

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	260596
Site Address:	Land Opposite Junction Of Forest Road &, Foxley Lane, Binfield, Bracknell, Berkshire
Expiry Date:	22 May 2026
Site Visit Date:	8 th March 2026
Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of stable block, consisting of no.3 stable stalls with associated hardstanding driveway.	

PLANNING POLICY	
National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP2 – Inclusive Communities CP3 – General Principles for Development CP4 – Infrastructure Requirements CP6 – Managing Travel Demand CP7 – Biodiversity CP8 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area CP11 – Proposals Outside Development Limits
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB02 – Development adjoining the Green Belt TB08 – Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities Standards TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS5 – Development in the countryside FD1 – Development and flood risk (from all sources) FD2 – Sustainable drainage NE1 – Biodiversity and geodiversity NE2 – Biodiversity net gain NE3 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area NE4 – Trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows NE5 – Landscape and design NE6 – Valued landscapes DH7 – Equestrian development

	HC3 – Local Green Space HC10 – Odor, fumes and dust
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
N/A	N/A	N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage- No objection subject to condition(s)
WBC Highways- Request further information before determination
WBC Landscape and Trees- No objection subject to condition(s)
WBC Ecology Newts- Request further information before determination
WBC Ecology- Request further information before determination

External

Bracknell Forest Council- Objection:

As part of the site falls within Bracknell Forest Borough, a separate planning application will need to be submitted to Bracknell Forest Council. The impact on the trees along the border will be assessed at this time.

In its current iteration, the application would not be supported by Bracknell Forest Council due to impact on highway safety. Bracknell Forest Council as Highway Authority for the access location objects and recommends that the application is refused. The proposed access would not provide safe and suitable access for all users and would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety due to insufficient visibility, insufficient set back of gate into the site and the deposit of loose material onto the highway resulting from the proposed hoggin surfacing of the access road, contrary to BFC Local Plan policy LP25 vi & vii and the NPPF at paragraphs 115 b) and 116.

Bracknell Forest Highway response:

Bracknell Forest Council as Highway Authority for the access location objects and recommends that the application is refused. The proposed access would not provide safe and suitable access for all users and would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety due to insufficient visibility, insufficient set-back of gate into the site and the deposit of loose material onto the highway resulting from the proposed hoggin surfacing of the access road, contrary to BFC Local Plan policy LP25 vi & vii and the NPPF at paragraphs 115 b) and 116.

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No objection
---------------------	--------------

Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application is an open agricultural field within the designated countryside. It is located adjacent to other open fields which are broadly surrounded by hedgerow and trees. The application site comprises an area of open grassland measuring approximately 0.4 hectares. It is located within the area of Wokingham Borough, adjacent to the boundary with the Borough of Bracknell Forest. Forest Road is a designated B road.

Proposal:

This application seeks permission for the proposed erection of a stable block, consisting of no.3 stable stalls with associated hardstanding driveway.

Principle of Development:

The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The site lies within the Countryside as designated in the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy. Core Strategy policy CP11 states, in order to protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of the environment, proposals outside of development limits will not normally be permitted except in certain circumstances.

These exceptions are:

- 1) *It contributes to diverse and sustainable rural enterprises within the borough, or in the case of other countryside-based enterprises and activities, it contributes and/or promotes recreation in, and enjoyment of, the countryside; and*
- 2) *It does not lead to excessive encroachment or expansion of development away from the original buildings; and*
- 3) *It is contained within suitably located buildings which are appropriate for conversion, or in the case of replacement buildings would bring about environmental improvement; or*
- 4) *In the case of residential extensions, does not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building;*
- 5) *In the case of replacement dwellings the proposal must:*
 - i) *Bring about environmental improvements;*
 - or ii) *Not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building.*
- 6) *Essential community facilities cannot be accommodated within development limits or through the re-use/replacement of an existing building*

7) Affordable housing on rural exception sites in line with CP9.

The relevant criteria for the proposal are criteria 1, 2 and 3. The proposed stables and associated equestrian use would constitute a countryside-based activity. However, the development is considered to represent an excessive encroachment of built form into an open field that would be disproportionate to the keeping of three horses. There are no existing buildings or areas of hard surfacing on the site, and the proposed stables and hard surfacing would extend laterally across the site, resulting in a significant change from its current open and undeveloped character. As such, the proposal fails to comply with criteria 2 and 3 of Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy. This matter is considered in further detail in the *Impact on Landscape Character* section of this report.

