

Local Development Order 3 and Accompanying Masterplan- Consultation Responses			LPA Response
Responses to South Ribble Borough Council and Ribble Valley Borough Council			
Consultee		Comments	
Active Travel England	N/A	Statutory consultation role does not extend to LDO consultations at this time. No comments provided	
Environment Agency	General Comments	LDO aims to encourage, identified in paragraph 1.3.2, we note a number of sectors identified could play a significant role in challenging and adapting to the impacts of climate change. Promoting the growth and development of such sectors could subsequently have positive environmental impacts. Section 1.5.3 identifying conditions - pleased to see that issue of foul drainage (including surface water) has been addressed using a standard condition (11), of which we recommended in the previous response to LDO 1 (2012).	Support noted. The LDO supports sectors that can promote low carbon and other climate change industries/sectors.
	Contaminated Land	Issue of land quality (contamination) has not been addressed by standard condition within this draft consultation document. No reference to issue of land quality and risk of contamination on site. There are areas of green space that are likely to have a low risk of contamination, other parts of the site could be at greater risk due to the legacy of the existing site operations. In the interests of the developer/landowner to ensure any existing contamination problems on site are resolved through development permitted under the Order such that they will not be a problem in the future. Prior to commencing works on site, we would recommend any developer/landowner should follow risk management framework provided in CLR11 Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination. Should also refer to the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination for type of information required to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. Environmental Health department at Local Authority would advise on risk to other receptors, e.g. human health. Issue of contamination could be dealt with through another standard condition. Rather than our standard site investigation condition, the developer/landowner should liaise with the relevant regulators up front and undertake any investigations and remediation works to their satisfaction in advance of development. This requirement could be contained somewhere in the LDO or	The site is already partially built with the majority of ground remediation, infrastructure provision and plot preparation already completed. These works have been carried out in accordance with surveys undertaken and following all required procedures and regulations. There is therefore no need for a condition in the proposed LDO.

		Masterplan. The information subsequently submitted to the Council in accordance with the Order may then only need to include a Validation Report demonstrating that any necessary ground investigation and remediation works associated with the site have been completed. y) A validation report demonstrating ground investigation and any necessary remediation works on the site have been completed to the satisfaction of the Council's Environmental Health department and the Environment Agency shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing.	
	Surface Water	Amendments to the Development Management Procedure Order (DMPO) came into effect on 15th April 2015. As a result, we are no longer a statutory consultee on the surface water aspects of development proposals. Providing detailed comments on the drainage strategy is not within our remit and we are not resourced to provide this service as part of our Flood and Coastal Risk Management function. Lancashire County Council in their role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and both South Ribble Borough Council and Ribble Valley Borough Council as Local Planning Authorities, will need to consider if surface water has the potential to impact third parties as a result of the proposed development under their responsibilities of the Floods and Water Management Act 2010. Notwithstanding the above, if it is apparent, or later becomes apparent that there is potential for surface water to have an impact, we could raise this with you as part of our strategic overview role to Local Planning authorities.	Noted. LLFA have been consulted
	Biodiversity Net Gain	Aware that Biodiversity Net Gain is not a requirement for Local Development Orders, however, if any future applicant within the EZ wishes to take this into account through a planning application, we would be supportive of this approach.	Noted.
LCC Highways	Introduction	part buildout and operation has occurred within the Samlesbury EZ amounting to 41,619 sqm, out of a total floor area originally considered which was 226,352sqm, equating to circa 18%. The latest Draft LDO 3 (2024) and revised Masterplan concentrates development to the east and south of the existing BAE Systems site. The original Jacobs TA assumed uses of B1 – 3%, B2 – 78%, B8 – 16%, and D1 – 3%. The updated LDO maintains the same overall floor area as set out in the 2014 LDO but amends the proposed land	Explanatory statement noted

