

Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed: Officer: **SK** Date: **17.12.20** Manager: Date:

Application Ref: 3/2020/0568

Date Inspected: 23/10/2020

Officer: SK



Ribble Valley  
Borough Council

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:

REFUSAL

**Development Description:** Leisure development including electric motorsport adventure facility and support building, cafe building, natural playground and 10 glamping pods.

**Site Address/Location:** Carr Hall Whalley Road Wilpshire BB1 9LJ

**CONSULTATIONS:** Parish/Town Council

**Wilpshire Parish Council have objected to the proposal objecting on the following grounds:**

The application exists to create a Business Park in the Green Belt at Carr Hall. Wilpshire Parish Council strongly objects on the following grounds:

1. This application will adversely affect the openness and permanence of the Green Belt: The proposed development is on a steeply sloping site on a prominent escarpment readily visible from the A666. The applicant's own topographical map shows the difference between lowest and highest points on the site is over 100 ft.
2. The two proposed large and tall buildings (the store/workshop is 7.6m high just to the eaves) will be readily visible from the A666 and nearby footpaths; also they will be dominant to users of the footpath through the site. Note: The existing commercial units as advertised by the Applicant's existing Estate Agents Taylor Weaver are described:- "At Carr Hall there are currently vacant 42,000 sq. ft of commercial buildings and 350 car parking spaces." The proposed usage could be accommodated in the existing buildings which the agents describe as being "of portal frame construction and capable of adaptation to alternative uses". The applicant already has consent for its use as a café and garden centre which is currently unutilised (3/2004/1020).
3. The proposed Glamping Pods and access track are in a prominent position on the steeply sloping site.
4. The 8ft high security fencing to the play area would further reduce the openness and particularly for users of the footpath through the site.
5. Light Pollution: The proposed development, with its need for security and safe access, will significantly extend the area of and increase light pollution. This will be visible from a wide area.
6. Environmental Issues: The development in the Green Belt would also adversely affect a wild life corridor. Noise, light and off-road traffic would have a detrimental effect upon the landscape and wildlife. The site area affected is 2.9 hectares or over 7 acres.
7. The applicant states under biodiversity that no unreported habitats or biodiversity features are affected. This is incorrect since the area is known to be a wild life habitat and the

woodland is known to have bat colonies (see Bat and Bird survey in application 3/2012/0539 at Carr Hall).

8. Residential amenity: Even with electric vehicles there would be significant and continuous noise from vehicles using the off-road tracks. The Glamping Pods and associated Fire Pit, especially as they are in an elevated position, will potentially be a source of noise which will carry far and wide.
9. Employment: The increase in employment opportunities is limited and would not outweigh the considerable harm to the Green Belt. There are 14.33 hectares of undeveloped employment land in the Ribble Valley. There is no need for the separation of Wilpshire and Langho, provided by the Green Belt, to be compromised.

It is of concern that the applicant has commenced works, including extensive landscaping works, into the Green Belt without consents. An Application for an agricultural building at Carr Hall 3/2009/0210P was refused since it would represent an unnecessary structure to the detriment of the open countryside and openness of the Green Belt.

This application must also be refused for the above reasons.

**Billington and Langho Parish Council have objected to the proposal objecting on the following grounds:**

- Work is already in hand, before the application has been passed, with machines on site, ground levelled and tree's felled.
- Change to design approved under application 3/2019/1002 to include upper floor store room with new windows in the north west gables. Resubmission of 3/2019/1002. THIS has already been carried out and is fully complete.
- This is the only green belt space and is crucial to the area. This application uses up a disproportional amount of the remaining green belt.
- This development will dominate the skyline of the area. Concerns were raised about the local footpaths that run through the area; these will be adversely affected by the application in particular the large obtrusive fences.
- The development states that there are no wildlife habitats or biodiversity features affected by the development. The area has bats in the woodland and deer roam the area.
- The site is in Open Countryside near the Green Belt. Development would not normally be allowed in such an area, unless there were exceptional planning reasons. The applicant has not supplied any exceptional planning justification.
- The parish council would like to ask why this is being considered when even an agricultural building was refused on this site, under application 3/2009/0210.
- The applicant in his Planning Statement outlines letters of pre-application advice sent to him by senior planning officers. There is little evidence that he has provided any of the evidence suggested by the officers to overcome basic objections to his proposal
- As there is an adjacent stream to the proposal site, the parish would expect comprehensive drainage details as does L.C.C., but these are missing

