|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | | **Officer:** | MC | | | | **Date:** | | 21/11/2024 | | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **27/11/24** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | | | 3/2024/0687 | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | | | 28/10/2024 | | | **Site Notice:** | | 28/10/2024 | |
| **Officer:** | | | | | MC | | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | **REFUSAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | | Regularisation of change of use of woodland to wedding venue, including creation of hard standing, construction of toilet block and storage container and construction of large marquee area consisting of joined and separate tipis. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | | **Bowland Wild Boar Park Wardsley Road Chipping PR3 2HB** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Parish Council:** | | | | | | Bowland with Leagram Parish Council object to the proposed development, noting the following points:   * The proposal conflicts with DMG1 in that it would affect the amenity of the surrounding area due to excessive noise levels * Conflicts with Policy DMB3 as it relates to the Forest of Bowland AONB and not represent high standard of design, would introduce a built development into an area largely void, would be large in scale, not reflect local character. * Conflict with DMG1 in relation to harmful traffic issues * Proposal cannot comply with recommendations made in the Ecology Advice Report due to development being retrospective   A number of conditions are also suggested in relation to guest numbers, parking restrictions, noise level restrictions, time limits, waste management, ecology/landscaping and lighting conditions. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | | | The LHA object to the development on the grounds of inappropriate access for the intensification of the use of the site, increase in traffic on rural roads with no footways or street lighting. Further objections on increase in vehicle movements when compared to that of an education centre.  The LHA note there would be an under provision of two parking spaces and concerns are raised that the site is located in an unsustainable location with a reliance on private motor vehicle. | | | | | | | | | |
| **RVBC Countryside Officer:** | | | | | | The Countryside Officer considers that a tree/landscape masterplan should be secured by condition. | | | | | | | | | |
| **RVBC Engineers:** | | | | | | No response received | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC AONB Officer:** | | | | | | No response received | | | | | | | | | |
| **RVBC Environmental Health:** | | | | | | Environmental Health Officer recommends the inclusion of a sound limiter condition to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 objections have been received raising the following concerns:   * Excessive noise levels in the rural area and impact on amenity of nearby residents * Noise is being heard from the wedding events far from venue e.g. Dinkling Green * There should be curfew times during the week * Traffic concerns e.g. impact on rural roads, impassable areas, safety concerns as there are no street lights and increase in traffic as a result of development * The road surfacing is poor in the area and allowing the development would make it worse * Impact on farmers and traffic implications for when livestock is being moved etc * The development is not necessary and may cause noise impacts on tourists who come AONB * Impact on local wildlife and the animals at the Boar Park * Negative impact on property value * Proposal does not accord with the design policies of the Core Strategy * The development is not for tourism * Impact on registered ancient woodland | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **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 EN2: Landscape  Key Statement EC1: Business and Employment Development  Key Statement EC3: Visitor Economy  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations  Policy DMG3: Transport And Mobility  Policy DMG1: General Considerations  Policy DME1: Protecting Trees And Woodlands  Policy DME2: Landscape And Townscape Protection  Policy DME3: Site And Species Protection And Conservation  Policy DMB1: Supporting Business Growth And The Local Economy  Policy DMB3: Recreation And Tourism Development  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  **3/2024/0293**  Approval of details reserved by conditions 4 (construction traffic management plan), 6 (landscaping and maintenance scheme), 8 (Sustainable Drainage Scheme) 9 (drainage maintenance and management plan) and 11 (proposed landscaping) of planning permission 3/2023/0509.  Approved with Conditions  **3/2023/0509**  Change of use of land to erect a further five holiday lodges and four camping pods.  Approved with Conditions  **3/2023/0278**  Non material amendment to application 3/2020/0579, involving the revision to the general arrangement of the holiday lodges and their orientation and relocation of the sewage treatment plan.  Refused  **3/2021/0240**  Discharge of condition 6 (Construction Management Plan) of planning application 3/2020/0579.  Approved with Conditions  **3/2020/0579**  Change of use of land to erect nine holiday lodges with parking and an associated package sewage treatment plant.  Approved with Conditions  **3/2016/0027**  Change of use of field to create camp site for five camping pods, toilet and shower building, access and car park.  