

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
Mr. J. Boland 'A'	Two stable barns, horsewalker and all weather gallop - The Barn, Icknield Street, Beoley, B48 7EW	GB	11/0410-DK 23.08.2011

**RECOMMENDATION:** that permission be **REFUSED**.

### Consultations

Wythall PC Consulted 01.06.2011. Response received: 17.06.2011.  
Strongly object - appears to be a commercial enterprise in the Green Belt. The access is up a narrow track totally unsuitable for the use as described in the supporting documents.

WH Consulted 01.06.2011. Response received: 08.06.2011.  
No objection.

WCC PROW Consulted 01.06.2011. Response received: 27.06.2011.  
The proposal affects a public right of way as recorded on the Definitive Map. The public right of way is Beoley footpath 502 (BE-502).

However, the proposal should have no detrimental affect on the public right of way providing that the applicant is aware of the standard obligations.

The applicant should note policy RST.3 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan to ensure that the development does not reduce the utility, convenience, recreational value, attractiveness and historic significance of the public right of way.

RA Consulted 01.06.2011. No response to date.

ENG Consulted 01.06.2011. No response to date.

EDO Consulted 01.06.2011. No response to date.

EHO Consulted 01.06.2011. Response received 15.06.2011.  
No objection.

Tree Officer Consulted 01.06.2011. Response received 15.06.2011.  
No objection.

Publicity Site Notice posted: 20.06.2011. Expired 11.07.2011.  
Press Notice posted 09.06.2011. Expired 30.06.2011.  
3 Responses received summarised as appropriate:

- Objection on the grounds that it is completely disproportionate in size and destroys a vital part of the local green belt.
- The lane is very narrow and has too much traffic already. It will not withstand anymore. There are very few passing places.
- The road is generally in poor repair and used extensively by horse riders and cyclists (part of a cycle route). Horse box trailers cannot be reversed along this narrow road and this will cause disputes and problems with other traffic having to reverse for very long distances.

- The gates of 'Roseway' have been used for turning purposes which is not acceptable.
- The new buildings will be on or near the highest part of the land and will be visible across the whole valley. This area has been designated as protected and a conservation area because of its appearance, etc.
- The foot path crossings proposed are not safe. Would a foot path be allowed to be constructed across a horse racing course!
- I think the whole proposal is ill conceived, unsafe, will cause highway mayhem and inappropriate for green belt land.

### The site and its surroundings

The application site is a large area of agricultural land to the west side of Icknield Street to the north of Barton Farm. There is an existing agricultural building currently in use as kennels and a public footpath transects the site in an east west direction. The site lies within confirmed Green Belt.

### Proposal

The proposal relates to the erection of two large stable buildings in the north east corner of the application site and the gallop will follow the existing boundaries of the site and intersect the public footpath at two points labelled 'A' and 'B'. It is proposed that the gallops will be fenced for up to 20m either side of the crossing point and there will be gated access for pedestrians with appropriate warning signs. There is also a horse-walker proposed close to the stables.

The proposed stables will be externally clad in timber with a roof of fibre cement sheets. There are 18 individual stalls proposed with a store room for tack, feed and equipment.

### Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC.1, SD.2, D.38, D.39
BDLP	DS2, DS13, C4, RAT16, RAT17
DCS2	CP22
Others	PPG2, PPS7, SPG5

### Relevant Planning History

10/0881            Two hay storage Barns. Agricultural Notification. Details approved 26.11.2010.

### Notes

The site is located in the Green Belt in a Landscape Protection Area. I consider that the main issues in the determination of the application are:

- (i) whether the development of the stables are appropriate development in the Green Belt;
- (ii) whether there would be harm to landscape character;
- (iii) the issues raised by Third Parties.

### Green Belt

In this respect, I consider the main policies against which the proposal should be assessed are policies DS2, C4, RAT16 and RAT17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan (2004).

Policy RAT16 is supportive of the development of buildings for agricultural and equestrian pursuits in the Green Belt provided that the criteria in policy RAT17 are fulfilled.

Each of the stable buildings A and B are identical to each other with a floorspace of 238sqm (a total of 476sqm). The ridge height would be 4.8m. There is also a circular horse walker structure proposed. The gallop is approximately 500m with fencing along the length. There are additional structures proposed at the crossing points for the Public Right of Way as outlined in the description above.

Members will note that the scheme falls outside the scope of policy RAT17 because of its scale. Each of the buildings contains a large corridor (at least a third of the width of the structure) and also a tack room and feed store.

I am of the view that the corridor and tack room are not essential facilities (unlike the stables) for outdoor sport and recreation. This is made clear in the appeal decision (APP/P1805/A/09/2098683) at Cofton Hackett that additional building to house feed and equipment are not essential facilities. I see no difference in this case.

In terms of the stables proposed, they are 3.5 x 3.5m in size. The stables are 4m high (eaves minimum). In terms of height, it exceeds the requirements and given that 18 stables are proposed, this makes a significant difference to the overall bulk of the proposal.

I have concerns about the scale of the building which is large when PPG2 makes clear reference to unobtrusive stables and policy RAT17 states that preference should be given to the use of existing buildings and should only be allowed in a position isolated from existing farm buildings in exceptional circumstances. I consider it inappropriate development in the Green Belt and very special circumstances are required.

The Design and Access Statement refers to Planning Policy Statement 7 in respect of farm diversification but there is no reference to the development being inappropriate and Green Belt policy carries more weight. The applicant has been invited to present additional information in terms of very special circumstances and Members will be updated on this matter.

### Landscape Character

The proposal is located in a Landscape Protection Area and I note the attractive views from the site and footpath to hills and woodlands in the distance to the east and south.

The site is also in an elevated position. I consider that the proposal would cause visual harm to the protected landscape and this harm must be considered additionally to the harm arising from inappropriateness. I consider that it would be in breach of policy C4 of the BDLP 2004.

### Third Party Comments

Members should note the comments received from Third Parties. The issues in respect of Green Belt have been addressed in my report above. I note there are concerns in respect of the scale of the proposal and the narrow width of Icknield Street. There is no objection from WH. In terms of the footpath, whilst there is no objection from WCC PROW, I would share the concerns of the Third Parties about the safety of a public right of way being intersected by a gallop in two places and this may discourage the use of the path.

### Conclusions

I appreciate that the applicant owns a large area of land but this does not justify such large stables for personal use. Overall, there is no justification presented for the scale of the buildings and there is a negative impact on the Landscape Protection Area. I consider that it amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

**RECOMMENDATION:** that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The scales of the proposed buildings are disproportionate for the purposes of stables and as such, the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No very special circumstances exist sufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies D.39 and SD.2 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001, policies, DS2 and DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004, and the advice of PPG2 (Green Belts).
2. The development would have a detrimental impact on a designated Landscape Protection Area by virtue of its scale, design and position. The proposal is thereby contrary to policies CTC.1 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001, and policies C1, C4 and DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004.