The provision of Pasture and Grazing for Horses:

The proposed use of the application site is for equestrian purposes, which represents a material change of use from agriculture. The red-line application site comprises a limited parcel of land, within which the proposed stable building and associated hardstanding would occupy a substantial proportion of the available area, leaving a restricted extent of residual land.

Whilst there is no prescribed policy standard for land take associated with private equestrian use, it is necessary to consider whether the scale and siting of the proposed built development is proportionate to, and functionally justified by, the level of activity that could reasonably be accommodated within the application site. In this case, the limited size and configuration of the red-line site would significantly constrain the amount of land available for paddock use, such that the proposed stable building would not be supported by a commensurate extent of equestrian land within the site.

The British Horse Society guidance, whilst not policy, provides a recognised benchmark of 1-1.5 acres per horse, which illustrates that the amount of land typically required to support the keeping of horses is materially greater than that available within the application site. The application site is approximately 1 acre and given the extent of proposed development that would occupy the majority of the site, would not be sufficient outside space for one horse. This reinforces the conclusion that the proposed stable building would be disproportionate to the level of equestrian activity that could reasonably be supported within the red-line boundary.

The applicant has referred to land shown within the blue-line ownership. However, the assessment of the proposal must be based on the application site as defined by the red-line boundary. The proposed stable building has not been demonstrated to be capable of functioning proportionately and independently within that boundary, and its justification would therefore rely on land outside the application site. This lack of functional containment further undermines the appropriateness of introducing permanent built development into the countryside in this location.

As a result, the proposed development would introduce a stable building and associated hardstanding without sufficient land within the application site to demonstrate that it is necessary, proportionate or justified in planning terms. The limited extent of land available means that the scale of built form would be excessive relative

to the use it is intended to serve, thereby resulting in an unjustified encroachment into the countryside.

For these reasons, the proposal fails to comply with Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy, which requires development to be of an appropriate scale and form, and Policy CP11, which seeks to prevent excessive or unjustified encroachment into the countryside. Even if the red-line boundary were to be extended, the landscape and countryside impacts identified in the following section would remain.

Impact on Landscape and Character of the Area:

Policy and guidance

As stated, one objective of policy CP11 is to maintain the quality of the environment. Policy CP1 sets out that development should *'maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment'* and CP3 states that development should be of *'an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area'*.

Policy CC03 states that *'development proposals which would result in the loss, fragmentation or isolation of areas of green infrastructure will not be acceptable'*. The countryside is stated in the supporting text of the policy as Green Infrastructure.

Policy TB21 of the MDD Local Plan States *'proposals must demonstrate how they have addressed the requirements of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment'* and *'shall retain or enhance the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape.'*

The Council's Landscape Character Assessment identifies the site being within landscape character area I1: Ashridge Farmed Clay Lowlands, which is described as A simple farmed landscape dominated by open arable fields and some pasture, with mature hedgerow trees marking former hedge lines. A valuable feature of the landscape is identified as its 'strong rural character'.

Key characteristics include:

- Agricultural landscape defined by large, open, geometric arable fields of irregular shape.
- Rural and peaceful character.
- Pastoral farming and stud farms and gallops.

Key issues identified in the LCA is a demand and pressure for increased built form and part of the landscape strategy *'is to conserve the sparse settlement pattern through controlling development.'* Some of the the associate guidelines are:

- Conserve the open and rural qualities of the landscape.
- Conserve and protect the rural landscape pattern of mixed arable and pasture fields.
- Maintain the sparse settlement pattern of dispersed farms through control of new development, avoiding linear spread of development.
- Protect the perceptions of rural tranquillity in the landscape, through the management of development.

The NPPF at para 187 states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: *‘recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’*.

Assessment

The proposed development comprises a stable building, access track and associated hardstanding to facilitate the keeping of three horses for private use. Whilst equestrian use is not in itself inappropriate in the countryside, the siting and extent of the proposed built form and engineered surfacing is disproportionate to the modest level of activity proposed and results in unacceptable landscape harm.

The stable building would be positioned centrally within the site, rather than adjacent to an existing boundary or in association with established built form. This isolated siting would interrupt the currently undeveloped field and appear as an incongruous encroachment into the open countryside. The central location also necessitates the introduction of a new access track extending into the site, together with a proportionally substantial area of hardstanding around the building. Taken together, these elements would result in a spread of development across the field, fundamentally altering its open and pastoral character.