Approved with Conditions  **3/2010/0234**  Proposed erection of an ‘Iron Age’ round house  Approved with Conditions  **3/2002/0588**  Proposed extension to visitor centre to form cafe and extra toilet facilities  Approved with Conditions  **3/2001/0932**  Proposed extension to information centre for curing of wild boar meat  Approved with Conditions  **3/1999/0559**  Conversion of barn to form visitor centre and wardens accommodation. public toilets and food store  Approved with Conditions  **3/1998/0077**  Visitor car park, improvement to access road  Approved with Conditions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The site is located approximately 4.1 kilometres to the north-east of the Tier 2 Village of Chipping within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). The site is located to the west of the Bowland Wild Boar Park within a wooded area. Access to the site is off Little Bowland Road and descends down a private, narrow track which provides access to the Boar Park, holiday lodges and the unauthorised wedding venue.  The site comprises an area of hardstanding and a cleared area within the woodland which has been used for wedding events. As a result, gravel chipping has been laid, as well as a decking area for tipi’s as well as a storage container, material tent and mobile home. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The development is retrospective and is for the change of use of woodland to a wedding venue. Retrospective permission is also being sought for the erection of the decking, hardstanding and the storage containers (although the toilet block is proposed and was not visible at the planning officers site visit).  The proposal includes the erection of tipis as part of the wedding venue which comprise of 4 no. joined up tipi’s and 1 no. separate tipi for indoor poor weather condition ceremonies. The tipis would have a maximum height of approximately 7.2 metres. Elevation plans of the storage container and catering tent has now been provided (drawing ref: A4011-PL15) and the agent has confirmed by email that the toilets will be standard Portaloo style toilets.  The tipis would be located centrally within the site, with the toilet block being sited to the north and the storage unit to the west of the tipi’s. The site has an area of hardstanding for parking and gravel paths leading into the venue area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  An assessment must be made as to whether the principle of allowing the wedding venue would be acceptable. It is acknowledged that the Borough has a number of wedding venues operating, however each application must be assessed on its own merits.  Key Statement DS1 relates to new development and seeks to direct new housing development within an identified strategic site and the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Whalley and Longridge in addition to Tier 1 Villages which are the more sustainable of the Borough’s 32 defined settlements. The same policy also requires ‘development’ within the Borough’s remaining 23 Tier 2 Village settlements to meet proven local needs or deliver regeneration benefits.  Key statement DS2 states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.  In addition, Key Statement EC3 states that:  *‘Proposals that contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy of Ribble Valley will be encouraged, including the creation of new accommodation and tourism facilities through the conversion of existing buildings or associated with existing attractions. Significant new attractions will be supported, in circumstances where they would deliver overall improvements to the environment and benefits to local communities and employment opportunities’.*  Also relevant is Policy DMG2 which requires development within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas to meet at least one of six considerations which are listed as follows:  *1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area.*  *2. The development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.*  *3. The development is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such.*  *4. The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area.*  *5. The development is for small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.*  *6. The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation*  In addition, Policy DMG1 states that development *should ‘be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials’.*  Policy DMB1 states that:  ‘P*roposals that are intended to support business growth and the local economy will be supported in principle. Development proposals will be determined in accord with the core strategy and detailed policies of the LDF as appropriate’.*  It also states *‘the expansion of established firms on land outside settlements will be allowed provided it is essential to maintain the existing source of employment and can be assimilated within the local landscape. There may be occasions where due to the scale of the proposal relocation to an alternative site is preferable’.*  Policy DMB3 states:  *‘Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the borough. This is subject to the following criteria being met:*  *1. the proposal must not conflict with other policies of this plan;*  *2. the proposal must be physically well related to an existing main settlement or village or to an existing group of buildings, except where the proposed facilities are required in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction and there are no suitable existing buildings or developed sites available;*  *3. the development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design;*  *4. the proposals should be well related to the existing highway network. It should not generate additional traffic movements of a scale and type likely to cause undue problems or disturbance. where possible the proposals should be well related to the public transport network;*  *5. the site should be large enough to accommodate the necessary car parking, service areas and appropriate landscaped areas; and*  *6. the proposal must take into account any nature conservation impacts using suitable survey information and where possible seek to incorporate any important existing associations within the development. failing this then adequate mitigation will be sought.