

5g 3/12/1195/FP – Replacement of the kitchen and food preparation area to the marquee at Paradise Wildlife Park, White Stubbs Lane, Bayford, Broxbourne, Herts, EN10 7QA for Mr P Sampson

Date of Receipt: 16.07.2012

Type: Full – Minor

Parish: BRICKENDON LIBERTY

Ward: HERTFORD HEATH

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Three Year time limit (1T121)
2. Approved plans - (1T102; PWP 501/003B; PWP/12/5301/01; PWP/12/5301/02; PWP/12/5301/03; PWP/12/5301/04 and PWP/12/5301/05)

Directive:

1. Other legislation (01OL1)

Summary of Reasons for Decision

The proposal has been considered with regard to the policies of the Development Plan (East of England Plan May 2008, Hertfordshire County Structure Plan, Minerals Local Plan, Waste Local Plan and the saved policies of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007 and in particular policies ENV1, LRC10 and GBC1) and guidance provided in the National Planning Policy Framework. The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies is that permission should be granted.

_____ (119512FP.MC)

1.0 Background:

- 1.1 The application site forms part of Paradise Wildlife Park and lies within the north west corner of the Park as shown on the attached OS extract. The park site itself lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 1.2 The proposal is for the extension of the existing marquee to provide a new kitchen and food preparation area. The marquee was granted permission in October 2008 and is used for various functions ancillary to the wider Wildlife Park use. The applicant indicates that it has played a

3/12/1195/FP

major part in providing visitor experiences over many years but that the food preparation/kitchen area is in need of modernisation. The proposed extension would therefore replace the existing tarpaulin structure which is currently used for the storage and preparation of food for functions at the marquee.

- 1.3 The proposed extension would be timber clad with a pitched roof to match the height and pitch of the adjacent marquee. It would be no wider than the existing tarpaulin structure, and no deeper than the marquee structure itself.

2.0 Site History:

- 2.1 There is a lengthy planning history for this site, of which Members may be aware. It is not intended to repeat the full history here, but the following application is considered to be relevant in this case:-

- 3/08/1401/FP – Retention of event marquee – Approved October 2008.

3.0 Consultation Responses:

- 3.1 No consultation responses have been received at the time of writing this report. However, any representations received prior to the date of committee will be reported at the meeting.

4.0 Parish Council Representations:

- 4.1 Brickendon Liberty Parish Council had not commented on the application at the time of writing this report but, again, any representations received prior to the date of committee will be reported to Members at the meeting.

5.0 Other Representations:

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by way of site notice and neighbour notification.
- 5.2 No letters of representation have been received as of the time of writing this report.

6.0 Policy:

- 6.1 The relevant 'saved' Local Plan policies in this application include the

following:

GBC1 Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
ENV1 Design and Environmental Quality
LRC10 Tourism

6.2 In addition, the guidance on tourism development (Section 3) and development within the Green Belt (Section 9) provided within the National Planning Policy Framework is relevant to the consideration of this application.

7.0 **Considerations:**

- 7.1 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein inappropriate development will not be permitted except in very special circumstances. The proposed development is an inappropriate form of development as it is a building/structure for a purpose which does not fall within the categories defined as appropriate in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Members will be aware that, when this is the case, for permission to be granted, the harm by way of inappropriateness and any other harm caused by the development must be clearly outweighed by other material considerations. This approach is set out in policy GBC1 of the Local Plan, and supported by the NPPF.
- 7.2 The marquee is located well within the park, away from any of the boundaries. The design of the extension would be in keeping with the established character of the marquee and it is not considered that it will have any significant visual impact in the surrounding area. Given its design and location, officers are therefore of the view that limited harm would be caused to the Green Belt by the extension in terms of either its appearance or its impact on the openness or rural character of the area. It is considered to be acceptable in accordance with the requirements of policy ENV1 of the Local Plan.
- 7.3 The main issue to consider in the determination of the application then is whether there are other matters to which such weight can be assigned that the harm by way of inappropriateness and the other harm, if any, is clearly outweighed.
- 7.4 Policy LRC10 of the Local Plan states that the Council will encourage suitable tourism proposals in appropriate locations, and this is in line with guidance in Section 3 of the NPPF. Paradise Wildlife Park has previously been recognised by the Committee as a “major educational attraction that provided local employment” (Development Control Committee minutes for the meeting of 19th November 2008) and in general is

considered to be a valuable and beneficial tourism facility. Given this, it is felt that significant weight can be assigned to the development of facilities that enable the potential of the attraction to be enhanced.

8.0 Conclusion:

- 8.1 Given the limited visual impact of the kitchen extension beyond its immediate locality and its value to the Park's operations, it is considered that the limited harm caused to the Green Belt in this case is clearly outweighed by the tourism benefits of the proposal and that very special circumstances therefore exist to justify the approval of the proposed extension.
- 8.2 It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions suggested at the head of this report.