

Addendum

LA01/2021/1530/F

1.0 Update

1.1 Correspondence was received from the agent via email on the 23.10.2023 which included a letter.

1.2 The letter advised that;

- “The planning report refers to application LA01/2019/0614/F which was previously approved and states that this is not similar to our proposal. My client feels that this is not accurate and sets a precedent for our proposal.”
- “This was for two pods outside development limits and not farm diversification. It states that it was approved due to integration and that our proposal does not integrate. Again this is inaccurate as paragraph 2.1 of the planners report clearly states that “the majority of the boundaries of the site consist of mature hedging. The western roadside frontage is also supplemented by a line of trees which sit to the rear of the boundary treatment”.”
- “Surely this mature vegetation and treeline will afford an excellent degree of integration. The client has offered to supplement and augment the vegetation should the Committee feel this necessary.”
- “The planner refers to the hut being prominent, however a point that was failed to be mentioned was that the ground levels of the proposal are lower than that of the Finvoy Road which will result in the hut be settled down into the field and surrounding vegetation.”
- Reference was made to Planning Approval LA01/2019/0614/F being “almost identical to my client’s application”.
- The agent advises that his client is happy to meet DfI Roads request and satisfy the provisions of this policy.
- Rural and traditional in its design, and modest in terms of size and scale.
- Potential to also yield economic benefits for the local area.
- Complies with the provisions of CTY 1 and also CTY 13.

2.0 Consideration:

- 2.1 The proposal is for a single Shepherd's hut style glamping pod for holiday let. The principle of development has not been established on the site as the proposal does not meet with any of the policy provisions for tourism development which are outlined in either Planning Policy Statement 21 Sustainable Development in the Countryside or Planning Policy Statement 16 Tourism.
- 2.2 As detailed in the Committee report at paragraph 8.8, Application LA01/2019/0614/F is not comparable to the proposal application as this proposal sought two no. camping pods. In this instance it was considered that the two pods were capable of successfully integrating into the site. As detailed in the Committee report, each site must be assessed on its own merits.
- 2.3 By virtue of its design, the Shepherds hut style glamping pod sits elevated off the ground and therefore despite the existing boundary vegetation it is considered that the introduction of this type of development, which in principle is unacceptable, will result in a detrimental impact to the rural character of the immediate surrounding area. The Old Finvoy Road, while a minor road, still provides public views of the site and given the design and siting of the proposal, concerns in relation to integration remain as detailed in paragraphs 8.10-8.12 of the Committee report.
- 2.4 Paragraph 6.260 of the SPPS requires planning authorities to carefully manage tourism development in the countryside. While proposals for overnight tourist accommodation may have the potential to yield economic benefits for the local area, it is unlikely that this would outweigh the concerns with regards to the proposal. The principle of development has not been established and the proposal is contrary to policy as detailed in the Committee report.
- 2.5 No further information has been provided to address comments provided by DfI Roads in their response dated 21st April 2022. The agent was offered the opportunity to address these but as the principle of development was not considered acceptable no further information was provided. As it has not been demonstrated that

the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on road safety
the proposal is contrary to Policy AMP 2 of PPS 3.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to refuse the planning application in accordance with paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee Report.