

APPLICATION REPORT – 23/00445/FUL

Validation Date: 30 May 2023

Ward: Euxton

Type of Application: Full Planning

Proposal: Erection of two stable buildings, covered midden and other associated development including sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane (resubmission)

Location: Land 150M West Of Oakfields And 197 Runshaw Lane Euxton

Case Officer: Mr Iain Crossland

Applicant: Mr Trevor Howarth Brantwood Support Services

Agent: Mr Trevor Howarth Brantwood Support Services

Consultation expiry: 21 June 2023

Decision due by: 25 July 2023

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that planning permission is refused for the following reason:

The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, therefore, harmful by definition. There would also be other harm to the Green Belt through encroachment into the countryside. It is not considered that there are very special circumstances to overcome the definitional harm to the Green Belt and additional harm from encroachment of the countryside. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site is located within the Green Belt on the western side of Runshaw Lane in a rural part of the parish of Euxton. The dwelling of no.197 Runshaw Lane (Oakfields) is located on the opposite side of Runshaw Lane to the east of the application site. The site consists of open grassland with hedges to the site boundaries and is part of a larger area of pasture. There is an existing gated access located towards the northern end of the site within the eastern site boundary. The character of the area is that of open agricultural land with sporadic dwellings and agricultural buildings and some ribbon development along the main highways. Field boundaries are defined by trees and hedges.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of two stable buildings, a covered midden and other associated development including a sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane. This would provide a commercial equestrian facility offering livery and schooling amongst other provision. The application is a resubmission of a previously refused application (ref. 22/01166/FUL) and is identical in the development sought.

4. The proposed two stables buildings would each measure 27.4m by 6.1m, including an overhang, and would have dual pitched roofs with a maximum height of approximately 3.3m. They would be faced in timber cladding with a roof laid in fibre cement sheets. Each building would comprise six stables and an ancillary store. These would be positioned at the southern end of the site facing one another leaving a concrete yard between the buildings. There would be a small covered midden store to the western end of the buildings and a sand paddock to the north measure approximately 20m by 50m. There would be an access road of approximately 90m in length providing vehicular access to Runshaw Lane the north and a grasscrete car park of approximately 62m by 5.6m to the eastern side of the site.

REPRESENTATIONS

5. No representations have been received.

CONSULTATIONS

6. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: No comments have been received.
7. Lancashire County Council Highway Services (LCC Highway Services): Are of the opinion that the proposed erection of two stable buildings, covered midden and other associated development including sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane will have a detrimental impact on highway safety in the immediate vicinity of the site and should be refused on highway safety issues.
8. The applicant has responded to the issues raised by LCC Highways, however, LCC have failed to confirm the acceptability of the details.
9. Euxton Parish Council: No comments have been received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.
11. The Framework is supportive of sustainable development in rural areas and most specifically in the context of this rural site states at paragraph 83 that Local Authorities should *support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings and promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural enterprises*. The proposed development would support the establishment of a new equestrian business.
12. Support for rural businesses is reflected in the Central Lancashire Core Strategy Policy 13, with the caveat that such proposals should not undermine the purposes of the Green Belt.
13. This part of the Borough is not specified as an area for growth within Core Strategy Policy 1 and falls to be considered as an 'other place'. Criterion (f) of Core Strategy Policy 1 reads as follows:
"In other places – smaller villages, substantially built up frontages and Major Developed Sites – development will typically be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling, conversion of buildings and proposals to meet local need, unless there are exceptional reasons for larger scale redevelopment schemes." The proposed development would be small scale.
14. With regard to the location of the site in the Green Belt, the Framework states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt except in a limited

number of specific circumstances. National guidance on Green Belt is contained in Chapter 13 of the Framework, which states:

137. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

138. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*

147. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

148. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

149. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) limited infilling in villages;*
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.**

15. Paragraph 150 of the Framework identifies certain other forms of development that are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. This includes b) engineering operations.

