

No.2	APPLICATION NO.	2020/0935/FUL
	LOCATION	Ring O Bells Public House Ring O Bells Lane Lathom Ormskirk Lancashire L40 5TE
	PROPOSAL	Change of use of land and replacement of the existing building to that of a wedding venue (sui generis)
	APPLICANT	Country Barns Ltd
	WARD	Newburgh
	PARISH	Lathom
	TARGET DATE	16th February 2021

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 The proposed new building and the large areas of hardstanding are considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development would cause an adverse impact on openness and result in encroachment into the Green Belt. The very special circumstances identified are not considered to outweigh the identified harm. It is considered there is significant potential for the proposed development to result in harm to residential amenity. There would also be harm to the visual amenity of the area, unjustified loss of a community facility and the submission fails to provide adequate information in regards to drainage and flood risk. The proposal therefore conflicts with the NPPF and Policies GN1, GN3 and IF3 of the Local Plan.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

3.0 THE SITE

3.1 The site is located to the north-west of Ring O'Bells Lane and north of the canal. The site comprises a two storey building which was last in as a public house, a children's play area and car parking surrounded by grassed areas. There is a single garage located adjacent to the main car park.

3.2 The building has been unused for some time but is not considered to be derelict or in a poor condition. Public footpath no. 81 runs north to south through the site close to the existing building.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

4.1 The application proposes the demolition of the existing public house and the erection of a new U-shaped building set around a courtyard which would be used as a wedding venue. The submission also proposes the change of use of the surrounding land to be used in connection with the wedding venue.

4.2 There would be two car parking areas; one to the eastern side of the new building and one alongside the canal, each with a separate vehicular access. There would be an entrance courtyard to the front (south) of the building which would share the access with the eastern carpark.

5.0 PREVIOUS RELEVANT DECISIONS

5.1 1993/1071 - Internal alterations and single storey rear extension to provide dining/play area - Granted

5.2 1989/0086 - Single storey extensions to dining facilities and new toilet facilities - Granted

6.0 CONSULTEE RESPONSES

6.1 Canal and River Trust (07.12.2020) - no objection in principle. Condition recommended.

6.2 United Utilities (01.12.2020) - no objections in principle.

6.3 Cadent (27.12.2020) - highlight apparatus is located within the vicinity of the site.

6.4 Environmental Health Officer (26.0.2021) - Concerns about this application. The use appears to be far more intense than it was previously, with much more potential for noise disturbance. Short term high level external noise is very likely, particularly late at night. It would cause an adverse effect on the sleep, health and amenity of neighbours. I therefore object to its approval on these grounds.

6.5 Lancashire Constabulary (20.11.2020) - Advice regarding crime prevention.

6.6 LCC Highways (08/12/20), (14/01/21) – no objection in principle. Conditions recommended.

6.7 MEAS (15.01.2021) - no objections in principle.

The Council does not need to consider the development against the three tests (Habitats Regulations). Recommend conditions in respect of Bats, Construction and Environment Management Plan, Birds, Invasive Species and Landscaping.

7.0 OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Lathom Parish Council

Lathom Parish Council welcome a proposal for the redevelopment of the site, though there are a lot of issues relating to noise and traffic: in order to clarify these issues we would ask the officers to look into the entrance/exit to the venue in respect of traffic coming from Briars Lane direction. The volume of traffic leaving at night as no accommodation for overnight visitors. Also to consider noise volume and advise the parish council so we may comment further.

7.2 Representations have been received which can be summarised as follows:

- Welcome regeneration of site but consider current proposal is inappropriate
- Concerns regarding traffic generation and highway safety
- Concerns about noise and disturbance from the proposed use. Query what controls can be put in place.
- Concerns about the content of the submitted noise assessment. Consider noise impact would be in breach of NPPF and Noise Policy statement for England (2010)
- Consider there is inadequate parking for the expected number of guests, staff, performers, occupants of canal boats
- Consider signage for parking/access in area is inadequate
- Welcome plans for meadow field in terms of biodiversity and improved appearance
- Pleased to note the premises will have a live-in manager but query size of accommodation for a full-time occupancy
- Consider design of building and site are attractive and improvement to the area
- Prospect of employment is a boost for the area
- Consider road improvements in respect of traffic speed should be funded by applicant
- Consider design is not suitable due to lack of accommodation for guests

- Consider there are alternative uses which would better on the site
- Design is attractive in general terms but question if it is appropriate for this area. - Consider cumulative impact of proposed development would result in the site losing its rural character.
- Existing building has significant heritage and history
- Highlight inaccuracies in supporting information. The pub has not been closed for four years, only two years.