- This application does not offer an amenity to the local area for local people. The development already has a café that is not used to capacity nor it seems the local resident.
- The applicant's Transport Study refers not only to the proposed leisure development, but also to additional industrial and office proposals at the site. The parish do not understand why these office proposals are omitted, as they believe such plans should be included in the interests of proper planning. Their surprise is compounded by the reality that 4,500 sq. metres of apparently empty office space is owned by the applicant adjacent to the proposed leisure site.
- The parish would also expect to see full technical details of the noise emitted by the proposed quad-bikes, as do Ribble Valley Environmental Health officers. The Council web-site acknowledges by its long list of consultees that many houses in two parishes may be within earshot of continual noise from the proposal site and this will naturally be worse at weekends, when more customers may be using the track, but more residents will be at home.
- Traffic to the site if approaching from the south or West will be directed down Whitehalgh Lane, an area already struggling with the volume of traffic. If travelling to the site from the east traffic will be directed down Snodworth Road, another road with issues of being unsuitable for the current volume of traffic. This development will add strain to the already overloaded area.
- Last, but not least, the parish believes that some of the development requested should have been submitted as a request for an existing use certificate. The applicant has already cut down some trees, and built some roads and car parking near or on the proposal site. If RVBC should refuse this application, the parish would like RVBC to consider whether enforcement action is required in respect of any unpermitted engineering works

**CONSULTATIONS:**

**Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies**

**LCC Highways:**

LCC Highways have raised a number of concerns in respect of the proposal as follows:

With respect to this application whilst we would not object to the development there are a number of areas of concern.

The areas that require further information are as follows

- The car park shows no areas for Mobility Parking, Cycle Park facilities for café customers and Glamping Pod users, Motorcycle parking nor does there appear to be any facilities for the recharging of electric vehicles
- Lancashire's Parking standards would suggest the 25 parking spaces are not sufficient to support the café and leisure facilities
- The surfaced access to the car park should be wide enough to allow 2 vehicles to pass or a passing place should be provided
- Consideration should be given to re-routing one of the cycle paths so as not to conflict with the access to the lower of the car park
- A construction management plan, this should include reference to the low railway bridge in Langho
- Details of a warning sign on site to alert drivers of the low bridge in Langho. Guidance should be taken from The Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 4 Section 7
- Lack of commercial servicing for the Café
- An exterior lighting design would also be expected

- Should you wish to support this application we would require that a condition stating that any of the elements of this application could not be occupied or start to trade until the outstanding condition from application 3/2014/1044 regarding the improvement to the bus stops on Whalley Road has been completed. Although it is expected that this should be completed as part of an earlier planning application.
- It is also noted that this application is just for the leisure elements of the Highways Pre Application and that the Transport Report refers to a larger office and light industrial units. If these units are to be presented with a subsequent application, then the additional traffic levels may require further works at the junction with Whalley Road A666, to improve the pedestrian and vehicle access across the road.
- In order to fully support the application, we would look for further evidence to show how our concerns can be allayed.

#### RVBC Env Health:

Ribble Valley Environmental Health department have offered the following observations:

- The development would be subject to the need for a site licence, issued by Environmental Health, for the glamping pods prior to operation. See attached standard schedule of conditions. Owing to the close proximity of the proposed development to sensitive (residential) premises, there are concerns that it may have the potential to cause noise, odour and artificial light nuisance to the occupiers of those premises. I have no objection in principle to this planning application but would recommend that the following conditions are included, to protect the amenity of the locality, as part of the approval if granted:
- The development hereby approved shall not commence until a scheme for the control of odours for the cafe has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the technical specification and siting of any external ventilation ducting and/or plant. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first use and thereafter maintained in good working order at all times.
- The kitchen extraction and ventilation system for the café shall be designed to the standard stated in the EMAQ guidance on the "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems" for the type of food outlet proposed.
- The approved ventilation/extraction equipment shall be operated at all times when cooking is carried out and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
- Before use of the development commences, a noise-mitigation scheme shall be submitted in writing and approved in writing by the local planning authority detailing measures that will be implemented to ensure that any noise associated with the development does not cause detriment to amenity or nuisance, especially to those living and working in the vicinity. In particular consideration to be given to noise levels regarding:
  - Maximum number of motorsport vehicles permitted to be in use at any one time
  - Limits on the times of use of the track
  - Limits on the times of use for the buildings
  - Limits on numbers any races or other events that may be held over a four weekly/yearly period
  - Limit on noise from cumulative use of all buildings on site
- The rating level of noise arising from the use of the kitchen extract ventilation system shall not exceed 10 decibels (measured in dB(A)) of the background noise level at the nearest noise sensitive premises to the proposed development, as assessed in accordance with British Standard 4142 (2014) or subsequent replacement standard.