The proposal would also fragment the existing field, subdividing what is currently open land. The residual land to the south would be left with a limited grazing function. This form of fragmentation is inconsistent with the objective of protecting the countryside as part of the Borough’s green infrastructure network and conflicts with Policy CC03.

The access track, at approximately 5 metres wide, would be comparable to a two-way vehicular route and would introduce a significant expanse of hard surfacing into an otherwise undeveloped field. In addition, the concrete apron would further increase the extent of impermeable surfacing. Whilst some operational hardstanding may be necessary, the overall extent proposed is excessive and poorly related to the limited scale of the equestrian use. The development would therefore represent an unjustified and urbanising encroachment into the countryside.

It is well established that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside is not dependent solely upon public visibility. Accordingly, the existing vegetation along the southern boundary does not negate the impact of the development. Notwithstanding this, the access track and associated development would be visible from the site entrance and in views into the site, particularly during winter months.

The proposal would conflict with the identified character of Landscape Character Area I1, which is valued for its *‘strong rural character’*, large, open fields and *‘rural and peaceful character’*. The Landscape Character Assessment seeks to *‘conserve the sparse settlement pattern through controlling development’* and to *‘conserve the open and rural qualities of the landscape’*. The introduction development spread laterally across the open field would fail to achieve these objectives and would instead erode landscape openness, fragment the field pattern, and diminish rural tranquillity. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy TB21.

It is acknowledged that the Landscape Character Assessment references the presence of pastoral and equestrian uses within this character area. However, this does not negate the requirement for any associated built development to be appropriately sited and designed, and to be of a scale and extent that is commensurate with its landscape context. In particular, development should be closely related to existing built form or landscape features and avoid unnecessary encroachment into open fields. The current proposal fails to meet these requirements, resulting in an extent and arrangement of development that is harmful to the character and appearance of the countryside.

The scale, layout and form of the development would not be appropriate to the area as required by Policy CP3, nor would it maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment as required by Policy CP1. By fragmenting and urbanising part of the countryside, which forms part of the Borough's green infrastructure network, the proposal conflicts with Policy CC03.

The Council raised concerns regarding the siting of the development and the extent of built form. Whilst amendments were received, these were limited in scope and did not materially address the concerns regarding the spatial spread of development across the site.

Overall, the proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting and extent of built form and hard surfacing relative to the limited level of use and size of the field, would result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and openness of the countryside. The development would represent an unjustified encroachment into an otherwise undeveloped field and would fail to respect the prevailing rural character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CP1, CP3 and CP11 of the Core Strategy, Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan, and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The officer notes the Landscape and Tree officer raises no objection, but the substantive part of the response refers to the impact on trees. For the reasons set out, it is considered that the development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with development plan policies.

Neighbouring Amenity:

The application site is bounded by trees and hedgerow and separated from any neighbouring amenity. Therefore, there are no detrimental impacts on overlooking, loss of light, or overbearing.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The proposed development would utilise an existing field access onto Forest Road. However, the change of use from agriculture to equestrian would result in a material increase in the nature and frequency of vehicular movements, including regular trips associated with the day-to-day care and servicing of horses. The British Horse Society recommended checking on horses at least twice a day. This represents a more intensive and frequent pattern of use than the existing open pastoral field.

Bracknell Forest Council highways team have advised:

'Although the application is submitted to Wokingham borough, there is a sliver of land along the eastern boundary which is within BFC's administrative area. The Planning Officer may wish to make representation in this regard. Access is also proposed from Forest Road partly within this area.

The proposed access surfacing with hoggin is not acceptable and would result in deposit of loose material onto BFC's highway network. Hard surfaced access is required. The access gate width is insufficient and the gate is too close to the carriageway of Forest Road. The gate needs to be set back such that a horse box can wait fully off the carriageway of Forest Road for the gate to be opened. The visibility from this gated access is also significantly substandard.

A Highways Act Section 278 agreement with Bracknell Forest Council would be needed but is unlikely to be accepted due to insufficient visibility, insufficient set-back of gate into the site and the deposit of loose material onto the highway resulting from the proposed hoggin surfacing of the access road.'

