

Item 10/00131/FULMAJ

Case Officer Caron Taylor

Ward Adlington & Anderton

Proposal Retrospective application for continued use of land for recreational paintball games, retention of ancillary structures and car parking (resubmission of withdrawn application 09/00525/FUL)

Location Land 400m East Of 41 Wigan Lane Coppull Lancashire

Applicant Mr Duncan Gass

Consultation expiry: 15 April 2010

Application expiry: 20 May 2010

Proposal

1. The application is a retrospective application for continued use of land for recreational paintball games, retention of ancillary structures and car parking (resubmission of withdrawn application 09/00525/FUL).
2. The application was deferred at the previous committee meeting to allow a site visit to take place.

Recommendation

3. It is recommended that this application is refused planning permission.

Main Issues

4. The main issues for consideration in respect of this planning application are:
 - Principle of the proposal
 - Access and parking
 - Impact on neighbour amenity
 - Impact on ecology
 - Impact on public right of way

History

5. The site history of the property is as follows:

Background

6. The application proposal is already taking place without the benefit of planning permission. The application site is situated on an area of wooded land between Wigan Lane, Coppull and Castle Drive, Adlington. It is known as Yankeewood Paintball Centre and is operated by Delta Force. It is approximately 4.89 hectares in area. It is accessed via a track off Wigan Lane and a gravel carpark is provided at the top east end of the track. There are six 'game zones' within the site and a central 'base camp' from which the games are organised. In the base camp area are kitchen, toilet and lockers, equipment store, kiosk and briefing podium/scoreboard stand. There are also canvas tents and the area is has been laid with gravel.
7. As well as paintball guns, pyrotechnics are available for use by participants, this include paint and smoke grenades. A sound amplification system and limited lighting is also used at the site.
8. Two public footpaths pass close to the site.

9. A previous application at the site was withdrawn to allow a noise assessment to be undertaken.
10. Directly to the east/southeast is Rigby Quarry/Landfill site.

Representations

11. Eighteen letters of objection have been received to the application. These can be summarised as:
 - The paintballing is noisy and disruptive, it destroys enjoyment of their home and garden. Their garden can't be used when it is going on and it can be heard inside the house even with double-glazing;
 - There is shouting, the noise of guns, paintballs hitting oil drums, yelling and offensive language from the site and what sound like grenades;
 - It is too close to residential properties;
 - Concern for wildlife and flora and fauna;
 - Concerns over highway safety and parking;
 - Paintballing goes on at weekends and several days in the week and almost continually in school holidays;
 - It destroys the pleasure of walking in the countryside;
 - The access is a dangerous junction on a busy road;
 - Cars wait to get into the site on the main road before the gates are opened;
 - A new carpark has been built and 40 spaces are not enough;
 - The landfill is not allowed to operate on Saturday afternoons and Sundays. This is most used at weekends;
 - Weekends should be quiet times for residents;
 - Staff test the guns early on a Sunday morning e.g. 8.30am;
 - The noise survey submitted was done on a weekday, not a weekend;
 - Householders already have to endure the sand extraction and landfill;
 - There has been an increase in litter;
 - The site is in the Green Belt;
 - The noise is made worse as the site is in a hollow which acts as an amphitheatre;
 - Noise causes alarm and distress;
 - Trees have been cut down;
 - Paint will get into water courses;
 - If approved sound barriers should be erected.
12. Fifteen letters of thanks and support to Delta Force have been submitted with the application, mainly from educational and charitable organisations, five of which refer specifically to the Coppull site. These express thanks for days spent at the centre, commend its running and express regret that it is threatened with closure.

Consultations

13. **Adlington Town Council** objects to the application on the following grounds:
 - Traffic – there could be an extra 40/80 cars a day or more entering and leaving the site together at the busiest periods of the day. When the applicant's noise survey was undertaken there were 250 people on site which may have resulted in over 100 cars using the entrance/exit at peak times. The sight lines at the junction of the site with Wigan Lane are poor in both directions, traffic tends to speed along this winding country lane and it has been the scene of several accidents in the past. The supporting statement at para 4.15 and 5.12 are therefore incorrect.
14. Drainage – The application states that the proposal is not within 20m of a watercourse. However there is a ditch shown at the edge of the site. This section also indicates that surface water drainage will be by a sustainable urban drainage system and soakaway. Will the buildings and parking affect surface water run off?
15. Supporting Statement
The Town Council disagree with parts of the Supporting Statement and argue that other parts are wrong:

They cannot see that this development would offer any benefit to the community. It states that there are no rare or protected habitats or species nor does it have a significant conservation interest, but how is this known if a survey has not been done? A tree survey has not been done. The development has already been detrimental to the quality of life of residents in the area who have complained about the noise from this facility. The nearest houses are only 2-300m from the site and residents are subjected to the constant noise of bullets, explosion or grenades, machine gun fire and loud shouts/screams on site operation days.

16. The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy LT12 - Criterion (e) as it already harms the amenity of residents by creating noise pollution, (f) the only way to access the site is by car (h) public right of way no. 13 runs through the site. What protection is there for people using these footpaths? A risk assessment is included however is flawed as any members of the public using paths will not be wearing protective clothing that participants must be and therefore are exposed to injury which is unacceptable.
17. The applicant is applying for use 365 days a year therefore it would appear they wish to expand the business. Noise is disturbing residents now continuously throughout a day of operation especially at weekends when they are entitled to some peace and quiet. Properties are closer to the site than specified in the application as it is measured from the centre of the site. The application underestimates the time that paintballing takes place.
18. The number of carparking spaces is different in different parts of the application– 40 and 45, which is correct? The statement states the traffic generated is low based on surveys at other sites – other sites should not be used to generalise about this site. There is poor visibility at the junction. There are other anomalies in the Statement.
19. The Town Council believe this is an inappropriate use of the Green Belt. Paintballing is not a sport recognised by the Sports Council.
20. **LCC Ecology** – state that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposals are compliant with planning policy, guidance and legislation, to establish impacts and demonstrate adequate mitigation and compensation in terms of protected species, a full tree survey and information to demonstrate adequate mitigation and compensation or loss and damage to wildlife is needed.
21. **Chorley and District Natural History Society** – object to the application. The area is adjacent to Ellerbeck reclaimed opencast site which has become one of the most valuable wildlife sites locally. They are concerned that frequent use of the adjacent land for a noisy activity such as paintball is harmful to breeding birds and mammals. Cuckoos have bred nearby and deer are regularly seen, neither of these will tolerate noisy neighbours.
22. **Wigan Council** – Have no objection in principle providing there is no adverse impact on the amenity of any nearby existing or proposed land uses with regard to noise, smells, fumes, light spillage, traffic or on-street parking, visual intrusion or other nuisance.
23. **LCC Highways** – State the access point/entrance is existing (from before this current use). The sightline to the south is well above the minimum standard for the national speed limit. The sightline to the north is significantly above the minimum standard for the national speed limit. The gate is set back sufficiently to allow vehicles to pull off Wigan Lane whilst the gate is unlocked and opened (and staff arrive and open up well before guests.) The track is sufficiently wide to allow two vehicles to pass (and there is a large passing place if any larger vehicles visit the place for some reason.) No vehicle would need or want to reverse out of the site onto Wigan Lane. It would seem there are sufficient parking arrangements for the foreseen use. The volume of traffic generated by this activity is small in the scale of vehicle numbers and whilst they think the applicant's numbers are on the conservative side, they estimate the potential numbers does not create a number that approaches a critical point. From the above, it is clear this proposal would have no highway impact. However, they would make a small comment that the entrance has no indication of the site's activity or an address. If new users visiting the site have to slow to find it, then this could present a nuisance if not a hazard. They are told that on

paintball days, signing is put out and this is probably a good solution and should be continued (within the bounds of legislation of course).

Assessment

Principle of the development

24. The application site is in the Green Belt covered by Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts (PPG2) which is reiterated by policy DC1 of the Local Plan. Planning Policy Guidance note 17 (PPG17) covers Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation.
25. It is considered there are two related aspects to the proposal itself, the use of the land and the associated facilities.

Change of Use of the Land

26. Paragraph 3.12 of PPG2 states the statutory definition of development includes engineering operations, and the making of any material change in the use of land. The carrying out of such operations and the making of material changes in the use of land are inappropriate development unless they (i) maintain openness and (ii) do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.
27. As to whether the proposal preserves the openness of the Green Belt there are a large number of paraphernalia associated with the change of use. These include:
- Tents/marquees
 - Containers x4
 - Scoreboard/stage
 - Gen rack
 - Gas store
 - 'Church' structure
 - 'Village' huts x5
 - 'Castle' structure
 - 'Fortress' structure
28. In addition there are other facilities that are not necessarily operational development such as stacked piles of oil drums, siting of a howitzer gun and screens/enclosures, however they are associated with the use of the land and the development must be considered as a whole.
29. In terms of (i) above (at Para. 25) as to whether the proposal maintains the openness of the Green Belt, PPG2 states: *'The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness.'* Openness with regard to PPG2 means free from development. All the facilities associated with the use are pepper potted throughout the site and have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt as they mean it is no longer free from development.
30. In terms of (ii) above, as to whether the proposal conflicts with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, it is not considered the proposal conflicts with these purposes except one, that is 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. The proposal has introduced large structures and large amounts of hardstanding into the area, including laying of a carpark which it is considered conflicts with this purpose.
31. It is therefore considered that the material change of use of the land is inappropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with PPG2.

Facilities Associated with the Development

32. In terms of the facilities associated with the use as a paintballing site such as the 'church', 'village huts', 'castle' and 'fortress', paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 states that essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation are appropriate development providing they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it (in accordance with paragraph 3.5). Paragraph 3.5 states that essential facilities should be genuinely required for uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not

conflict with the purposes of including land within it. There are a number of questions that need therefore to be answered in establishing if the development is acceptable in principle.

- Are the facilities 'essential'?
- Do they preserve the openness?
- Do they conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt?

33. Looking at the first question, there are a number of structures on the site associated with the paintballing activity and there is no doubt that some of the facilities would be classed as essential to the playing of paintball as it is inherent to the game that players need to hide from opponents. However, it must be considered whether the level of facilities provided is beyond what are essential for the paintball game. In this case it is considered the facilities do go beyond 'essential' because of their size and elaborate nature. The larger structures are not essential to the playing of the paintball games, they are only desirable. This is evidenced as there are many other paintball sites that operate without such large or elaborate structures. There are also competitions that only use inflatable structures.
34. The amount of gravel hardstanding that has been laid is also considered excessive. Again, although this may be desirable it is not considered essential. This may lead to the playing areas being muddy, but this would be expected by the participants of such an activity located in woodland.
35. Although the applicant argues that the facilities provided are essential as opposed to desirable, there is a significant difference between the two concepts. The courts (*Wainsfort Corporation v SoS for the Environment, Transport and the Regions (2000)*) held that 'essential' in Green Belt terms is a strong word. It imposes a high standard, bearing in mind the general policy of the Green Belt and its development and would indicate that it should be the minimum amount of facilities necessary. In this case it is not considered all the facilities are 'essential' to the paintball games, but that the site could still operate without many of the facilities.
36. As to whether the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt or conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt which are also a qualification of appropriateness, it has already been considered above that the structures do not preserve the openness of the Green Belt in terms of PPG2 and conflict with its purposes 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. The facilities provided therefore fail the tests and are therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
37. In conclusion of the principle of the development, it considered that the material change of use of the land is inappropriate development. In terms of the associated facilities the Council also considers they go beyond what is genuinely required for the operation of the paintball site they are therefore not essential. They are also not considered to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposal therefore fails the test of appropriateness in the Green Belt in accordance with PPG2.
38. Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt by definition and should not be granted planning permission unless the applicant can demonstrate that there are very special circumstances to justify the development. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
39. It is not considered in this case that very special circumstances have been put forward that outweigh the presumption against it. The proposal is therefore contrary to PPG2 and associated Local Plan Policy DC1.
40. Paragraph 3.15 of PPG2 states the visual amenity of the Green Belt should not be injured by proposal for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt which, although they would not prejudice the purposes of including land in Green Belt, might be visually detrimental by reason of their sitting, materials or design. The material of the structures are timber and therefore have a rustic appearance, however they are given an urban form such as a 'church'. They are visible from the public footpath that runs adjacent to the site boundary to the north

and the scale of the buildings what would not be expected to be present do impact on the visual amenity of the Green Belt, especially from the public footpath.

41. Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation (PPG17) sets out general principles in planning for new open space and sports and recreational facilities: In identifying where to locate new areas of open space, sports and recreational facilities, local authorities should:

- i. promote accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport, and ensure that facilities are accessible for people with disabilities;
- ii. locate more intensive recreational uses in sites where they can contribute to town centre vitality and viability;
- iii. avoid any significant loss of amenity to residents, neighbouring uses or biodiversity;
- iv. improve the quality of the public realm through good design;
- v. look to provide areas of open space in commercial and industrial areas;
- vi. add to and enhance the range and quality of existing facilities;
- vii. carefully consider security and personal safety, especially for children;
- viii. meet the regeneration needs of areas, using brownfield in preference to Greenfield sites;
- ix. consider the scope for using any surplus land for open space, sport or recreational use, weighing this against alternative uses;
- x. assess the impact of new facilities on social inclusion; and
- xi. consider the recreational needs of visitors and tourists.

42. It states that in rural areas those sports and recreational facilities which are likely to attract significant numbers of participants or spectators should be located in, or on the edge of, country towns. Smaller scale facilities will be acceptable where they are located in, or adjacent to villages to meet the needs of the local community. Developments will require special justification if they are to be located in open countryside, although proposals for farm diversification involving sports and recreational activities should be given favourable consideration. All development in rural areas should be designed and sited with great care and sensitivity to its rural location.

43. PPG17 reiterates the test for sports and recreation development in Green Belts and states planning permission should be granted in Green Belts for proposals to establish or to modernise essential [this author's emphasis] facilities for outdoor sport and recreation where the openness of the Green Belt is maintained. In addition it states that the development should be the minimum necessary [this author's emphasis] and non-essential facilities (e.g. additional function rooms or indoor leisure) should be treated as inappropriate development. Very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Green Belt will need to be demonstrated if such inappropriate development is to be permitted. It has already been considered that the proposal does not maintain the openness of the Green Belt and that the facilities provided are not essential as they are above the minimum necessary. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to PPG17.

44. In conclusion of principle of the development the proposal is considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with PPG2 and Policy DC1 of the Local Plan. It is also considered contrary to PPG17.

Detailed Issues

45. Policy LT12 of the Local Plan states that in the case of noise generating sports, priority will be given to the use of derelict and degraded land. Subject to all the criteria of the policy being met:

- (a) the development will have no adverse impact on the local environment or the visual character of the landscape;
- (b) the development will have no adverse impact on the distinctive characteristics of the landscape areas identified in Policy DC9;
- (c) the development will not result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land;
- (d) the development will not cause harm to a site of nature conservation value;
- (e) the development will not harm the amenities of local residents;
- (f) the site will be easily accessible by a choice of means of transport other than the private car;

(g) the site has adequate access and the traffic generated can be safely accommodated on the local highway network;

(h) the proposal meets other development control criteria including drainage, the existence of public rights of way, landscaping and the design and siting of ancillary buildings.

46. The land is not is it considered to be derelict or degraded and the applicant has not demonstrated that any other sites were considered in their site selection. As to whether the criteria of the policy have been met will be assessed in the sections below.

Access and Parking

47. The application states that 40/45 spaces are provided on the site (the application forms states 40, the Design and Access Statement states 45). They are provided on an area of gravel hardstanding.

48. The applicant does not specify the capacity of the course in terms of the number of participants. The applicant advises in the Design and Access Statement that it is usual for there to be about 3 players per car based on surveys at their other paintball sites. On the day the Council's commissioned noise assessment took place 365 participants were registered to play. Even if every car turned up carrying four people, this would have resulted in 90 cars requiring parking. On the day of the applicant's own noise survey there were 250 participants registered to play, again if every car carried four people this would require 62 parking spaces. It is considered unlikely that participants would travel to the site via public transport as this part of Wigan Lane is not served by a bus. Even allowing for some participants to be dropped off and therefore not requiring parking, it is considered that there is insufficient parking for the site. Objectors to the application have stated vehicles have been parked on Wigan Lane, which is considered unacceptable in highway safety terms. Although LCC Highways have not objected in terms of the junction, it is not clear from the application submission the actual number that can participate at one time and will need parking facilities, as evidenced by the number of participants on the noise assessment days. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to TR4 and LT12 of the Local Plan.

Neighbour Amenity

49. The main issue in relation to neighbour amenity is noise emanating from the site.

50. Planning Policy Guidance note 24 (PPG24) states that the impact of noise from sport, recreation and entertainment will depend to a large extent on frequency of use and the design of facilities. More detailed advice is given in Annex 3 of the guidance.

51. Annex 3 gives advice on noise from recreational and sporting activities. It states for these activities...the local planning authority will have to take account of how frequently the noise will be generated and how disturbing it will be, and balance the enjoyment of the participants against nuisance to other people. Depending on local circumstances and public opinion, local planning authorities may consider it reasonable to permit higher noise emission levels [from leisure uses] than they would from industrial development, subject to a limit on the hours of use, and the control of noise emissions (including public address systems) during unsocial hours.

52. The previous application (ref: 09/00525/FUL) at the site was withdrawn as a noise assessment was requested by the Council. This has been submitted by the applicant with the current application. On the day the applicant's noise survey was carried out there were 250 participants at the paintball site. It concludes that considering the various standards and guidelines, noise impact due to paintballing games, is 'slight' or 'marginal' and paintballing noise levels are lower than those which would be expected to cause annoyance.

53. The applicant's noise assessment was carried out on a Wednesday between 11am and 3pm, however the majority of paintball days take place at weekends. The assessment specifically notes that at some times the movement of a dumper/extractor on the nearby landfill site was audible, and in particular the vehicle's warning bleeper. The adjacent landfilling operation does not take place on Saturday afternoons or Sundays and weekends are a time that residents would reasonably expect a reasonable level of peaceful enjoyment of their properties.

54. The Council therefore commissioned an independent appraisal of the noise assessment submitted by the applicant. This concluded that the assessment did not provide the necessary evidence to allow the Council to make a valid judgement with respect to the likely noise associated with the activities pertaining to the paintballing site and more evidence was required. Following receipt of this advice the Council commissioned a Baseline Noise Survey and Impact Assessment.
55. The Council's assessment notes the closest residential properties are those to the east on Castle Drive and Castle House Lane and properties to west of Wigan Lane. The Council's commissioned noise assessment was carried out on a Saturday between 8.30am and 4.30pm when Delta Force advised 365 participants were registered to play (this information was acquired covertly), though they advised the covert enquirer they can cater for a capacity of 400 participants on site at any one time. Delta Force was not aware they were being noise monitored.
56. Both surveys note that there are no British Standards, Codes of Practice or other statutory criteria which relate specifically to noise due to paintball games. However, both note that PPG24, BS4142:1997 'Rating Industrial Noise Affecting Mixed Residential and Industrial Areas', World Health Organisation 1999 'Guidelines for Community Noise' and 'Clay Target Shooting: Guidance on the Control of Noise' all provide useful guidance.
57. The Council's commissioned survey concludes that taking the above guidelines into account it would recommend approval in terms of noise impact on the grounds that it is operating within the limitations of relevant guidance, based upon the fact that it was monitored on one of the sites busiest days having 365 participants.
58. Given the recommendations of the noise assessments that were carried out at points closest to the paintball site, it is not considered the Council has sufficient grounds to refuse the application on noise impact to residential properties.
59. Although Delta Force advises that participants arrive on site at 9am, the application applies for the opening hours to be 8.30am to 5.30pm every day of the week. Objectors have stated that guns have been heard as early as 8.30am on a Sunday, as though staff are testing them ahead of participants arriving.
60. The applicant advises that they are willing to avoid the use of pyrotechnics at the site if it is thought necessary.

Other Matters

Public Footpath

61. A public right of way passes close to the paintball site. The Definitive Map shows its route crosses Wigan Lane and then at the access to the application site crosses fields to the north (it does not go down the access track). At this point it is known as Footpath 58 Coppull. As it crosses the ward boundary it becomes Footpath 13 Adlington. It meets the application site boundary in the north corner then runs along the north boundary of the application site and then continues on to Castle House Lane, Adlington.
62. The applicant considers that this footpath may have been diverted in the past down the access track to the application site, however this is not the case. Lancashire County Council Countryside Service advise that the public right of way was suspended by Orders in 1977 and 1982 due to open cast coalmining on the route. However, this was revoked in 2009 by the Department of Communities and Local Government. The current status of the footpath is that it should be available for the public to walk as per the Definitive Map. However, this is not possible as the route is not accessible from the western side on Wigan Lane as there is no stile into the field. In addition there is no stile or bridge where it joins the application boundary in the north corner. The path is then densely overgrown and it is not possible to walk it as per the definitive route.

63. The County Council state they are aware of this issue and are working with the landowner to try and resolve the issue. They state a likely solution (in terms of it will allow an access route through to Adlington at a reasonable cost, i.e. without needing bridge crossings etc.) is to divert the footpath down the access track and for it to continue southeast until it joins an existing track which heads north to rejoin the definite route. However, the County Council advise that no such application to divert it has been made.
64. The application is accompanied by a Risk Assessment in relation to the public right of way, which states that the principle risk is a direct hit in the face, particularly the eye, from close range as walkers will not be wearing eye protection like participants. The risk assessment considers the risk to walkers to be low as the footpath is not frequently used and only one of the game zones is located in the part of the woodland close to the footpath which is used for approximately 20mins on game days. They also state the woodland is thick and the footpath is separated from the game zone by a buffer strip.
65. The applicant advises that there are measures in place to prevent conflict with walkers, which includes a safety briefing that includes reference to the footpath and that if participants deliberately aim and shoot at walkers will be removed from the game, player cannot handle any gun unsupervised or outside the game zone, the games are patrolled by at least one marshal.
66. The applicant has advised they would be prepared to implement additional measures to protect walkers including enhancing the vegetation between the game zone and the footpath and introducing a length of netting to reinforce the zone, which would remove the risk.
67. The case officer has walked the line of the definitive footpath along the boundary with the game zone and a small number of stray paintball pellets were found on the line of the footpath. The risk to walkers, although considered to be low is a consideration in determining the application.
68. Laws pertaining to paintball markers in the United Kingdom classify them as Air Weapons. Owners do not require a license unless the marker first above 300 feet per second (91m/s). The minimum age to be in possession of a marker is seventeen, except in target shooting clubs or galleries, or on private property so long as projectiles are not fired beyond the premises. Therefore it is considered that additional measures as proposed by the applicant would need to be introduced. However, although the implementation of high fencing/dense netting to protect walkers could be controlled by condition, it is considered that this in itself would impact on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt as they would be on the outside edge of the site.

Ecology

69. As the application is retrospective, no surveys were carried out. Lancashire County Ecologist states that that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposals are compliant with planning policy, guidance and legislation, to establish impacts and demonstrate adequate mitigation and compensation in terms of protected species. In addition a tree survey and information to demonstrate adequate mitigation and compensation for loss and damage to wildlife has not been submitted.
70. It is clear damage has been done to trees on the site and hardstanding has been placed around them.

71. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to PPS9 and Local Plan policies EP4 and EP9.

Other Issues

72. An objector has raised the issue as to whether paint will get into water courses, however the paint is water soluble and biodegradable.

Overall Conclusion

73. The proposal is considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt both in terms of the change of use of the land and the facilities associated with the development in accordance with PPG2 and Local Plan policy DC1. It is also considered contrary to PPG17.

74. The proposal is not considered to comply with Local Plan policy LT12 in terms of nature conservation, transport, parking and nature conservation.

75. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Planning Policies

76. National Planning Policies:
PPS1, PPG2, PPS9, PPG17, PPG24

Adopted Chorley Borough Local Plan Review
Policies:
DC1, EP4, EP9, EP9, TR4, LT12

Recommendation: Refuse Full Planning Permission

Reasons to follow