*  *In the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty the following criteria will also apply:*  *1. the proposal should display a high standard of design appropriate to the area.*  *2. the site should not introduce built development into an area largely devoid of structures (other than those directly related to agriculture or forestry uses).*  *In the AONB it is important that development is not of a large scale. in the AONB and immediately adjacent areas proposals should contribute to the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape’.*  The key policy test is that contained within Policy DMG2 which requires development outside of settlements to be essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area, small-scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area or small-scale uses appropriate to a local area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.  A planning statement has been submitted in support of the application, stating that the development would meet the local need for rural tourism, however the application has not been supported by way of evidence to demonstrate that there is a local need for a wedding venue in the Borough. The applicant puts forward the argument that the use of a wedding venue in this location would provide a unique venue in an attractive location and would assist in contributing towards the visitor economy of the borough and the rural economy of the Ribble Valley.  It is considered that there will be some social and economic benefits to allowing a wedding venue to operate in this location, for example providing business to local holiday accommodations and through the employment of caterers, DJ’s etc and it could provide economic benefits to the Bowland Wild Boar Park attraction and Bowland Escapes Holiday Park, if guests choose to stay overnight in the accommodation adjacent to the site. However, the development cannot be considered essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area and no supporting evidence has been submitted to demonstrate this.  Turning to scale the venue can accommodate up to 150 day guests and 200 evening guests. The submitted statement does identify that based on current bookings, the numbers are suggested to be nearer the number of 65 day guests with 35 additional evening guests. Notwithstanding this, if the capacity is that of up to 200 evening guests, it is not considered that this could identify as small-scale use, appropriate to a rural area.  The objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the Parish Council in relation to the scale of the development within the National Landscape are noted. The intensification of the use of the site by way of the size and scale of the venue capacity is not considered to be appropriate to this rural location within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape.  The main argument for supporting the development by the applicant, is that it would boost the visitor economy to the associated Boar Park and holiday lodges, however not all guests would be able to be accommodated on site nor may they choose to stay on site and the supporting statement identifies that any holiday accommodation not occupied by the venue would be let out to other guests, contributing further to the scale of the use cumulatively on site.  Whilst the built development would be mostly screened from the public realm, the nature of the use and guests number associated with the development is considered to be large in scale as noted above and this, coupled with the existing use of the Boar Park (which mainly operates in the summer months alongside the wedding venue) and holiday lodges would have the potential for large numbers of visitors to a fairly isolated location within the National Landscape, including large numbers of vehicles navigating quiet and narrow roads in the evenings and at night time.  As such, the proposal is not considered to be a small-scale tourism or recreational development appropriate to a rural area or a small-scale use appropriate to a local area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated. It would fail to contribute to the protection or conservation of the National Landscape and the scale and nature of the development would undermine its character and quality. Therefore, the scheme fails to satisfy policy DMG2.  The applicant considers that the use is compliant with Policy DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, with particular focus on the development operating in association with the existing Bowland Wild Boar Park and Bowland Escapes Holiday Park which are rural attractions within the Borough.  With regards to Policy DMB1, paragraph 7.3 of the submitted planning statement indicates that the wedding venue would be provided in association with the Bowland Wild Boar Park and the Bowland Escapes Holiday Park. This policy allows for the expansion of established firms provided it is essential to maintain the existing source of employment and can be assimilated within the local landscape. No supporting information has been submitted to demonstrate that the wedding venue is essential to maintain the existing Boar Park business which is a source of employment. Furthermore, the wedding venue is considered to be a new enterprise rather than an expansion of the existing Boar Park business.  In terms of the sustainability of the site, Key Statement DMI2 states that:  *‘New development should be located to minimise the need to travel. Also it should incorporate good access by foot and cycle and have convenient links to public transport to reduce the need for travel by private car’.