		use proportions so that B1 (now E(g) (i-iii)) is increased with the proportion of B2 and the B8 subsequently decreasing. For consistency the Transport Assessment also supports a flexible approach to land use proportions but retains overall floor area	
	Summary	LCC Highways as LHA can confirm support the updated contents of Transport Assessment and that the resulting impacts from the EZ with mitigation (details yet to be agreed and delivered at 2 locations) can still be accommodated on the surrounding network. The timing and its delivery is subject to a Highways Working Group that includes LCC Highways, NH and the developer with their transport consultants being set up and agreeing and progressing such matters.	Support noted.
	Accidents	Table 2.1 of TA includes all accidents information. This review is considered reasonable having regard to the existing network and there are no specific safety issues that will be exacerbated with delivery of further development within the Samlesbury EZ. Notwithstanding this existing position, when mitigation is detailed up (and considered by LCC and NH) for example, at the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A677/A59 intersection (Swallow Hotel junction) or • J31 of the M6 with A59, safety and historic accidents that have taken place will be considered within the design process. Note: these matters will be picked up as part of the design of the mitigation scheme, all satisfying DMRB, modelling (isolated/microsimulation), safety audit and user audit. The actual designs as originally presented 10 years ago are likely to change as the detail design progresses.	Noted
	Parking	The specialised nature of the site and its location away from main urban areas will result that sufficient car parking will need to be provided within the curtilage of each site in line with the use and need of each building. This approach is supported as it overcomes my concern of vehicles parking on road, as on occasion does currently occur and is likely that some of the end users will also require controlled secure parking provision. Each proposed development will provide an assessment of car parking accumulation need as part of the Prior Notification process. Car parking, including for disabled use and Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging points as well as cycle parking	Support noted.

		would be provided in accordance with demonstrated end user requirements. It may be the case for other end users with less security needs that temporary overflow car parking to be required as part of a managed approach to parking which will be reviewed and monitored on a regular basis as part of a car parking management strategy. This is a controlled pragmatic approach which is supported and not aimed at undermining site sustainability or overpromoting the use of the private car.	
	Traffic Data and Peak Hours	Little difference in traffic data from 2013 - 2023. Satisfied with peak hours determined	Noted
	Committed Developments	TA considered impact based on existing planning permissions or proposals likely to come forward. Any further traffic data required would be collected by the developer and their support/consultant. Not EZ to deliver mitigation necessary to support other developments not yet committed. This approach is necessary, as mitigation triggers are not yet known and are influenced by background traffic levels and development impacts.	Noted
	Traffic Growth	Traffic levels assessed are similar to previous and have been considered. As part of the Working Group, traffic data will be collected over time to ensure mitigation delivered is still fit for purpose in regards to external traffic flow from other developments and EZ development.	Noted
	Trip Rates	Whilst it is likely that for further development within the site, the trip rates will be lower than TRICS, however trip rates will be monitored by the Working Group as some units may be at much higher levels of impact and will only be known on confirmation of end users. This is not a concern as monitoring will take place thus also influencing the trigger for delivery of the mitigation. It is also worth highlighting the scale of development within the Samlesbury EZ does not change.	Noted
	Distribution	In paragraph 4.12.6, it is indicated that NH are satisfied with the distribution. With this, and the more local bias, I am satisfied with the approach taken in the TA update.	Support noted.