16. The proposed development would support a commercial equestrian facility and falls to be considered as a facility for outdoor recreation, in accordance with the definition in the Framework outlined above, and is identified as an exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt under paragraph 149.b). However, paragraph 149.b) states that such facilities are not inappropriate only where they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

17. A relevant High Court case *R. (on the application of Boot) v Elmbridge Borough Council* [2017] at the time of the previous National Planning Policy Framework 2012 concludes that

paragraph 89 of the 2012 Framework, which is repeated at paragraph 149.b) of the current Framework, does not permit any harm at all to the openness of the Green Belt. A development that would have any adverse impact on openness would not comply with a policy that required openness to be maintained or preserved. The decision-maker therefore has no latitude to find otherwise. There would have to be very special circumstances to justify a grant of planning permission.

18. Any harm to the openness of the Green Belt therefore means that the test in paragraph 149.b) cannot be met. New buildings in this location would inevitably have an impact on openness as the site is currently free from any development or buildings. Whilst the proposed stable buildings would be relatively low level structures, the footprint and the enclosure that they would create would be significant in the context of a currently open field. Their location close to the south eastern field boundary would make them a visually prominent feature from public vantage points along Runshaw Lane as the site is open to views from the public highway in this location. This would result in a clear visual impact on openness. There would also be a spatial impact on openness given that the field is currently free from any development and the proposed development would result in a significant amount of built form. As the development would fail to preserve openness it would not comply with any of the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is therefore harmful by definition.
19. As it has been established, that the development of the site with stables buildings is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which results in definitional harm to the Green Belt, any other harm caused by the development must also be considered and added to the definitional harm.
20. There are five purposes of the Green Belt as detailed above. The development of the application site would involve the construction of a road, buildings and a sand paddock resulting in development encroaching into the countryside that is currently an area of open grassland pasture. This results in a clear incursion of built form within an undeveloped part of the Green Belt.
21. On the basis of the above it is considered that there is other harm to the Green Belt caused by the harm to purpose 3 of including land in the Green Belt, as the proposed buildings result in a degree of encroachment into the countryside.
22. The proposed car park, access track and sand paddock could also be considered as an engineering operation and can, therefore, be considered under exception (b) of paragraph 150 of the Framework. These would be low-lying surface structures; however, they would occupy an undeveloped area of land, which is laid to grass and is part of a field. This built form, combined with the use of the areas would have some impact on the openness of the Green Belt, although it is recognised that they would not be in use on a permanent basis. When in use, they would also have a greater visual impact compared to the existing situation. The identified impacts from these aspects of the development would be transient but nonetheless, this results in some harm to openness. Where harm to openness is identified, it cannot be said that openness is 'preserved'. Further, introducing these aspects of development would result in encroachment of the Countryside, as explained above.
23. As the proposed development would result in definitional harm to the Green Belt and other harm through encroachment there would have to be very special circumstances to justify the grant of planning permission that would outweigh this harm. The applicant's Planning Statement and Equestrian Justification identifies the following:

“Economic Benefits - In terms of economic benefits, there is a shortage of facilities of the type proposed in the area. It is planned that the centre will be an accredited BHS centre which has significant economic benefits. There are now more than 960 BHS Approved Centres in the UK, Ireland and worldwide, but within 10 miles of Chorley there are only three BHS accredited riding schools (Parbold Equestrian Centre, Landlords Farm Riding Centre and Moorview Equestrian Centre) and of these, only Parbold is a BHS accredited livery

stable. With accreditation therefore, the facility would be rare and would provide a comprehensive facility for the Chorley area.

A business plan is enclosed that shows that although it is a not for profit enterprise, the facility will still be sustainable over time.

The development will provide specialist employment for two full time apprentices to start with overseen by Darcey Parr and Zoe Draper on a part-time basis. In subsequent years as the business develops, an additional two part-time staff would be required.

Darcey is an extremely competent and well respected horsewoman and needs a base to operate from for lessons etc - this is available through the applicant and Darcey and Zoe could not afford to do it without his help. The applicant does not own any more suitable land elsewhere. It is not an opportunity available anywhere else in the area.