- The development hereby permitted shall be designed so that the rating levels for cumulative noise from external plant and equipment on the development shall not exceed the existing background noise level (LA90) at the external façade of any noise sensitive premises, as assessed in accordance with British Standard 4142(2014) or any subsequent replacement national standards. Alternative levels and monitoring locations may be used subject to the prior agreement of the Local Planning Authority.
- The development hereby permitted shall be designed so that the maximum instantaneous noise levels (LAFmax) from external plant and equipment shall not exceed 60 dB(A) evening and night-time (19.00-07.00) at the façade of any noise sensitive premises. Alternative levels and monitoring locations may be used subject to the prior agreement of the Local Planning Authority.
- The lighting scheme should comply with the Institution of Lighting Professionals Guidance Note for the reduction of obtrusive light 2011(or later versions). It should be designed so that it is the minimum needed for security and operational processes and be installed to minimise potential pollution caused by glare and spillage.

**LLFA:**

The Lead Local Flood Authority have objected to the proposal on the grounds that insufficient information has been submitted in respect of the application relating to matters of drainage and flood risk as follows:

- An appropriate site specific flood risk assessment which is required for this application as the total site area is over 1ha in size.
- An assessment of the existing and proposed surface water runoff rates, volumes and on-site surface water storage requirements. This is to demonstrate compliance with standards S2, S4, S5 and S6 of the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems; at least in principle.
- A surface water drainage layout plan that shows how surface water will be managed over the lifetime of the development. The surface water drainage layout plan should include details of all sustainable drainage proposals, temporary surface water storage facilities, flow controls, water quality treatments and outfall locations. The plan should be appropriately labelled, with details of all pipe/structure references, dimensions and design levels (including ground levels and finished floor levels (in AOD).  
If the surface water drainage proposals have not yet been finalised, then an outline surface water drainage strategy can be accepted, subject to the final details being provided at detailed design. Doing so would require a suitability worded pre-commencement planning condition to be added to the decision notice.
- Surface water flow calculations to demonstrate the suitability of the surface water drainage proposals and to demonstrate compliance with standards S7 and S8 of the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems; at least in principle.
- A final site plan that shows all on-site surface water catchment areas, i.e. areas that will contribute, either directly or indirectly, to any positively drained network. The plan should also detail how surface water will be managed within any non-drained areas of the site, for example shared spaces and public open space
- A site plan that shows all overland flow routes and flood water exceedance routes, both on and off site. This is to demonstrate compliance with standard S9 of the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems
- Details of how the surface water drainage system will be managed and maintained over the lifetime of the development

**CONSULTATIONS:****Additional Representations.**

11 Letters of representation have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Increase in traffic
- Loss of Green belt and habitat
- Increase in noise and disturbance
- Inadequate parking
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Noise from the 'quad' vehicles
- Visual impact
- Light pollution

**RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:****Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**

Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  
Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  
Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations  
Key Statement EN1 - Landscape

Policy DMB3 – Recreation and Tourism development  
Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  
Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  
Policy DMG3 – Transport & Mobility  
Policy DME1 – Protecting Trees & Woodland  
Policy DME2 – Landscape & Townscape Protection  
Policy DME6 – Water Management

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**Relevant Planning History:****ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:****Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application relates to a 2.9 Ha area of land located on the southern-side of Whalley Road. The area will be accessed via an existing access and track that currently serves the existing Carr Hall commercial and residential complex. The site lies within the defined Green Belt and as such, at a local level, Key Statement EN1 is primarily engaged for assessment purposes in respect of potential impacts upon the designation.