	Mitigation	<p>The package of mitigation to support the original Samlesbury EZ is referenced in paragraph 4.14, of which, the access points to the EZ and the Branch Rd scheme have been delivered. Other external mitigation such as at Swallow Hotel and M6 J31 is yet to be delivered. Paragraph 4.2.13 includes a number of additional sustainable mitigation measures, (of which a number are identical to the original Samlesbury EZ). Their need and delivery will be determined as development comes forward in line with the flexible approach to development type and scale and be agreed through the Working Group.</p>	Noted.
	Proposed Planning Conditions	<p>All conditions supported but note below about condition 13. I fully support the wording, however for the avoidance of doubt, as highlighted above in this report, the remit of the Working Group is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the process and to agree the designs of outstanding mitigation and well as its delivery, in line with development, having regard to background conditions (delivered under a S278 agreement). • Work and assist with those responsible for the Samlesbury EZ with regards to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ensuring the internal infrastructure and the access junctions into the site are effective and efficient to satisfy demand by all modes in line with further build out; o ensuring there is suitable network management within the site that limits/restricts on street parking and that all opportunities have been taken up to support a safe and sustainable development; o parking demand is suitably catered for, not resulting in on street parking but not to levels that undermine sustainable development (in a rural location); o support the review of the Travel Plans for the site and or individual units 	Noted. Full remit of Working Group will be set out and agreed by Terms of Reference.

	Conclusion	<p>The updated TA produced by Curtins, dated 5th June 2024 does provide evidence which indicates that the proposed changes to the Samlesbury EZ can still be accommodated with the previously agreed mitigation package (when fully delivered). This is as a consequence of background traffic flow not occurring, as originally anticipated and that trip rates within Samlesbury EZ are lower than a traditional employment development. This is likely due to the specialist nature of Samlesbury EZ. However, as the LDO includes level of flexibility with regard to land use types and scale, of which overall does not exceed that originally considered, it will still require all mitigation be delivered. With this, LCC as Local Highway Authority can support the LDO. However, this does require a Highway Working group that includes LCC (as LHA), NH and the developer with their transport consultant being set up and agreeing such matters with regard to development monitoring by all modes, car park management, site sustainability, Travel Plan, mitigation detail, supporting modelling building on that presented, and agree timing of delivery, in line with buildout of the LDO. The group to remain until all works are delivered and the TP is fully established.</p>	Noted the requirement for a Working Group is conditioned.
LLFA	Surface water flood risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)	<p>Surface water flood risk should also be considered during each construction phase, as heavy machinery can compact ground leading to increased surface water runoff. This can have a negative impact on nearby watercourses, such as increased sedimentation which can lead to siltation, poor water quality and an adverse effect on habitats. Discuss with Network Rail and/or the Highway Authority, to ensure the stability of these assets is not negatively affected. Maximise the use of SuDs. A comprehensive sustainable drainage approach can help to alleviate flood risk as well as managing the impacts where flooding does occur, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximising opportunities for infiltration of surface water through replacement of impermeable surfaces with permeable surfaces; • Maximising opportunities for planting and vegetated areas, in preference to engineered surfaces, to increase evapo-transpiration and provide improvements for biodiversity and wider natural capital benefits; and • Providing additional surface water storage over and above the minimum requirements e.g. an over-sized pond, to accommodate more extreme rainfall events (e.g. 0.5% annual exceedance probability) leading to a more flood/climate resilient development. • Ensuring that any development proposal will not negatively impact the water quality or ecology of any receiving 	Site wide drainage strategy agreed for the site and site wide drainage infrastructure in place. Noted that plot based drainage should incorporate permeable surfaces and aligns with plot based landscaping principles set out in Masterplan.

		<p>waterbody and seeking to improve water quality wherever possible. This can easily be achieved through the use of high-quality multifunctional SuDS, incorporating a treatment train. Specifically, appropriate sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated to drain any new impermeable surfaces such as roofs, compounds, substations, roads, parking and other hardstanding areas. SuDS should be designed to be compliant with the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance and the Defra Technical Standards for SuDS.</p>	
	Climate Change Allowance	The Lead Local Flood Authority recommends that the current climate change allowances for peak rainfall intensity from the Environment Agency's guidance to be applied to all developments, where reasonably practicable.	Noted and can be applied through LDO Masterplan condition
	Urban Creep Allowances	The Lead Local Flood Authority recommends that developments with any permeable area include a 10% urban creep allowance, which should be applied to the total impermeable site area, unless this would produce a percentage impermeability greater than 100%.	Noted and can be applied through LDO Masterplan condition

