-SI-XX-DR-A-0505 Rev P6
- Proposed Substation Location Plan B9812-AEW-SI-XX-DR-A-0046 Rev P1
- Proposed Sub Station B9812-AEW-XX-XX-DR-A-0045 Rev P2
- Travel Plan Framework - Ref. 19479-04a
- Proposed Energy and Sustainability Requirements and Strategy (30/03/2021 – 6117/17/05)

3. Prior to the commencement of any use hereby permitted on the appeal site, the Bolton Road/Golborne Road junction shall be amended in accordance with plan reference 19479-05-GA Rev E together with signalised pedestrian controlled crossings in accordance with details submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority beforehand.

4. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved, approval shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority with respect to the following matters: internal access, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping.

5. Any reserved matters application submitted in respect of layout shall be accompanied by a connectivity and implementation plan, the details of which shall include:

- Detailed plans to scale, including levels (to an agreed off site datum) showing a continuation of the estate road beyond the details shown on plan reference - Site Access - Priority Junction Drawing No 19479-02-GA Rev C, including footways and cycle routes within the site, including a connection between the development site indicated on plan reference Location Plan B9812-AEW-SI-XX-DR-A-501 Rev P1 and the remaining Primary Employment Area Land allocation (accessed off Lockett Road) to the north west terminating at the most northern point.
- the continuation of the footway and cycle connection to the adjacent footpath (number 32) which runs along the southwest boundary of the site;
- timing of the construction and implementation of the roads and connections in full, relevant to each reserved matters application.

6. Any reserved matters application in respect of scale shall be limited to those heights detailed on plan reference: Land Use and Building Height Parameters Plan - B9812-AEW-SI-XX-DR-A-0505 Rev P6.

7. Any reserved matters application submitted in respect of layout or scale shall be accompanied by the following for that part of the application site:

- (i) a full site survey showing the datum point used to calibrate the site levels, levels along all external site boundaries, and levels across the site at regular intervals, and
- (ii) full details of the finished floor levels of all buildings and hard surfaces.

8. Any reserved matters application submitted in respect of layout, scale or appearance, shall include a Crime Impact Statement (CIS). The CIS should include details of security measures, design features and other measures that aim to prevent crime.

9. Any reserved matters application in respect of layout shall include details of secure and covered cycle parking facilities associated with that specific unit on the site. The facilities shall be maintained as approved thereafter.

10. Any reserved matters application in respect of layout or landscaping shall include a biodiversity strategy, implementation and management plan to ensure a total of 17.22 on-site based habitat units, plus a minimum of 5 hedgerow units, when calculated against the site's baseline position using the latest DEFRA Metric, are achieved within the site as shown on plan reference - Location Plan B9812-AEW-SI-XX-DR-A-501 Rev P1. The strategy will demonstrate that all reasonable opportunities for the planting of hedgerow and biodiversity connections within the reserved matters application site boundary have been assessed.

11. Prior to the commencement of development, the following shall be undertaken by a qualified ecologist to a methodology and timetable submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority beforehand:

- An updated Ecological Assessment
- Bat Activity Survey
- Bird Survey and wintering birds' assessment
- An Amphibian Assessment
- A bird nest, bat commuting and amphibian habitat mitigation strategy

The above including the results from the surveys shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within one month of completion, together with any mitigation measures including a timetable for any their implementation. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved mitigation measures to the approved timetable for their implementation.

12. Within 2 years of the first submission of reserved matters, a reserved matters application for landscaping details shall be submitted for the area coloured green and annotated for 'proposed landscaping, ecological mitigation, site reprofiling, surface water drainage, access roads and infrastructure' in the 'Land Use and Building Height Parameters Plan B9812-AEW-SI-XX-DR-A-0505 Rev P6'. It shall include: full details of hard and soft landscaping, retention of existing trees, and details maintenance and management, together with a timetable to implement each of the above. The above shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable and maintained as approved thereafter.

13. Prior to the commencement of the development, including site clearance, excavation or construction works or the entry of vehicles or plant into the site, an Arboriculture Method Statement (AMS) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The AMS shall cover, but not exclusively, the following matters:

- Identify the order in which development operations will be undertaken, including tree works (removal and pruning) and construction programmes;
- Arboricultural constraints showing the relationship between the proposed development, the root protection areas and crown spreads;
- Specific tree protection and special procedures and materials where development is within the sphere of influence of trees and planting;
- Identify details of tree protection measures, including how the trees to be retained shall be physically protected from damage by plant, equipment, vehicles, excavation, deposit of excavated material and any other cause, which shall be achieved by the erection of 2.3 metre high fencing using vertical and horizontal scaffolding poles, or other stout fencing with the uprights driven well into the ground, erected in accordance with BS5837:2012, outside the canopies, and that these measures shall be maintained for the duration of the development operations and no operations or storage whatsoever shall take place within the fenced protection areas;
- Full details of all services to the development units, including; electric, gas, water and drainage, shown on accurate scale drawings outside the root protection zone(s); and
- A list of contact details during development.

The development shall be fully undertaken in full accordance with the approved AMS.

14. Prior to the commencement of development, notwithstanding the details within the recommendations of the Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Statement Title

Meridian 6, Version Rev B, full details of the Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS), including;

- Detailed arrangements for the methods to attenuate and discharge surface water from the site;
- Detailed scale plans of the SUDs pond;
- Micro drainage reports and flood route plan;
- SUDS maintenance plan;
- Detailed plans of required culvert;
- Details of additional storage for geocellular storage vessel;
- Details of proposed pollution control measures for surface water runoff from car parks;
- Proposals for conveying water of existing watercourses (drains, ditches) on site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- Management and maintenance details.

The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the agreed details only.

15. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved, details of a foul drainage system for the development site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Individual units shall not be occupied or brought into use until the unit has been connected to the completed approved foul drainage scheme.

16. No development shall commence until;

- a) a scheme of further intrusive investigations has been carried out on site to establish the risks posed to the development by past coal mining activity; and
- b) any remediation works and/or mitigation measures to address land instability arising from coal mining legacy, as may be necessary, have been implemented on site in full in order to ensure that the site is made safe and stable for the development proposed.

The intrusive site investigations and remedial works shall be carried out in accordance with authoritative UK guidance.

17. Prior to the occupation of the development (or any phase), or it being taken into beneficial use, a signed statement or declaration prepared by a suitably competent person confirming that the site is, or has been made, safe and stable for the approved development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This document shall confirm the methods and findings of the intrusive site investigations and the completion of any remedial works and/or mitigation necessary to address the risks posed by past coal mining activity.

18. No development shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works. The works are to be undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The WSI shall cover the following:

- 1. Informed by the updated North West Regional Research Framework, a phased programme and methodology of investigation and recording to include:

- i - archaeological evaluation trenching
- ii - informed by the above, more detailed targeted excavation (subject of a new WSI).

2. A programme for post investigation assessment to include:

- i - analysis of the site investigations records and finds
- ii - production of a final report on the investigation results.

3. Deposition of the final report with the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record.

4. Dissemination of the results commensurate with their significance.

5. Provision for archive deposition of the report and records of the site investigation.

6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved WSI.

19. Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved by the Local Planning Authority, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include details for the methods to be employed to control and monitor noise, dust (based on a risk assessment in accordance with the latest IAQM document "Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction – 2014"), vibration impacts, mud on the road, the storage of building materials, equipment and plant, and the placement of site cabins, site offices and storage containers. The approved CEMP shall be implemented before the construction works are commenced and shall be adhered to for the duration of the construction works.

20. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved (excluding site setup, removal of trees and vegetation across the site, and construction of the junction, access road and drainage pond in accordance with drawing references: C1238-S38-001 Rev B and 19479-02c-GA Rev C), an updated investigation and assessment of the nature and extent of any contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall identify any remedial measures required to deal with any hazards identified and a Remediation Strategy, including remediation options appraisal, verification plan, and a Gas Protection Design Report, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Remediation Strategy and remedial measures shall be implemented in full and a Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the occupation of any of the buildings hereby permitted.

21. The development hereby approved shall only operate in accordance with the following noise parameters:

Operational Noise

The Rating Level as defined in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound, measured at the façade (unless stated otherwise), shall not exceed the following cumulative levels from operational noise from Units at the development site, at the following nearest identified noise sensitive properties to the site.

R1 – Lily Farm Croft

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 37dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 34dBA

R2 – Bolton Road

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 40dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 37dBA

R3 – Walter Street

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 39dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 36dBA

R4 – Woods Lane

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 35dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 33dBA

Fixed Plant Noise

The Rating Level as defined in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound, measured in free field, shall not exceed the following cumulative levels from fixed plant noise from the development site, at the following nearest identified noise sensitive properties to the site.

R1 – Lily Farm Croft

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 28dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 25dBA

R2 – Bolton Road

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 28dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 25dBA

R3 – Walter Street

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 28dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 25dBA

R4 – Woods Lane

Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00 28dBA

Monday to Sunday 23:00 to 07:00 25dBA

22. Prior to the commencement of the construction of any building, a close boarded timber fence to the height between 2.5m to 4m high, as shown in Figure 4 and specified in s5.4 of the e3p Noise Impact Assessment reference 50-198-R1-4 dated October 2021 shall be implemented in full. Once implemented, the fence shall be retained as such thereafter.

23. The use of the development hereby approved (or any part of the development where individual units or phases are defined on the approved plans) shall not commence until a scheme for the extraction of fumes and odours (where relevant) has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works which form part of the approved scheme shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

24. The use of the development hereby approved (or any part of the development where individual units or phases are defined on the approved plans) shall not commence until a scheme for the extraction of dust (where relevant) has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works which form part of the approved scheme shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

25. No development shall take place until a Construction Training and Employment Management Plan (CT&EMP) relevant to that phase has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The CT&EMP(s) will aim to promote training and employment opportunities for local people and include:

- Measures to ensure the owner and contractors work directly with local employment and training agencies;
- Targets for employing local labour;
- Targets for work experience opportunities;
- Measures to provide training opportunities in respect of any new jobs created; and
- Requirements to submit monitoring information on the plan at regular intervals to the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed CT&EMP(s) and any amendments to the CT&EMP(s) shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

26. Prior to first occupation of each building a Training and Employment Management Plan (T&EMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority for that building. The T&EMP(s) will aim to promote training and employment opportunities for local people and include:

- Measures to ensure the owner and contractors work directly with local employment and training agencies;
- Targets for employing local labour;
- Targets for work experience opportunities;
- Measures to provide training opportunities in respect of any new jobs created; and
- Requirements to submit monitoring information on the plan at regular intervals to the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be occupied in accordance with the agreed T&EMP(s) and any amendments to the T&EMP(s) shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

27. Prior to first use of the development, an Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy and Implementation Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the number, location and maintenance of electric vehicle charging points for each building, amounting to a minimum of 5% of the total car parking provision within the development. The electric vehicle charging points shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timescales for implementation, with the agreed details maintained in an operational condition thereafter. The Implementation Plan shall provide details of how the future installation of electric charging points associated

with that phase could occur in parking or servicing areas not provided with charging points from the outset.

28. No external lighting shall be installed other than that submitted to and approved in accordance with the details submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority beforehand. The lighting shall thereafter be maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details.

29. Prior to first occupation of each building, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority for that building. The Travel Plan shall detail measures to reduce the need to travel to and from the site by private transport, detail the timing of such measures and accord with the submitted Framework Travel Plan - Travel Plan Ref 19479-04a. The operation of each building shall be undertaken in accordance with the respective approved Travel Plan and shall be maintained and kept up to date at all times and shall also take into account any change in circumstances, such as a change to the occupier of the site.

30. All new buildings approved as part of any reserved matters application shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Proposed Energy and Sustainability Requirements and Strategy (30/03/2021 – 6117/17/05) and Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) 2014 'Good'.

31. Prior to commencement of development other than demolition, a method statement for the removal of Japanese Knotweed from the site including a schedule of implementation, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

End of conditions