*  Policy DMG3 requires considerable weight to be attached to the availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development.  The site is not located in a sustainable location with poor access to public transport links, being in an isolated location, away from a settlement boundary or public transport with the nearest bus stop being over 5km from the site at Dunsop Road. The roads, being unlit with no separate footways would mean that there would likely be a reliance on the use of private motor vehicle. Whilst the type of wedding venue, being a rural woodland venue may typically be located in locations which are rural and not within built up areas, Criterion 2 is Policy DMB3 states that ‘*the proposal must be physically well related to an existing main settlement or village or to an existing group of buildings, except where the proposed facilities are required in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction and there are no suitable existing buildings or developed sites available’.*  It is acknowledged that policies DMB1 and DMB3 support proposals which would strengthen the local economy, however these policies require certain criteria to be met, and this includes compliance with other development plan policies. Where a conflict is identified, as identified above with policies DMG2 and DMG3, then the general support offered by these policies is considered to be dis-engaged. KS EC3 supports significant new attractions where they would deliver environmental improvements and benefits to the community, which is not the case here.  As such, it is considered that the development fails to comply with Key Statement DS1, DS2 and EC3 and Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMG3, DMB1 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG1 provides specific guidance in relation to amenity and states that all development must:  *‘1. not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.*  *2. provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances.*  *3. have regard to public safety and secured by design principles.*  *4. consider air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible’*  There have been 17 objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties, some of which raise concerns relating to noise. There are no residential properties outside of the Boar Park within immediate proximity of the site, however given the isolated, rural location of the wedding venue, the Council are of the understanding that noise can travel far within these areas depending on weather conditions. The planning statement also notes that weddings would finish by 11.30 and guests left by approximately 12.00am but neighbours have advised that the events have been going on into the early hours of the morning.  A noise assessment has been submitted alongside the application which recommends the use of a sound limiter to limit the noise levels from the venue. The Environmental Health Officer has been consulted on the application and considers that the installation and setting of a noise limiter at a specified sound level would be appropriate to mitigate the impacts of noise. This could be secured by condition. The condition should also require readings to be taken from nearby residential locations.  Subject to the above condition, it is considered that the proposal would comply with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in respect of noise.  A lighting scheme has also been provided for the application which states that there would be minimal lighting over the wider development site and no overspill light as to have any adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. The Environmental Health Officer has not raised any concerns in relation to lighting. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  Key Statement EN2 states:  *‘The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.*  *The landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced.*  *As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials’.*  In addition, Policy DMG1 states that:  In determining planning applications, all development must:  *1. be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 building in context principles (from the cabe/english heritage building on context toolkit.*  *2. be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials.*  *3. consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.*  Policy DMG2 states that development *‘will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. the AONB management plan should be considered and will be used by the council in determining planning applications’*.  There have been a number of objections to the design of the development, stating that the tipis and storage containers are not of a high standard of design and not appropriate development within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape. Whilst the applicant does state that the tipi’s would only be in situ between April – October and they would be dismantled for the remainder of the year, they would on occasion be erected throughout the year for small periods to allow for open days and wedding fayres to take place, as well as for periods over the festive season as a Santa’s Grotto for members of the public.  The tipis would not be highly visible from the public realm within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape as the access road slopes downwards to the site. It is therefore not considered that the tipi’s would be harmful to the character and appearance of the National Landscape as these would be removed after the summer period.  