	Operation and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems	<p>A site-specific 'Operation and Maintenance Manual' for the lifetime of the development of each sustainable drainage component that makes up each sustainable drainage system should be compiled. Typically the Lead Local Flood Authority would expect this to include, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A timetable for its implementation; • Details of the maintenance, operational and access requirement for all SuDS components and connecting drainage structures, including all watercourses and their ownership; • Pro-forma to allow the recording of each inspection and maintenance activity, as well as allowing any faults to be recorded and actions taken to rectify issues; • The arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme in perpetuity; • Details of financial management including arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturer's recommended design life; • Details of whom to contact if pollution is seen in the system or if it is not working correctly; and • Means of access for maintenance and easements. <p>Thereafter the sustainable drainage systems should be retained, managed, and maintained in accordance with the approved details.</p>	Noted. Implementation, maintenance, management, adoption, access, contact etc all addressed through drainage strategy
	Natural Flood Management Opportunities	<p>Natural flood management techniques work with natural processes to protect, restore and emulate the natural functions of catchments, floodplains, rivers and the coast. They aim to manage the sources and pathways of flood waters whilst providing wider benefits to people, wildlife and the environment.</p>	Noted. Implementation, management, adoption, access, contact etc all addressed through approved drainage strategy
	Proposed works to ordinary watercourses	<p>Existing watercourses should be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced through the site layout, for example, naturalization, de-culverting, and the creation of riparian habitats. The culverting of any ordinary watercourses should be avoided. When designing a site layout, it is critical to consider the future ownership of and access to any on-site watercourses. The site layout must provide safe access to all on-site watercourses for maintenance purposes. No development should occur within 8 metres from the bank top of any ordinary watercourse to achieve this. This includes the construction of structures such as walls and fences and any activity during the construction phases of development. A number of informatives are recommended which are on the consultation response document. Once planning permission has been obtained it does not mean that Ordinary Watercourse Consent will be given. It is strongly advised that you obtain any required consent before or concurrently as you</p>	Noted.

		apply for planning permission to avoid delays. Lancashire County Council's ordinary watercourse regulation policies, guidance, application validation checklist and pro-forma can be found at: https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/flooding/ordinary-watercourse-regulation/	
National Highways	Masterplan	National Highways worked with LCC regarding the revision of the masterplan, and acknowledge there is reference of the highways working group included within Section 7.2	Noted.
	Section 7.2 Transport Assessment Update 2023	<p>In order to ensure that the mitigation for the Swallow Hotel and M6 junction 31/A6 is delivered satisfactorily the detailed design of the mitigation and confirmation of trigger points for both junctions will be undertaken on adoption of the LDO. This work will be overseen by a highway working group which will include representatives from the highway authority and National Highways. That a highways working group will be put in place and the group will work to an agreed terms of reference. The detailed designs will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final details of how the schemes interface with existing highway alignments. • Full carriageway surfacing and carriageway markings details. • Full construction details. • Confirmation of compliance with departmental 7.2 7.2.1 7.2.2 7.2.3 <p>Fig. 36 - Birchwood Park bus stop. Fig. 37 - Active travel infrastructure at Birchwood Park. © Martine Hamilton Knight © Martine Hamilton Knight standards (as set out in the design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and policies (or approved relaxations/ departures from standard).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent stage 1 and/or 2 Road Safety Audit carried out in accordance with current departmental standards and current advice notes. The highway working group will also continue to monitor ongoing impacts of traffic from the Enterprise Zone development. Highway working group also continue to monitor ongoing impacts of traffic from the Enterprise Zone development. National Highways 	Noted.

		recognise the importance of this approach clearly set out in the masterplan and being part of that group.	
	Sustainable Transport Measures	National Highways is content with this approach and how this is identified within the masterplan.	Support noted.