8.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

8.1 The application has been supported by the following documents:

Arboricultural Implications Assessment
 Arboricultural Method Statement
 Ecological Survey and Assessment
 Employment Proposals
 Design and Access Statement
 Landscape Design and Strategy Document
 Noise Impact Assessment
 North West SuDS Pro-Forma and SuDS Report
 Planning and Heritage Statement
 Transport Assessment
 Mineral Resource Assessment
 Flood Risk Assessment
 Agent's letter of response to WLBC Policy department comments
 Transport Technical note and associated plans

9.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

9.1 The application site is located within the Green Belt as designated in the West Lancashire Local Plan Proposal Map.

9.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 DPD
 SP1 - A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
 GN1 - Settlement Boundaries
 GN3 - Criteria for Sustainable Development
 EC2 - The Rural Economy
 IF2 - Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
 IF3 - Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth
 EN2 - Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
 EN4 - Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Cultural and Heritage Assets

Supplementary Planning Document, Design Guide (Jan 2008)

Supplementary Planning Document, Development in the Green Belt (October 2015)

The site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and Policy M2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Sites Allocation and Development Management Policies Local Plan is relevant.

10.0 OBSERVATIONS OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF PLACE AND COMMUNITY

Principle of development - Green Belt

- 10.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a key material consideration in assessing the principle of the development. Paragraph 145 states that *'a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt'*. Exceptions to this include:
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:*
– *not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development*
- 10.2 I note the submission refers to Paragraph 145 d). Having assessed the proposal it is considered that the proposed development does not fall within the same use category as the existing use. As designated within the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended) both uses are considered to be sui generis i.e. 'of their own kind'. On that basis exception d) is not considered relevant to the assessment of this proposal.
- 10.3 The parts of the site which currently contain the pub building, outdoor seating/play areas and the associated car parking area are considered to be previously developed land within the Green Belt. The remainder of the land shown within the red line is not considered to be PDL. The principle of redeveloping the previously developed parts of the site is supported by the NPPF provided the new development does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
- 10.4 Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 134 sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt; one of which is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- 10.5 The proposed building would be 20% larger than the existing building and its footprint would be significantly larger than the existing footprint. The proposal spreads built development over much more of the site than the current compact form of development. The spread of the development is partly due to the large courtyard which is enclosed at the centre of the building however there is also a large amount of additional hardstanding which spreads across the site. Built development would extend in three directions into areas of the site which are currently undeveloped and the areas of hardstanding to the south of the building would formalise much of the site which is visible from the road. It is my view that the proposed scheme would result in encroachment into the countryside and the development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development, contrary to paragraph 145 of the NPPF.
- 10.6 The lower height of the proposed building is not considered to outweigh the identified harm which results from the larger scale building and the identified encroachment.
- 10.7 The red edge which denotes the application site includes not just the former Ring o' Bells site but also includes a meadow to the rear of the former public house and land along the canal bank. Paragraph 146 of the NPPF states that certain other forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The material change of use of land is one such form of development. The submission considers the meadow and land adjacent to the canal to be *'poor quality, unkept agricultural scrubland'*. However land in this area is designated as Grade 1 agricultural land.
- 10.8 The submission contains very little information as to the changes that would be required to the land to enable it to be used for a wedding venue beyond a statement that there would

be "*enhancements to meadow field to North West of the site*". On that basis I am unable to determine that there would be no adverse impact on openness or any conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.