The storage is approximately 1.2 metres long and 2.5 metres in height and as such, is considered fairly large in size. The planning officer noted during the site visit that a mobile home was being stored on the site and one of the storage containers was in situ. As noted above, Policy DMG1 states that development should be of a high standard of design and it is considered the addition of storage containers would be unsympathetic and a discordant form of development within the National Landscape. The Planning Officer was able to visit the site and noted that the existing servicing buildings associated with the holiday lodges and education centre have been constructed as to be in keeping with the surrounding area, for example using traditional cladding and mimicking the appearance of an agricultural building, which is typically found in such rural areas.  Policy DMB3 is of relevance in relation to design, which states that within the AONB (now National Landscape), proposals should not introduce built development into an area largely devoid of structures. It is acknowledged that the Council have granted holiday lodges and glamping pods to the south of the application site in areas of land which were previously devoid of structures, however regard must be had to the use of building materials being predominantly timber which is considered to be more appropriate and sympathetic to the woodland/rural area. Concerns are raised regarding the cumulative impact of built form within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape.  Having regard to the above, the proposal is considered to fail to accord with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 as the development is not considered to constitute high quality design and the storage containers would be an incongruous and discordant addition, failing to protect and conserve the natural beauty of the National Landscape. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Highways and Parking:**  Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policy DMG3 states that:  *‘All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards’.*  In addition, Policy DMG1 states that all development must:  *‘1. consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.*  *2. ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated’.*  *Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that ‘Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe’.*  A Transport Assessment has been submitted as part of the application and the submitted Planning Statement states that the development would not materially impact on the operation of the local road network or on road and pedestrian safety. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been consulted on the application and note that access would be via an existing access onto Little Bowland Road which is a Classified ‘C’ road. They note than an assessment of the site access was undertaken as part of a previous application (planning ref: 3/2020/0579) relating to the holiday lodges which found that the access had visibility splays of 2.4m x 40m to the right and 2.4m x 44m to the left of the site access. These splays were considered to be acceptable (albeit a shortfall) because the development would result in a slight intensification of the use, however they now consider that the development to create a wedding venue of up to 200 people would see a higher level of trips being made to and from the site, particularly in the hours of darkness which is not seen with the existing use. As such, they raise concerns regarding the appropriateness of the access which requires access off a 60mph road to provide visibility splays of 2.4m x 214m in both directions.  The LHA also raise concerns regarding the increased traffic along Wardsley Road (a concern which has also been shared with the Parish Council and local residents). The proposal would result in an intensification of the use of the rural road with no footways or street lighting which has several damaged verges on reduced width sections of the road and on bends and sections where slow two-way movements could take place. They raise concerns that the development would intensify movement along Wardsley Road and contribute to further decline to the carriageway edge and verges.  Furthermore, the LHA is of the opinion that the Bowland Wild Boar Park runs as an education facility rather than a visitor attraction and would be pre-booked and controlled by the applicant. They raise concerns that no information has been provided as to whether the Boar Park would remain open whilst weddings take place and the increased vehicle movements associated with guests to a wedding, caterers and staff, and servicing of the wedding venue, compared to the existing use would have a detrimental impact on highway safety.  Taking into account the above, it is considered that the proposal would fail to accord with Policy DMG1 and Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.  With regards to parking, the LHA note that the submitted information indicates that the venue works in partnership with Bowland Escapes and Horseshoe Glamping Executive Event Hire which can accommodate up to 60 guests. The LHA note that the current bookings suggest this is nearer to 40 guests and the LHA consider that it is expected that 40 vehicles can be accommodated for next to accommodation. The Planning Officer visited the site and noted that the glamping pods did not appear to have parking next to the accommodation and the submitted site plan does not show dedicated parking. The site plan shows 2 no. parking spaces next to the holiday lodges but this is for approximately 28 vehicles and not 40. The LHA also note that no detailed parking plan has been provided to show the parking layout within the application site, although the LHA note that this would likely be able to accommodate 25 spaces.  