	Supporting Transport Assessment	<p>National Highways, supported by WSP as their consultants on the North West Spatial Planning Framework, have been involved in discussions with Lancashire County Council (LCC) and Curtins, their transport consultant, as the Transport Assessment Update (TAU) was being prepared to support an updated LDO for the SEZ. WSP have reviewed the evidence presented in various drafts of the TAU to assess the impact of the remaining quantum of development proposed within the SEZ on the Strategic Road Network to ensure the mitigation and trigger point continue to be suitable to ensure the safe and reliable operation of the SRN, most notably M6 Junction 31. The TAU, along with additional work carried out by WSP which has been detailed in the attached note, predict that the updated development proposals for the SEZ would be accommodated by the mitigation scheme proposed for M6 Junction 31 at an appropriate trigger point. This review is appended to this technical note in Appendix A.</p> <p>It was agreed that further work will be carried out by LCC and their transport consultants upon the adoption of the LDO to ensure the mitigation scheme can be delivered at a suitable stage of development through detailed design work.</p> <p>As part of the discussions it was agreed that National Highways will form part of the highways working group to ensure the development does not have a detrimental impact on M6 Junction 31 as it is constructed and individual sites become operational. This has been clearly identified within the masterplan.</p> <p>The attached response and information within allows National Highways the confidence that we can offer no objection to this application based on the details provided and agreed implementation of a highways working group.</p>	Support noted.
Wildlife Trust		<p>Much of the general environmental content is welcome but we have identified a few potential concerns, one legal in nature. These are expressed below.</p>	

	<p>Past Mitigation (2014 et seq.)</p>	<p>The document states that, 'Based on the Ecological Statement, a comprehensive off-site mitigation scheme to compensate for the loss of grassland and ground nesting bird habitat has been implemented at Warton Mires, Lancaster and a series of onsite bat mitigation areas comprising managed tree, grassland and wildflower planting has been created on site. The final phase of the bat mitigation planting has now been completed meaning that the ecological condition for the site has been fully discharged in terms of ecological habitat creation.'</p> <p>The emphases above are ours.</p> <p>We are unable to verify if and how these onsite and offsite measures have been implemented and whether successfully. Has any monitoring been undertaken, and results published?</p>	<p>The mitigation scheme at Warton Mires is subject to a legal agreement between Lancashire County Council and the RSPB for a period of 25 years. As part of this agreement RSPB maintain a management plan and produce annual monitoring reports.</p> <p>With regard to the on-site bat mitigation this is guided by a bat mitigation management plan undertaken by qualified ecological consultants which sets out the scale of the required mitigation, its form, mix and future management for 25 years. This is overseen by Lancashire County Council.</p> <p>Both South Ribble Borough Council and Ribble Valley Borough are updated on progress via regular meetings with LCC.</p>
--	---------------------------------------	---	---