The area is largely rural in nature save that for the existing buildings that are located directly to the south-east of the extents of the application site. The site is afforded a significant level of visibility upon approach from the south-west along Whalley Road by virtue of the open nature of the site and areas of land to the east. There are no immediate residential receptors directly adjacent to or that interface with the main-body of the proposal site save that for a single residential dwelling that is located to the north-eastern extents of the woodland to which the woodland 'Electric Bike Adventure Track' relates.

### **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**

The application site does not benefit from a direct influencing relationship with any adjacent residential receptors save that for Strathmore (172 Whalley Road) which is within close proximity of the northern extents of the woodland within which the 'Electric Bike Adventure Track' is proposed.

Whilst it is not considered that any of the proposed uses will have a direct impact upon existing nearby residential amenity, this will largely be dependent on the noise ratings and frequency of use of the 'electric vehicles' that are proposed on site for leisure purposes. In this respect RVBC Environmental health department have suggested that a number of conditions be imposed that not only limits the noise levels of the vehicles but also details of:

- Maximum number of motorsport vehicles permitted to be in use at any one time
- Limits on the times of use of the track
- Limits on the times of use for the buildings
- Limits on numbers any races or other events that may be held over a four weekly/yearly period
- Limit on noise from cumulative use of all buildings on site

Such matters should be dealt through the imposition of a condition that requires, prior to the commencement of development, a noise-mitigation scheme be submitted in writing and approved in writing by the local planning authority detailing measures that will be implemented to ensure that any noise associated with the development does not cause detriment to amenity or nuisance, especially to those living in the vicinity. In the absence of a detailed noise assessment in respect of these matters at this stage a complete assessment of the potential for detriment to residential amenity as a result of disturbance from noise cannot be fully considered.

### **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**

Given the proposal lies within the defined Green belt consideration must be given for the potential of the development to undermine the intrinsic character and openness of the area. Planning Practice Guidance provides clear guidance in respect of what factors that can be taken into account when considering the potential impact of development on the openness of the Green Belt, in this respect the guidance states that:

*Assessing the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt, where it is relevant to do so, requires a judgment based on the circumstances of the case. By way of example, the courts have identified a number of matters which may need to be taken into account in making this assessment.*

*These include, but are not limited to:*

- *openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects – in other words, the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant, as could its volume;*
- *the duration of the development, and its remediability – taking into account any provisions to return land to its original state or to an equivalent (or improved) state of openness; and*
- *the degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation.*

Key Statement EN1 and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy as also engaged not only given that the proposal lies within the Green belt designation (EN1) but that Policy DMG1 largely relates to design matters for all proposals within the Borough.

The proposal seeks consent for an extensive level of built-form development consisting of a two-storey timber clad bike store/repair shop (with training rooms above), single storey timber clad 'café' building with storage and takeaway area, 8 pieces of large-scale play equipment and associated

2.44m high perimeter fencing. It is further proposed that a dedicated car parking area will be created with 10 glamping pods also being proposed to be located on-site with an associated fire pit and seating area. Other associated surface-level development is proposed in respect of an 'Electric Bike Adventure Track' located within the adjacent woodland and access tracks relating to the glamping pods.

It is proposed that the majority of the development will be located directly to the north-east of the existing car Hall building on the opposing side of the existing watercourse/drainage channel on site with the existing commercial premises on site being located further to the south-west. As such and given the level and quantum of development proposed, it is imperative to not only take account of that development which relates directly to the application but also the cumulative level of development that would be resultant when taking account of existing built-form on site.

In this respect it is clear the development, particularly on approach from the south-west along Whalley Road, will be read closely in conjunction with the existing two-buildings located on site. Taking into account the scale of the existing buildings, it is already considered that these represent significant levels of development in a Green Belt setting that to some degree could already be considered uncharacteristic. As such any associated additional built-development is likely to compound and exacerbate the visual perception of the level of development that the site is accommodating.

It cannot be argued that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green belt, particularly not only taking into account the scale of proposed buildings, but when also taking account of the significant scale of the proposed play equipment and the likely visual impacts resultant from the parked motor-vehicles occupying the car-parking area being visible on site.