The LHA recommend that the proposal provides 67 parking spaces and considers there to be a shortfall of 2 parking spaces, however the based on the information submitted within the application and the site visit, it has not been demonstrated that the existing accommodation can provide parking for 40 spaces in addition to the 25 spaces provided within the red line boundary and this would likely be a shortfall of 14 spaces. In the absence of a sufficient parking plan showing the level of parking within the red line and blue line boundary with sufficient space to turn vehicles, the Council cannot be certain that the development is able to provide the required 67 parking spaces for up to 200 guests as recommended by the LHA.  As such, the proposal is considered to conflict with DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Landscape/Ecology:**  Key Statement EN4 states that:  *‘The Council will seek wherever possible to conserve and enhance the area’s biodiversity and geodiversity and to avoid the fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats and help develop green corridors. Where appropriate, cross-Local Authority boundary working will continue to take place to achieve this.*  *Negative impacts on biodiversity through development proposals should be avoided. Development proposals that adversely affect a site of recognised environmental or ecological importance will only be permitted where a developer can demonstrate that the negative effects of a proposed development can be mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for. It will be the developer’s responsibility to identify and agree an acceptable scheme, accompanied by appropriate survey information, before an application is determined. There should, as a principle be a net enhancement of biodiversity’*.  The proposal has resulted in the loss of woodland by introduction of buildings/structures and chippings/shingle to provide car parking and walkways within the venue. The submitted landscape management plan indicates that replacement planting is proposed to the north of the application site.  With regards to Biodiversity Net-Gain (BNG), the application is retrospective and there is therefore not a requirement for the development to achieve a 10% BNG. Notwithstanding the above, the applicant has provided a BNG statement which indicates that the development would achieve a net-gain of 12.93%. However, the report contradicts itself by stating that BNG would be achieved by on-site and off-site measures in the ‘summary’ section but then states that BNG would be achieved by off-site measures only on page 19.  The applicant stated during the site visit that the trees have been replanted to the north of the site already, although no specific detailed have been provided within the application to state the type of planting or numbers. In addition, no detailed proposed landscaping plan has been provided within the submitted documentation. The Countryside Officer considers that a tree/landscape masterplan should be secured by condition to ensure that any loss of landscaping is accommodated for. Whilst a 10% mandatory BNG is not required, it is considered that any grant of permission should include a planting schedule and implementation timeline and an updated landscape management and maintenance makes reference to the new updated landscaping plan to compensate for the loss of woodland.  In addition to this, concerns have been raised by the Parish Council that the recommendations outlined within the submitted Ecology Report dated 5th April 2024 cannot be secured as the works have already taken place and concerns have been raised by local residents of the potential harm to wildlife and animals at the Boar Park from the development.  The site is located adjacent to the Swaney Holme Wood and New Ground Wood Biological Heritage Site which runs to the north-east of the access road and comprises Ancient Woodland.  Policy DME4 states that:  *‘Development proposals that would result in loss or damage to ancient woodlands will be refused unless the need for, and the benefits of, the development in that location outweigh the loss of the woodland habitat. in addition, in circumstances where a development would affect an ancient woodland, the borough council will seek to include appropriate woodland planting and management regimes through planning conditions and*  *Agreements’.*  Key Statement EN4 also states that development proposals that are likely to adversely affect county biological heritage sites will not be granted planning permission. It then states:  *‘Exceptions will only be made where it can clearly be demonstrated that the benefits of a development at a site outweigh both the local and the wider impacts. planning conditions or agreements will be used to secure protection or, in the case of any exceptional development as defined above, to mitigate any harm, unless arrangements can be made through planning conditions or agreements to secure their protection’.*  The submitted Ecology Survey and Assessment indicates that the development has the potential to impact on the Biological Heritage Sites and protected species.  Whilst some of the recommendations within the report cannot be secured by condition as the works have been completed, such as advising workers of their duties in relation to protected species, some of the suggested recommendations such as re-checks by an ecologist and other recommendations such as lighting controls and storage of materials to avoid contamination to the Biological Heritage Site could still be secured by planning condition and biodiversity enhancements could be achieved through the use of a ecology management plan condition.  