

Memo

From: Mark Waleczek

To: Adam Birkett

Cc: Colin Hirst – agreed 30/6/21

Date: 29/06/2021

Re: Extension of existing holiday lodge park to provide for the siting of 16 additional holiday lodges. Resubmission of 3/2019/0851.

Location: Ribble Valley View, Old Langho Road, Langho, BB6 8AW

Application Ref. No. 3/2021/0335

Brief Description of Proposal

The application relates to the addition of 16 lodges to the western boundary of the existing holiday lodge park at 'Ribble Valley View', Old Langho Road, Langho with associated landscaping and parking. The application is a resubmission of application 3/2019/0851 which was refused on the grounds of the proposal being contrary to policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Core Strategy. It was deemed that the proposal would have introduced *'a significant level of built-form in a visually prominent location within the defined open countryside that would have a significant visual suburbanising effect upon the landscape resulting in the erosion of the sense of openness that defines the character of the area'*.

Relevant Core Strategy Policies

At the time of the original application to add an additional 29 lodges to the existing site it was made clear that there was no objection in-principle to the development from an economic development perspective. This was based on the application meeting economic policies EC1 and EC3 of the Core Strategy by contributing to local business growth and the strengthening the visitor economy within the Ribble Valley. This new proposal meets these policies and continues to support the economic strategy of the borough. Policy DMG2 supports development in the open countryside where it is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area, subject to the consideration of the impact upon the landscape.

Development proposals should not undermine the inherent quality of the landscape and the Council will also seek to ensure that the open countryside is protected from inappropriate development (refer to EN2, DMG1 & DMG2 of the Core Strategy). Para. 83. of the NPPF further supports this by stating that decisions should enable 'sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside'. I am mindful of the previous application being refused based on the proposal being contrary to policies DMG1 and DMG2 relating to the scale of proposed work impeding on open countryside. This application proposes a reduced number of lodges on what appears to be a smaller area of development which will need to be assessed in the context of the visual impact considerations and policies outlined above, particularly those on which the proposal submitted under 3/2019/0851 was refused.

Conclusion

There is no 'in-principle' objection to the proposal from an Economic Development and Planning Policy perspective given the ability of this development to contribute to policies EC1 and EC3 of the Core Strategy, subject to appropriate mitigation of the landscape impact.

The perceived benefits of the development must be balanced against considerations regarding matters of design and the potential harm of the proposal upon the character of the landscape, including the ability to which this can be mitigated. These detailed matters of design remain outside the scope of this response but should be considered as part of the development management process as part of the applications consideration.

Mark Waleczek

Planning Policy Assistant

Colin Hirst
Head of Regeneration & Housing