In this respect it is considered that the proposal, when taking account of existing built-form, would result in a cumulative level of development that fundamentally and significantly compromises the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN1 and Policies DMG1 and DMB3(3) of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraphs 143 and 145(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Consideration must also be given to not only the level of built-form and the potential impact upon openness but also of that of the design and external appearance of the buildings and structures themselves and whether they respond positively to the character of the area or represent an appropriate response to the landscape character of the area.

The proposed buildings are both of a significant scale, being of a gabled appearance and being largely timber-clad, one of which is two-storey in height with the other being single storey in height. Taking account of the character of the area and the sense of openness afforded to the site it is not considered that the proposed buildings represent a positive response to the character of the area and would not be considered to be of such a high-quality design that would result in overall enhancement or contribution.

The proposed play area is not only significant in relation to overall ground area but also in relation to the size of the equipment proposed. Whilst it is accepted some of the play equipment is of a typical scale there are a number of pieces that are 9m to 10m in height, reaching heights that exceed the maximum ridge height of the proposed two-storey bike/repair workshop building.

Taking into account the scale of the proposed equipment and their general appearance, it is not considered that it can be argued that these would represent appropriate development, in a Green Belt setting, that responds positively to the character of the area or the inherent character and visual amenities of the designated area. As such it is considered that the proposal, by virtue of the quantum, design, scale and external appearance of the proposed buildings, glamping pods and associated 'Natural Playground' would result in the introduction of an incongruous, anomalous and

discordant form of development that fails to respond positively to the character of the area and would result in development that fundamentally and significantly compromises the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt.

It is for these reasons that the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN1 and Policies DMG1 and DMB3(3) of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraphs 143 and 145(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Principle of Development:**

The application site is located within the defined Green Belt, as such and at a local level, Key Statement EN1 is primarily (but not solely) engaged and at a national level Paragraphs 143 to 147 of the National Planning Policy Framework are also primarily engaged for the purposes of assessing the proposal, in particular in relation to any harm to the Green belt which may be resultant from the proposal.

Key Statement EN1 is explicit insofar that 'the overall extent of the green belt will be maintained to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment. The development of new buildings will be limited to the purposes of agriculture, forestry, essential outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the green belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of the designation'.

In this respect the statement is clear in that the development of new buildings will solely be restricted, for the purposes of this application, to that which is deemed to be 'essential' outdoor sport and recreation. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed recreational facilities are in any way 'essential' in terms of local economic benefit or in support of existing facilities. Whilst it is recognised there may be some limited local economic benefit, this would not be considered to be nor has it been demonstrated that this would be fundamental or necessary in absolute as the definition of 'essential' would imply.

Further consideration must also be given to national level planning policy as embodied within the National Planning Policy Framework which remains material to the determination and consideration of the application. In this respect Paragraph 145 of the framework is of prime relevance, Para.145 states that Local planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt further providing a number of exceptions.

Para.145(c) states that 'the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it'.

Therefore, whilst Para.145(c) may be considered to be permissive of the provision of facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, this exception is only engaged where the facilities would 'preserve the openness of the Green Belt'. As such, should it be determined that the proposal undermines the openness of the Green Belt, the exception is disengaged and the proposal must be considered to be in conflict with this part of the Framework.

Given visual harm has been identified (Visual Amenity/External Appearance) that considers the proposal would fundamentally undermine the visual and spatial openness of the Green belt, it must therefore be considered that the proposed development fails to benefit from the permissive exceptions of Paragraph 145(c).

Policy DMB3 is also or relevant given the proposed development seeks to create that which could be considered as being recreation and tourism development. In this respect Policy DMB3 states that

planning permission will be granted for development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the borough subject to a number of criteria, one of which being that 'the proposal must not conflict with other policies' of the adopted development plan and that 'the development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design'. As above, given that visual harm has been identified that undermines the character, quality and visual amenities of the area, it must therefore be considered that the proposal is in direct conflict with Policy DMB3 and as such the supportive and permissive nature of the policy in respect of tourism and recreational development is fully disengaged.

Taking into account the above matters it is considered that the proposal is considered contrary to the aims and provisions of Key Statement EN1 insofar that it does not represent 'essential outdoor sport or recreation'. It is further considered that the proposal has intrinsic conflict with Policy DMB3 of the Ribble valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 145 of the National planning Policy Framework.