Having regard to the above, it is considered that additional landscaping and ecological management details could be secured through the use of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, if permission were to be granted. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Matters:**  Policy DME6 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that:  *‘Development will not be permitted where the proposal would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.*  *Applications for development should include appropriate measures for the conservation, protection and management of water such that development contributes to:*  *1. preventing pollution of surface and / or groundwater*  *2. reducing water consumption*  *3. reducing the risk of surface water flooding (for example the use of sustainable drainage systems (suds))*  *as a part of the consideration of water management issues, and in parallel with flood management objectives, the authority will also seek the protection of the borough’s water courses for their biodiversity value.*  *All applications for planning permission should include details for surface water drainage and means of disposal based on sustainable drainage principles. the use of the public sewerage system is the least sustainable form of surface water drainage and therefore development proposals will be expected to investigate and identify more sustainable alternatives to help reduce the risk of surface water flooding and*  *environmental impact’.*  The submitted planning statement indicates that the surface water drainage position will remain largely the same as existing and notes that the creation of additional hardstanding through the introduction of stone chippings would mean that the water drains through this area first before penetrating into the ground as per the previous position. They consider that there is no increase in impermeable areas, as all of the areas of hardstanding will still allow surface water to drain to ground.  Turning to foul waste, the submitted planning statement indicates that this will all be disposed of through the temporary toilet cabin, which will be removed from site and will not be permanently drained given it is not a permanent structure. On that basis, there will be no change to the current drainage of surface water or foul waste that would result in any impacts from this development.  Having regard to the above, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flooding elsewhere.  Other comments have been made from the occupiers of neighbouring properties raising concerns that the proposal would negatively impact on their property price, however this is not a material planning consideration that would impact on the determination of this planning application. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  Having regard to all material considerations, it is considered that the development is not essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area and is not a small-scale tourism or recreational use that is appropriate to the rural area. The isolated nature of the site means that the development will be dependent on private motor vehicles. Whilst Policies DMB3 and DMB1 generally support the expansion of existing businesses and sites for tourism and visitor facilities in the Borough which are related to an existing group of buildings, this general support is considered disengaged where there is a conflict with other policies within the LDF as is the case here. Furthermore, issues have been highlighted with respect to design and highway safety implications/parking. As such, significant weight is given to the negative environmental impacts of the development and this outweighs the social and economic benefits identified.  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, by reason of its size, scale, nature, visual impact and dependence on the use of private motor vehicle due to the site’s isolated location with limited access to public transport or access by cycling or foot, is not considered to constitute a small-scale use appropriate to a rural area. Nor is it considered, or been demonstrated, to be essential to the local economy or social well-being of the area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Key Statement DS1, DS2 and EC3 and Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMG3, DMB1 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework which requires sustainable development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **02:** | The development would be sited in an unsustainable, isolated location with limited access to public transport or access by cycling or foot, with a reliance on private motor vehicle. Access to the site including use of local rural roads by a significant number of private motor vehicles is considered un-safe and the development would fail to integrate into the local environment without a significant negative impact on the highway network. Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal can achieve adequate parking provision, appropriate to the scale of development. The proposal would therefore be unacceptable in terms of highway safety, contrary to Key Statement DM12 and Policies DMG1 and DMG3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **03:** | The development by reason of the size, siting and design of the storage container fails to achieve a high standard of design and would introduce an unsympathetic and discordant form of development that would fail to contribute to the protection or conservation of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape. The proposal therefore does not comply with Key Statement EC2 and Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMB1 and DMB3 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework in particular paragraph 135. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |