Date: 20 May 2024 Our Ref: 22/00009/REFUSE Please ask for: Mr Iain Crossland



Civic Offices Union Street Chorley PR7 1AL

The Planning Inspectorate, 3rd Floor, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

Council Response Surface Water Flood Risk

Dear Sir,

Proposal: Hybrid planning application seeking: Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except for means of access, parking and landscaping) for a new prison (up to 74,531.71 sqm GEA) (Class C2A) within a secure perimeter fence following demolition of existing buildings and structures and together with associated engineering works; Outline planning permission for a replacement boiler house (with all matters reserved except for access); and Full planning permission for a replacement bowling green and club house (Class F2(c)) on land adjacent to HMP Garth and HMP Wymott, Leyland **Location:** HM Prison Wymott Moss Lane Ulnes Walton Leyland PR26 8LW **Appellant:** Ministry Of Justice **Planning Inspectorate Appeal Ref:** APP/D2320/W/22/3295556

Planning Application Ref: 21/01028/OUTMAJ

The Council is grateful for being given the opportunity to respond to the late representation that was sent to the Planning Inspectorate on 08 May 2024 submitting that a sequential test should have been required and carried out in relation to the proposed development that is subject to the above appeal.

Having reviewed the surface water flooding data held by the local planning authority (see appendix 1 attached) and the Flood Risk Assessment (CD. A18) submitted by the Appellant it is clear that the appeal site falls within an area identified as being susceptible to surface water flooding. The Council would therefore agree that a sequential test should be applied to the proposal in line with Paragraph 168 of the National Planning Policy Framework and is a material consideration in this instance.

Despite the late stage at which this representation has been received and the absence of a sequential test having been identified it is the Council's view that this requirement must be taken into consideration given that the matter has been identified prior to any decision having been taken as to the outcome of the appeal.

The Council will await the Inspectors decision as to whether the representation is accepted into evidence, whether the Appellant is required to carry out a sequential test and what next steps may be necessary in this regard.





Yours sincerely,

Hayes Q 0 6

Adele Hayes Chief Planning Officer Chorley Council