These concerns indicate that the access, in its current form, fails to provide safe and suitable access arrangements. Whilst matters such as gate width and set-back could potentially be amended, any the deficiencies in visibility splays represents a more fundamental constraint. No acceptable visibility splays have been demonstrated and, given the location of the access, visibility may rely on third-party land and/or the removal of established roadside vegetation. This would not only be uncertain in delivery but would also be likely to erode the rural character of the road frontage.

In the absence of satisfactory evidence demonstrating that acceptable access arrangements including visibility splays can be achieved and maintained, the proposal fails to provide a safe and suitable means of access for all users.

Flooding and Drainage:

The application site is within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of surface water flooding. There will be an increase in impermeable area, however as no drainage details have been provided. The Council's Flooding and Drainage Officer poses no objection and a condition would have been included if the development was accepted in all other respects.

Trees:

There are no protected trees on the Site that would be impacted by this development. According to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, two trees – T2 Oak and G20 Ash—are *"proposed for removal as part of the new development, as these specimens could not be effectively retained as they are located within the outline of the new structures, or located too close to make their retention feasible sustainable. All of the trees to be removed have been given a C category grading in accordance with BS 5837. It is therefore felt that these trees should not act as a limitation on the effective use of the site or impose any significant constraints on the layout."* (Ref: GHA Trees, GHA/DS/160339:26, 30/01/2026, page 6)

Additionally, regarding trees, the BNG Report Section 4.1 Discussion indicates the following;

The proposals generate an on-site net change of +10.63% in area-based units, with trading rules satisfied as a result of the proposed development. The client has not supplied a landscape plan for indicative locations of where the offsetting habitats of 16no. small sized trees and 0.07ha of other neutral grasslands will be located, but this iteration of calculations shows the feasibility of achieving the required net gain within the blue line site ownership boundary.” (Re: ET Planning Ltd., BNG Assessment, Feb 2026 p. 15)

The council's tree officer has raised no objection.

Ecology Newts:

The applicant has provided ecological information: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 'Land Location off Forest Rd, Binfield, Bracknell', EBS Environmental Business Solutions, October 2025. The report states: *“As there are numerous ponds within 500m of the site of which most are not accessible a set of Reasonable Avoidance Measures should be agreed prior to works commencing.” - “Further surveys may be required for the following species: GCN”*

Nature Space have reviewed the above and stated the following *“The position of this site places it in the centre of a large network of ponds (16 ponds), the closest of which is 15m from the northeastern site boundary. It is highly likely that these ponds form a meta population, a conclusion supported by the fact that there are GCN records in 5 of these ponds. The closest of these recordings are from 180m (2019) and 210m (2016) southeast of the site boundary. The further three are historical recordings (2013) located within 500m of the site to the east and northeast. The potential for the site to be used during GCN dispersal and migration cannot therefore be ruled out without further survey.*

Suitable habitat is also present on the site. This is in the form of the scrub patch to the southwest, as well as the woodland surrounding the entirety of the site which looks to have scrubby ground coverage. No management regime is mentioned in the PEA for the grassland on site. In the pictures provide, the sward height looks uniform and managed. However, tussocky patches around the field peripheries adjacent to the woodland and scrub could be utilised by GCN. Overall, there are opportunities for GCN foraging, movement and sheltering”.

NatureSpace has required further information prior to determination in the form of either:

1. Provide further information (eDNA of ponds within 500m with connectivity to the site) in line with Natural England's Standing Advice, which may be able to rule out impacts to great crested newts. Note that surveys for great crested newts are seasonally constrained and can only take place between April and June. If a positive result is returned, then a European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) may be required with further population assessments necessary.

OR

2. Apply to join the Great Crested Newt District Licence Scheme. This does not require further survey work and can be done at any time. Please contact NatureSpace for a quote and further information.

In the absence of sufficient ecological information, the applicant has the option to address potential impacts through participation in the Great Crested Newt District Licensing Scheme. Had the proposal been acceptable in all other respects, a condition securing participation in the scheme would have been recommended.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

As of 2024, a 10% Biodiversity net gain (BNG) for minor developments is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021). This can be achieved through either on-site or off-site mitigation.

Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.

The biodiversity gain condition is a pre-commencement condition: once planning permission has been granted, a Biodiversity Gain Plan must be submitted and approved by the planning authority before commencement of the development.