	<p>Current Proposal</p>	<p><i>The latest documents seek to create a new planning permission in the form of a Local Development Order (LDO). This begs the question as to whether that LDO would need to comply with the Environment Act 2021, which states:</i></p> <p><i>General condition of planning permission</i></p> <p><i>13</i></p> <p><i>(1) Every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition in sub-paragraph (2).</i></p> <p><i>(2) The condition is that the development may not be begun unless—</i></p> <p><i>(a) a biodiversity gain plan has been submitted to the planning authority (see paragraph 14), and</i></p> <p><i>(b) the planning authority has approved the plan (see paragraph 15).</i></p> <p><i>Biodiversity gain plan</i></p> <p><i>14</i></p> <p><i>(1) For the purposes of paragraph 13(2)(a), a biodiversity gain plan is a plan which—</i></p> <p><i>(a) relates to development for which planning permission is granted, and</i></p> <p><i>(b) specifies the matters referred to in sub-paragraph (2).</i></p> <p><i>(2) The matters are—</i></p> <p><i>(a) information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat,</i></p> <p><i>(b) the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat,</i></p> <p><i>(c) the post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat,</i></p> <p><i>(d) any registered offsite biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity value of that gain in relation to the development,</i></p> <p><i>(e) any biodiversity credits purchased for the development, and</i></p> <p><i>(f) such other matters as the Secretary of State may by regulations specify.</i></p> <p><i>Your authority may wish to seek a legal opinion on the above. We have been unable to locate a statement anywhere in the current LDO consultation documents about Biodiversity Net Gain. The original document, which preceded the Environment Act 2021, was focussed on avoidance, mitigation, and compensation, but not on enhancement, presumably as enhancement was not then a statutory requirement although it would have been best practice.</i></p>	<p>LDO's are not subject to Biodiversity Net Gain. Notwithstanding this due consideration has been given to the delivery of ecological mitigation for the site and all relevant legislation and regulations. All assessments mitigation design and implementation have been carried out with the support of qualified ecologists. It has been concluded that because the ecological mitigation for the site has already been fully implemented on a site wide basis rather than incrementally based on an individual development basis, the ecological requirements for the site have been discharged. Further to this the whole site has now been subject to development in terms of a combination of site wide infrastructure, buildings and plot formation.</p>
--	-------------------------	---	--

		<p><i>As current best practice, we recommend that your authority (and South Ribble planning authority, if relevant) comply with the requirements of the Environment Act 2021, regardless of the legal position above, and prepare a Biodiversity Gain Plan, with a requirement that it be implemented within an appropriate timescale. If net gain is now a legal requirement for this LDO your authority will need to deliver a minimum of 10% to avoid legal challenge. In the masterplan, the VISION FOR THE SITE (2.0) lacks any vision for nature's recovery. That should be remedied.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>Additional Matters</p>	<p><i>Additional issues arising that do not appear to be addressed by the consultation documentation but, we believe, should be, are as follows:</i></p> <p><i>What provision has been made for ongoing habitat maintenance? Is there an enforceable legal agreement regarding said habitat maintenance?</i></p> <p><i>Why does the landscaping requirement mention only Salmesbury Hall, and that only in historic environment terms? The landscaping of all individual plots should be required to tie in with the overall biodiversity / ecological strategy.</i></p> <p><i>UK Government Guidance states that the LDO will need to take account of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy - in this case, that for Lancashire.</i></p> <p><i>We note that paragraph 1.5.2 is omitted from the consultation document. We suspect that this is a simple error in numbering but draw it to your attention in case a paragraph of text has been accidentally omitted.</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for consulting The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside: this is much appreciated.</i></p>	<p>Habitat maintenance is addressed through management plans for both the off site and on site mitigation. Both are subject to legal agreements. The reference to landscaping for Salmesbury Hall relates to a specific need to visually protect the Listed Building. Landscaping of individual plots is to be a key feature of the site and is addressed within the Master Plan design principles. These principles highlight that although not an ecological requirement part of the purpose of the landscaping is to add to and enhance the implemented ecological mitigation. It is also worth highlighting that the SUDs balancing ponds and swales form a significant landscape feature on the site with a programme of aquatic and marginal planting having been recently implemented. All relevant legislation and regulations have been considered. Comment on numbering error noted.</p>
<p>Responses to South Ribble Borough Council</p>			

Historic England		<p>From the information available, we do not consider that there will be a significant impact on the historic environment from the revised Masterplan. The Grade I Listed Samlesbury Hall is located very close to the southern boundary of the Samlesbury Site, however the on-site bat mitigation areas proposed in the Masterplan will provide screening that will help to mitigate the impact of new development from affecting the setting of Samlesbury Hall.</p>	Noted.
Blackburn with Darwen		<p>BwD welcomes the strategic economic and national role performed by the EZ, especially through the growing presence of the new National Cyber Force HQ and AMRC and the on-going growth of BAE Systems, and its strategic importance as a key location of the Northern Cyber Corridor. Its adjacency and proximity to BwD is clearly advantageous, allowing us to connect with, and to leverage further growth. The new masterplan and LDO align with the new BwD Local Plan, which identifies the Blackburn Growth Axis (Linking Samlesbury EZ with the M65, through the Blackburn Town Centre proposed Skills Campus) as a key economic framework for delivery of BwD's growth ambitions. The new LDO and masterplan will be a clear focus for the emerging Joint Lancashire Local Transport as new and improved transport, and cyber, connectivity will be vital in ensuring the scalability of new growth opportunities within the Blackburn Growth Axis and surrounding area. As well as road infrastructure improvements, masterplan proposals for enhanced levels of sustainable transport options should be strengthened. E.g. BwD recently prepared Bus Service Improvement Plans and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans and findings could be integrated better to Transport Assessment and Masterplan to encourage appropriate upgrades of public transport operates between Blackburn and Preston along A677 every half hour, just be increasing service frequency at peak times and shift change times. Overall, BwD is pleased that focus remains on supporting strategic/national economic role which site performs. Important to also ensure that the proposed ribbon housing development '@Cuerdale' is resisted, otherwise the growth and success of the EZ may be compromised by competing infrastructure and unplanned development demands. Keep BwD informed of next steps and timescales.</p>	<p>Support noted. Sustainable transport measures are set out as a priority within the Masterplan and opportunities for enhanced delivery will be explored through coordination of travel planning across the site and through working with occupiers and relevant stakeholders going forward. Comment on Cuerdale proposal noted but are outside the scope of the site based LDO. With regard to pre-primary education, child care,</p>

Osbaldeston Parish Council		<p>Missed opportunity to spread commercial benefits to local businesses and organisations. - Myerscough smithy road could be opened at spine road to allow easier access to A59, currently Clarendon HGV Haulage, Monks Contractors (Civils), Nationwide Platforms and Mellor Plant all heay HGV users negotiating mini roundabout at Mellor Brook end of Myerscough Smithy Road. Makes sense when site was secure military site, mixed nature now makes it missed opportunity. Access is blocked by locked security gate. - already number of food outlets in immediate vicinity of the site used by EZ staff, Chaiwalla fast food, Huntleys, The Village Bakery, Taylors Chippy, The BlueBird Inn, as well as those in Mellor. - Convenience stores based at 3 local petrol stations. - Local schools including Balderstone Primacy (with unused access road terminating at main entrance) struggle for numbers, EZ staff using school would assist viability, with expansion on site. 2. SIC codes caused some concern especially 'Nuclear' - this could be a variety of uses but wondered about suitability of site when a housing estate is planning by Blackburn with Darwen adjacent. Other SIC codes Pre-primary education (85.10) Child day care activities (88.91), unlicensed restaurants (56.10/2) thought to dumb down highly technical nature of existing and planned land uses. Also felt these uses could easily be overly dominant when national fast food chains move on site.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment for the site has assessed the operation of the site roads and local network and has not raised any issues with the operation of Myerscough Smithy Road. The highway authority is satisfied with the assessment. The operation of Myerscough Smithy Rd has been considered by LCC highways previously. Further consideration of the matter would be done locally and not through the LDO process. Reference to nuclear within SIC codes is an error and will be corrected. With regard to pre-primary education, childcare and unlicensed restaurants these uses are strictly controlled by the LDO and are limited to single facilities and also limited in floorspace. They will only form a very small amenity area intended for users on the site and are not intended to attract users from outside.</p>
Responses to Ribble Valley Borough Council			
Natural England	No Objection	<p>Advise that all environmental impacts and opportunities are fully considered and relevant bodies are consulted. Do not consider that Darwen river section SSSI will be damaged or destroyed</p>	Noted.