- 10.9 In accordance with paragraph 144 when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. It is my view that the proposed wedding venue and associated development would have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It would introduce permanent buildings where none exists now resulting in encroachment and harm to the openness of the Green Belt. On that basis the proposal fails to comply with section g) of paragraph 145 of the NPPF and the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated to overcome the identified harm.

Principle of development - loss of community facility

- 10.10 The NPPF at paragraph 92 requires that planning policies and decisions should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services and ensure that established shops, facilities and services are retained for the benefit of the community. In accordance with Policy IF3 of the Local Plan, the loss of any community facility such as (but not limited to) pubs, post offices, community centres and open space will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer needed, or can be relocated elsewhere that is equally accessible by the community.
- 10.11 The proposed works would result in the loss of a public house which is considered to be a community facility. The applicant considers that due to the pandemic the pub would no longer be required and is likely to remain closed. However there is no similar facility within close proximity of the site - the nearest being located on the edge of Burscough approx. 1km from the application site.
- 10.12 It is acknowledged that at the time of submission the pub had been closed for approximately two years however the submission contains limited information regarding the marketing of the property that was undertaken from November 2019 until August 2020 (9 months). Pertinent details such as the asking price have not been included with this submission.
- 10.13 In this respect I would also note that a Planning Inspector recently determined marketing of properties should be extended where such marketing has taken place within the lockdowns/pandemic period. The decision related to the sale of a dwelling with occupancy restriction however, I consider the principle of the determination to be relevant here and any submission should demonstrate that the building and business have been marketed appropriately. In this case approx. 5 months of marketing was undertaken during the pandemic/lockdowns. On the basis of the information provided I am unable to determine that appropriate marketing has taken place and therefore the loss of the community facility is not justified. I consider the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of policy IF3.
- 10.14 The submission makes limited reference to a use for community events - "*it is the intention of the applicant not to lose the community focus and intends to provide a number of community events annually*". Very little detail has been provided on this matter and it is unclear how such events would be compatible with the proposed wedding venue use or that they would take place instead of a lucrative wedding event. It is my view that such one-off events would not replicate the community facility which exists at present that of a meeting / socialising place available for patrons to visit at their convenience.

Heritage Assets

- 10.15 The public house can be seen on the 1848 OS map consequently the building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The application has been accompanied by a Heritage statement which assesses the impacts of the loss of the building.
- 10.16 The Ring O Bells is a large two storey detached brick property of late Victorian age, with a slate hipped roof and some modern C20th single storey extensions. It sits within a large plot, with a car park that fronts the canal. The building fronts Ring O Bells Lane and is a prominent building which makes a positive contribution to the streetscene, and is a local landmark. Although it is not listed, the building has attractive architectural features which make a positive contribution to its historic character. It formed an important venue within the community and for passing trade on the canal. Whilst the supporting evidence has indicated the existing building is not fit for purpose as a wedding venue, this is largely due to its existing internal layout. There is no evidence as to why the existing building cannot be reconfigured, retained and refurbished and its curtilage improved with sympathetic landscaping.
- 10.17 However whilst I consider the loss of a local landmark to be harmful, the existing building is not listed and thereby not afforded statutory protection and its loss cannot be controlled on heritage grounds. I have consulted the Council's Conservation Officer who raises no heritage objections to the proposal.

Design / Layout

- 10.18 All development should comply with the requirements of policy GN3 which, along with the Council's SPD Design Guide, requires that new development should be of a scale, mass and built form which responds to the characteristics of the site and its surroundings. Care should be taken to ensure that buildings do not disrupt the visual amenities of the streetscene because of their height, scale or roofline.
- 10.19 The existing building is historic and traditional in form albeit with some modern single storey additions. It has a compact footprint and a relatively small area of the site is occupied by buildings. The proposed building would be lower in height but would have a much larger footprint than the existing public house. Nonetheless I am satisfied that the design of the building itself and the materials proposed to be used in the construction would be acceptable. The proposed new development of a low lying range of buildings would be constructed in stone and is considered to be traditional in character, taking reference from some of the local vernacular architecture.
- 10.20 On its own the building would not have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local area. However the cumulative impact of the building along with the additional works surrounding the building such as car parking and formal entrance courtyard would result in the site losing its existing rural character. The site is prominent in the street scene and the proposed works and alterations particularly at the front of the site would be discordant with this rural area.
- 10.21 It is my view that the proposed development would not comply with the relevant requirements of policy GN3.

Impact on residential amenity

- 10.22 The NPPF at paragraph 127 requires that planning should ensure that developments provide a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users. Policy GN3 of the West Lancashire Local Plan (2012-2027) DPD allows development provided it retains or creates reasonable levels of amenity for occupiers of the neighbouring and proposed properties.
- 10.23 Due to the siting and height of the proposed building it is my view that the proposal would not be overbearing to neighbouring properties and would not cause harm as a result of overlooking or loss of privacy. The main issue is considered to be the potential for harm to be caused by noise and disturbance.
- 10.24 The application has been accompanied by a Noise Impact Assessment which has been considered by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. The EHO is satisfied that the noise assessment has properly covered noise from external plant such as extraction ventilation and recommended adequate plant noise levels. She is also satisfied with the assessment of background music and amplified music as these aspects can be adequately controlled by building design such as that suggested, and, simple volume control by management thereafter.
- 10.25 However the EHO raises concerns regarding accidental noise break out - with entertainment venues there can often be occasions when doors are opened due to overheating / guests opening doors. This can be very difficult to prevent / control until it has already happened. The assessment has covered some of the expected noise from external sources such as people and vehicles however it is considered it has not adequately covered noise from commercial vehicles such as coaches /minibuses and motorbikes and themed weddings. Nor does it cover the eventuality that attendees may not necessarily stay in the car park – they may move towards the road to be picked up on the lane, or loiter in the vicinity of nearby houses. Once they have left the car park they are outside the control of the premises.
- 10.26 This is a semi - rural area where, later in the evening, especially around the time the proposed venue will be closing, the area is known to be very quiet. The EHO raises concern that during these quieter interludes any noise from the car park would be very noticeable. It will also be sudden noise, such as a car horn or shout /scream which is more likely to rouse a person from sleep. Such noises are much more likely to be disruptive and complained about.
- 10.27 The main concern is regarding external noise from the considerable number of attendees, who will mostly arrive and depart at roughly the same time particularly at the end of the event when these guests will require transport home. Weddings could be on any day of the week, all year round. There will be noise associated with such large groups of people, the attendance of taxis, minibuses or coaches, cars and vans in addition to noise from people especially after the consumption of alcohol. The maximum effect from noise could be expected between 11.30pm to 12.30am. The noise assessment estimates 34 car movements between 11.30 and 12.30am. The premises has previously operated as a dining pub resulting in far fewer / more sporadic vehicle movements than this.
- 10.28 There are residential dwellings within very close range, the nearest being just 17 metres away. Several further dwellings are located across the road at around 35 metres away. If vehicles pulled up on the roadside to pick people up, the distance is again around 17 metres. Houseboats moored nearby (approx. 35 metres) with poor levels of sound insulation could also be affected. The former use is far less intense – a quiet dining pub where it is unlikely that patrons would all arrive and leave at the same time.

- 10.29 The World Health Organisation (WHO) recommends that to prevent annoyance and sleep disruption, noise events in the evening (7-11pm) and night time (11pm-7am) should not exceed 60 dB at façade level. Taking the group noise at 95 dB as an example, the EHO has calculated that the nearest property could receive between 65 and 71 dB at façade level and 50- 56 dB internally - well above the WHO recommendations. At this level the 'noise' would be clearly audible in the garden and inside. I expect this would generate annoyance, sleep disturbance and be a cause of complaints.
- 10.30 All the above mentioned noise sources are realistic possibilities. If they did occur, all would be above the recommended maximum noise level (LA max). The large increase in the number of people attending exacerbates the potential for such. A solid fence around the car park would only protect residential gardens and ground floor rooms. First floor level bedrooms would not be protected by a 2.5 metre fence.
- 10.31 The unpredictable nature of groups of people who have consumed alcohol and the relatively large number of people attending means it will be difficult to prevent noise by good management. It is noted that concerns have been raised by nearby neighbours in regard to the potential for noise nuisance.
- 10.32 The Council's EHO has suggested several conditions to seek to control the impact of the development on the amenities of neighbouring properties, including a restriction on the hours of opening which would be limited to Monday – Thursday - 9am - 7pm Friday and Saturday - 9am - 10.30pm Sunday / Bank holiday 9am - 7pm. Having regard to the type of business proposed it is considered that these limited opening hours would be incompatible. The agent has advised that the applicant's business model relies on a closing time of a minimum of 11pm ideally midnight.
- 10.33 Having regard to the assessment undertaken by the Environmental Officer it is my view that the proposed development would result in harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties through the creation of noise and disturbance at unsociable hours and therefore would not be compliant with the requirements of local plan policy GN3 1(iii).

Highways/Parking

- 10.34 Policy GN3 of the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 DPD states that development should incorporate suitable and safe access and road layout design in line with latest standards. Parking should be provided in accordance with local plan policy IF2.
- 10.35 The submitted transport statement uses evidence from another similar sized wedding venue to assess the level of vehicular movements that would be expected from the proposed use. The transport statement also provides swept path analysis to demonstrate that larger vehicles such as coaches, refuse and delivery vehicles and limousines can access and turn within the site and leave in a forward gear.
- 10.36 The proposed site plan indicates that 28 car parking spaces would be created adjacent to the building with a further 24 spaces in the overflow car park next to the canal. Three disabled spaces are proposed with cycle and motorcycle spaces located to the north of the building. It is my view that the level of parking proposed complies with the requirements of policy IF2.
- 10.37 The site has two vehicular accesses onto Ring O'Bells Lane which would be retained as part of the scheme. I have consulted the highway authority who, following the receipt of additional information and amended plans, have raised no objection to the proposals. It is considered that the development would have minimal impact on highway safety in the

locality and that adequate parking would be provided. Several conditions have been recommended which I consider to be appropriate.

Biodiversity

- 10.38 Policy EN2 in the Local Plan states development proposals must seek to avoid impacts on significant ecological assets and protect and improve the biodiversity value of sites. If significant impacts on biodiversity are unavoidable, then mitigation or as a last resort, compensation, is required to fully offset impacts.
- 10.39 The application has been accompanied by an Ecological Survey and Assessment including bat surveys which have been considered by the Council's Ecological Consultant.
- 10.40 The Council's Ecologist advises that the Council does not need to consider the proposals against the three tests set out in the Habitat Regulations. Subject to the recommended conditions it is concluded that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on any protected species or their habitat. The proposal would therefore comply with the requirements of policy EN2.

Trees

- 10.41 Policy EN2 of the Local Plan states that development involving the loss of, or damage to, woodlands or trees of significant amenity, screening, wildlife or historical value will only be permitted where the development is required to meet a need that could not be met elsewhere, and where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the loss or damage.
- 10.42 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has considered the proposals with regard to the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Arboricultural Method Statement and the Landscape design strategy document. It is noted that some tree removal is proposed mainly for conditional reasons. Trees identified for removal for development reasons have been graded as lower grade trees. A high grade Beech tree by the entrance and adjacent to the road is shown for retention.
- 10.43 I do not consider that there would be any significant loss of amenity and the proposed tree removal is not unreasonable in the context of the site. The landscape proposals provide good structure planting and would create an attractive setting. I consider the proposed landscaping scheme would provide adequate compensation for the loss of the trees. The Arboricultural Method Statement includes tree protection details and a condition for its implementation would be appropriate with any approval of the application.

Drainage

- 10.44 The Council's drainage engineer has reviewed the application with regard to the flood risk associated with this proposal. It is his opinion that the Flood Risk Assessment is deficient in that it does not consider future potential impacts of flooding from the canal. The risk has been quantified using historical data. This matter would need to be addressed.
- 10.45 The application form indicates that the foul sewage would discharge to the mains drainage system however, the Council have been unable to find details of such a system. It is proposed that surface water be discharged to a ditch but no details have been provided to indicate where the ditch flows to beyond the site. It would need to be demonstrated that

this ditch connects to a functioning surface water drainage system. Furthermore, the ability of the site to drain via infiltration methods has not been satisfactorily discounted. Therefore, at this time it is not possible to confirm the submitted drainage details are acceptable.

Minerals Safeguarding Area

- 10.46 The Lancashire County Council Minerals and Waste Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD was adopted in September 2013. This plan provides policies for minerals and waste planning in Lancashire. Policy M2 of this document identifies the site as falling within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Within these areas, planning permission will generally not be granted for any form of development that is incompatible by reason of scale, proximity and permanence with working the minerals found on the land.
- 10.47 The area of the site to be developed with a new building and car park has previously been developed. On the remainder of the site the proposal does not include any permanent development which would prejudice the future working of minerals found on the land and is therefore in accordance with Policy M2 of the Lancashire County Council Minerals and Waste Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD.

Very special circumstances

- 10.48 As detailed above it is considered that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
- 10.49 In addition to the identified harm to the Green Belt significant issues with proposed development have been identified including harm to residential amenity, harm to visual amenity of the area, unjustified loss of community facility and a lack of information regarding drainage.
- 10.50 The applicant puts forward the case that the harm to the Green Belt would be outweighed by the benefits including creation of jobs within an on-going rural development, the reuse of the site, the payment of CIL levy, good design and landscaping, reduction in anti-social behaviour, creation of community events and opportunities for energy saving and sustainable construction. It is the applicant's opinion that the benefits of the scheme amount to very special circumstances.
- 10.51 It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in the re-development of the site and provide jobs however it has not been demonstrated why an alternative scheme which does not result in harm to the Green Belt, harm to residential amenity, harm to visual amenity of the area and the unjustified loss of community facility could not be achieved on the site.
- 10.52 It is my view that the benefits of the scheme as described by the applicant outweigh neither the identified harm to the Green Belt nor the other harms which have been identified.

11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 The proposed new building and the large areas of hardstanding are considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development would cause an adverse impact on openness and result in encroachment into the Green Belt. The very special circumstances identified are not considered to outweigh the identified harm. It is considered there is significant potential for the proposed development to result in harm to residential amenity. There would also be harm to the visual amenity of the area, unjustified loss of a community facility and the submission fails to provide adequate information in regards to drainage and flood risk. The proposal therefore conflicts with the NPPF and Policies GN1, GN3 and IF3 of the Local Plan.

Note

1. Despite the requirements of Paras 38-46 of the National Planning Policy Framework it has not been possible to reach a positive agreed solution through the Council's adopted and published procedures. The development proposed shows insufficient regard to the policy requirements as detailed in the reasons above.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed development conflicts with the NPPF and Policy GN1 in the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 DPD in that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development resulting in harm to the openness of the Green Belt and furthermore would result in encroachment into areas of the countryside which are currently undeveloped. The submission fails to demonstrate very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh the identified harm.
2. The proposal conflicts with Policy GN3 in the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012 - 2027 in that the noise impacts of the development would result in significant harm to residential amenity of the occupiers of nearby properties.
3. The proposal conflicts with Policy GN3 in the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012 - 2027 and supplementary planning document 'Design Guide' (Jan 2008) in that the cumulative impact of the building, formal courtyard and car parks would be harmful to the rural character of the locality and would be out of keeping in the street scene.
4. The submission documentation fails to provide adequate justification for the loss of the community facility and fails to demonstrate that the facility is no longer needed or that it can be relocated to an equally accessible location. On that basis the proposal fails to meet the requirements of Policy IF3 in the West Lancashire Local Plan (2012-2027) Development Plan Document and paragraph 92 of the NPPF.
5. The submission documentation fails to demonstrate that adequate drainage can be provided to serve the development and that the proposal would not result in unacceptable flood risk. On that basis the proposal fails to meet the requirements of Policy GN3 in the West Lancashire Local Plan (2012-2027) Development Plan Document and paragraphs 163 and 165 of the NPPF.