The BNG Metric supplied for this application states that 10.63% gains for hedgerow, habitat and watercourse units can be achieved through on-site mitigation. WBC Ecology have provided comments stating the following *'I disagree with the current baseline proposed. "Section 3.2.1 of the PEA states there were areas of scrubland within the grass (comprising bramble Rubus fruticosus and goat willow Salix caprea), but this amounts to less than 20% of the total area", however this has not been reflected in the A-1 Habitat Baseline tab of the submitted Statutory Metric.*

It is not a requirement to demonstrate BNG at this stage but the baseline does need to be correctly established.

By reason of insufficient information relating to the baseline habitat value of the application site, the Local Planning Authority is unable to accurately establish the pre-development biodiversity value of the site. In the absence of an agreed baseline, it has not been demonstrated that the statutory biodiversity gain objective could be applied or secured in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). The proposal therefore fails to provide a sufficient basis on which the Local Planning Authority can lawfully determine compliance with the biodiversity net gain requirement.

Protected Species:

The council's Ecologist has raised concern regarding the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA), as it does not meet the requirements of the CIEEM Guidelines, BS42020:2013, or the NPPF, and fails to provide sufficient baseline ecological information to inform determination of the application. The assessment is limited in scope, considering only breeding birds, great crested newts and badgers, with insufficient justification for scoping out other protected and priority species or evidence demonstrating that site habitats are unsuitable to support them.

The site comprises modified grazed grassland, mature trees and scrub, within a wider landscape of grassland and lowland mixed deciduous woodland. Collectively, these habitats have the potential to support a range of protected and priority species, including bats, reptiles and amphibians. No bat assessment has been undertaken, despite the presence of suitable habitat and the proposed removal of three trees, and no ground-level tree inspection has been carried out to identify potential roost features. In the absence of adequate survey information, it has not been demonstrated that bats, a European Protected Species, would not be adversely affected.

Species of Principal Importance under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006, including slow worm, grass snake, adder and common toad, have not been adequately assessed, and the application fails to demonstrate their absence or identify appropriate mitigation, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CP7.

It is recommended that the PEA is revised to provide a comprehensive assessment of relevant protected and priority species, including clear justification where species are scoped out, proportionate mitigation measures, and consideration of impacts on ecological connectivity and adjacent priority habitats.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

When planning permission is granted for a development that is CIL liable, the Council will issue a liability notice as soon as practicable after the day on which the planning permission first permits development. Completing the assumption of liability notice is a statutory requirement to be completed for all CIL liable applications.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010):

In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that persons with protected characteristics as identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

Conclusion:

The proposal would conflict with development plan policies and the NPPF and result in material harm for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting and extent of built form and hard surfacing relative to the limited level of use and size of the field, would result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and openness of the countryside. The development would represent an unjustified encroachment into an otherwise undeveloped field and would fail to respect the prevailing rural character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CP1, CP3 and CP11 of the Core Strategy, Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan, and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The application site, by reason of its limited size and configuration, is incapable of supporting the proposed equestrian use in a manner that would justify the scale and siting of the stable building within the countryside. The proposed development would introduce a permanent built structure without sufficient land within the application site to demonstrate that it could function proportionately and independently as proposed. As a result, the development represents an unjustified and disproportionate form of encroachment into the countryside, contrary to Policies CP1, CP3 and CP11 of the Core Strategy and Policies CC03 and TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan.
3. By reason of insufficient information relating to the baseline habitat value of the application site, the Local Planning Authority is unable to accurately establish the pre-development biodiversity value of the site. In the absence of an agreed baseline, it has not been demonstrated that the statutory biodiversity gain objective could be applied or secured in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). The proposal therefore fails to provide a sufficient basis on which the Local Planning Authority can lawfully determine compliance with the biodiversity net gain requirement.
4. The application has failed to demonstrate the proposed development will have an acceptable impact on ecology and biodiversity by reason of insufficient information within a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal establishing the impact on wildlife and habitats, contrary to policy CP1, CP3 and CP7 of the Core Strategy, CC01 and TB23 of the MDD Local Plan and section 15 of the NPPF.
5. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would provide a safe and suitable access for the equestrian use by reason of the layout of the front of the site, and the failure to demonstrate adequate visibility splays within the control of the application site, contrary to CP1, CP3 and CP6 of the Core Strategy and section 9 of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Refused
Date:	19 May 2026

Earliest date for decision:	1 April 2026
------------------------------------	--------------

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	22.05.2026