It is recognised that Paragraph 144 of the Framework, allows for harm within the Green Belt if such harm is outweighed by other considerations that would constitute 'very special circumstances'. However, it is not considered that such special circumstances have been adequately or robustly demonstrated that would outweigh the significant visual and landscape harm from the proposal. As such it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 144 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar that 'very special circumstances' have not been demonstrated that would outweigh the identified visual harm to the Green Belt resultant from the development.

#### **Landscape/Ecology:**

The application has been supported by the submission of a Phase 1 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) (July 2020). The assessment seeks to ascertain the impact upon trees within influencing distance of the proposed development and associated works.

The application site is bounded to the north and east by extensive areas of woodland that are afforded protection through a Tree Preservation Order (Carr Hall Woodlands) with other areas of woodland also being present to the south that do not directly abut the application site.

The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment identifies the removal of 7.3% of an area of category B woodland (0.1095Ha) and the 100% removal of a Category C tree grouping (0.0021ha loss). However no mitigation for the proposed woodland loss has been provided and no details of replacement tree-planting have been provided.

In addition, the submitted report identifies (Para. 3.3) that the detail of the 'Electric Bike Adventure Track' alignment and construction were not made available at the time of undertaking the AIA nor were details of the construction methodology available. As such it cannot realistically be considered that the proposal accords with Policy DME1 insofar that it is clear that the impact of the track, and its construction and use, has not been considered and as such the detailed impact upon protected areas of woodland cannot be fully ascertained based on the submitted supporting information.

The above matters are further clarified in Para. 4.13 of the submitted AIA assessment which states that to allow for a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) to be completed, details of the 'alignment and construction methodology of the quad bike off-roading track including track design, final surface finish, level changes and construction layout access layout and specification' will be required.

As such and taking account of the above it is considered that the proposal is in direct conflict with Policies DME1 and DME2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that the applicant has failed to provide adequate information in relation to the potential impacts of the alignment, levels and construction of the 'Electric Bike Adventure Track' upon trees that are afforded protection through a

Tree Preservation Order. It is further considered that the proposal will result in the unacceptable loss of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order that are considered to be of high landscape amenity value without adequate mitigation having been proposed.

**Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**

As such, taking account of the above, it is considered that the proposal represents inappropriate development within the defined Green Belt which results in significant harm to the visual character and openness of the character of the Green belt for which 'very special circumstances' have not been demonstrated that would outweigh the identified visual harm resultant from the development.

It is further considered that the proposed development, by virtue of the quantum, design, scale and external appearance of the proposed buildings, glamping pods, parking provision, boundary treatments and associated 'Natural Playground' would result in the introduction of an incongruous, anomalous and discordant form of development that fails to respond positively to the character of the area and would result in development that fundamentally and significantly compromises the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt.

Taking account of the information submitted in support of the application it is further considered that the applicant has failed to submit adequate information that demonstrates that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.

It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That planning consent be refused for the following reason(s)

01	The proposal is contrary to Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the requirements of Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar that the applicant has failed to submit adequate information that demonstrates that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.
02	The proposal, by virtue of the quantum, design, scale and external appearance of the proposed buildings, glamping pods and associated 'Natural Playground' would result in the introduction of an incongruous, anomalous and discordant form of development that fails to respond positively to the character of the area and would result in development that fundamentally and significantly compromises the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN1 and Policies DMG1 and DMB3(3) of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraphs 143 and 145(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework.
03	The proposal, when taking account of existing built-form, would result in a cumulative level of development that fundamentally and significantly compromises the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Key Statement EN1 and Policies DMG1 and DMB3(3) of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraphs 143 and 145(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework.
04	The proposal is considered contrary to the aims and provisions of Key Statement EN1 insofar that it does not represent 'essential outdoor sport or recreation'. It is further considered that the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 144 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar that 'very special circumstances' have not been demonstrated that would outweigh the identified visual harm to the Green Belt resultant from the development.
05	The proposal is in direct conflict with Policies DME1 and DME2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy insofar that the applicant has failed to provide adequate information in relation to the potential impacts of the alignment, levels and construction of the 'quad bike track' upon

trees that are afforded protection through a Tree Preservation Order. It is further considered that the proposal will result in the unacceptable loss of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order that are considered to be of high landscape amenity value without adequate mitigation having being proposed.