<p>Brian and Netta Whitehead</p>	<p>Visual Design</p>	<p>1. Colour of materials, particularly roof structures: the landform to the east of the EZ rises dramatically, and the village of Mellor is at an elevated point overlooking the EZ. As the consultants (BDP) recognise in the draft masterplan (paragraph 5.4, bullet point 3), 'the roof colours should take account of the site's visibility from surrounding areas'. We think the masterplan should go further than that, and specifically prescribe the colours of roofs in order to minimise visual impact on the community of Mellor. Figure 2 on page 4 of the masterplan illustrates the jarring nature of expansive areas of white roofs to the existing buildings on the EZ. The masterplan should specify a variety of natural colours (greens and light browns) to soften the buildings in to the landscape when viewed from an elevated position. This would be a little or no extra cost to the developers, but would avoid blight as development at the EZ expands southwards in to a zone even more visible to Mellor.</p>	<p>The need to take account of the site's visibility and appropriate colours is a design principle set out in the Masterplan. These take into account areas adjacent to BAE and those further away. Away from the BAE site more muted building colours have been achieved and a combination of appropriate colour schemes and landscaping is intended to achieve a high quality scheme appropriate to its surroundings. Prescribing precise colours would be too restrictive and it is considered that appropriate schemes can be achieved with reference to the design principles which are conditioned through the Masterplan condition in the LDO.</p>

		<p>2. Landscape Visual Impact Assessment: we are surprised that an LVIA has not been carried out to inform the layout and form of the masterplan, and would expect one should have been, given the site's evident prominence in the landscape. Had the site been promoted by a planning application, an LVIA would have supported that application, so its absence from an LDO and masterplan would be at odds with normal planning procedures.</p>	<p>The site is now partially built out with infrastructure, plots, SUDs and site wide ecology and landscaping set and in place. This was undertaken through the 2014 LDO and visual impacts on setting, Green Belt, Listed Building etc were considered. The new LDO is intended to complete build out in the context of the established layout and plots. The design and landscaping principles are intended to support this completion.</p>
		<p>3. Allied to the above, there should be some controls over building heights, with suitable parameters for structures clearly being set out. A 'tall' building would be entirely out of character with this urban fringe/ semi-rural area, yet that would appear to be uncontrolled by the LDO at present. We would expect that no new structure would exceed or even approach the height of any of the existing BAE systems buildings</p>	<p>The height of buildings is benchmarked by the existing BAE site and existing buildings on the EZ.</p>
	Noise	<p>There should be some control over noise. Whilst the existing buildings on site may contain engineering operations inside, it is foreseeable that a new manufacturer coming to site may expect to operate noisy and disruptive machinery outside: this could have a serious adverse impact on the local residential community, and the Mellor Primary School. Again, if the site were being promoted by means of a planning application, and assessment of noise impact would have to be included, so its absence from the LDO and</p>	<p>Any potentially noisy proposals subject to assessment and monitored accordingly.</p>

		masterplan would appear to be at odds with normal planning procedures	
	Traffic Control	In regard to the roads, there is already something of a "rat run" through Mellor as a short cut, presumably by drivers wishing to avoid the junction of the A677 with the A59, a run which also cuts out the need to drive past BAE systems and the proposed EZ. We would therefore urge the planning department to introduce further traffic and speed controls through Mellor village, especially along Mire Ash Lane/ Church Lane and down Mellor Brow, which currently have no speed or vehicle weight controls.	Site and local roads have been assessed through an update to the Transport Assessment no issues of rat-running were identified. The highway authority are satisfied with the assessment. The traffic impacts of the development will be kept under review by a working group.
DLP Planning (BAE)	Wording Clarification	For the avoidance of doubt and to avoid any confusion, Part 6 in Appendix 3 (Development Permitted by this LDO) should be updated to reflect the revised wording at 1.3.2 (7) of the Statement of Reasons. In addition, "Authorise development that is ancillary to such purposes" should also be included in the Appendix 3 section on Development Permitted by this LDO.	Noted and updates will be made