The range of facilities and activities proposed is in very short supply in the area. This has been compounded by the closure and redevelopment of the Squires Equestrian site off Lucas Lane which provided roughly 35 stables and 13.27 hectares of land for grazing. The site is situated between the M61 motorway to the east, and the defined settlement boundary of Whittle-le-Woods which is to the west.

This land was sold to Redrow who were granted permission to develop up to 250 dwellings. A substantial group of stables and land once used for riding lessons and grazing have therefore been lost.

There is a general shortage of stable yards in the area with many having been redeveloped such as the Lucas Lane site. A review of sources of equestrian properties such as UK Land and Farms has shown that there is little or no such facilities currently available in the area. There is demand in the area and a lack of appropriate alternative locations.

Social and Recreational Benefits - these are considerable. As is highlighted in the NPPF, active recreation such as horse riding and associated activities are wholly appropriate to the open countryside. Covid has also resulted in a substantially increased demand for access to the countryside.

The proposed operators are well known and highly regarded (see Appendix 1), but currently have no facility to operate from. The facilities will not only be used for teaching purposes and for children's pony parties, but will also be used for social benefit and educational purposes such as Shaftesbury High School where Darcey has strong links. It is estimated in the UK that around 2-5% of school-age children have ADHD. This is the most common behavioural disorder in the country. The provision of outdoor activities in an engaging and stimulating environment has been shown to address these issues. Being able to work with others is a key quality – it helps at school, in sport and is essential in later life. Having the skills to empathise with others affects school cohesion, friendships and well-being.

In a new environment, situation or group such as would be provided at the centre, new communication skills are learned. Being able to communicate effectively, especially in different and often strange and exciting situations, accelerates these skills in the way that ideas and information is shared. Children's listening skills are also enhanced through learning from activity leaders and from dealing with the animals and outdoors activities. The centre would therefore enhance and support educational facilities in the area by providing a safe environment for young people to work and engage in equine related outdoor activities, where they can build confidence and improve communication skills through interaction with horses and ponies.

Environmental Benefits - The provision of enhanced landscaping and planting generally will reduce the impact upon the local countryside and will assist with containing the development visually. It will allow greater use of a part of the countryside and improve accessibility for the wider community and significantly enhance the area. Additional planting will also increase the biodiversity of the area."

24. There is no reason to doubt the extensive experience, enthusiasm, or professionalism in anyone involved in this planning application. There is also no reason to doubt that the proposed development could become a successful and well used facility and that there may be demand for such facilities. It is not considered, however, that the above benefits of the scheme either individually or cumulatively represent the very special circumstances required to outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt, which must be afforded substantial weight. The applicant's case could be readily replicated through similar proposals at other sites in the Borough. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal is unacceptable in principle.

Details of the proposed development

25. The Central Lancashire Rural Development SPD sets out more detailed guidance in relation to the type of equestrian development that would be suitable in rural areas. The SPD sets out matters relating to scale, siting, design, site treatment, highway safety and reinstatement. These are assessed below:
26. *Scale: For development proposals involving more than three horses, the applicant should submit a statement with the planning application detailing why accommodation of the size proposed is required.*
27. It is considered that the supporting information submitted with the planning application sufficiently justifies that the scale of development would meet its intended purpose, as described earlier in this report.
28. *Siting: new buildings should not harm the landscape character of the surrounding area. They should be well related to existing trees, hedges or landscape features, avoiding prominent positions, and generally at least 30 metres away from neighbouring residential properties. There should be proper screening for car and horse-box parking and appropriate arrangements for manure storage and/or management.*
29. The proposed stables buildings would be positioned close to the southern and eastern boundary of the site relatively close to the highway and the field boundary. Whilst some planting is proposed between the development and highway, it would still be highly visible from public vantage points, despite the presence of trees and hedges to the boundaries. As such the development would inevitably have some impact on the open landscape character of the area. The proposed stables buildings would be located in excess of 30m from the nearest property on Runshaw Lane and would be partially screened from the dwelling by intervening vegetation. The proposal fails to comply with this element of the SPD due to its visually prominent position.
30. *Design/materials: traditional designs will generally be the most appropriate, clad externally in timber and with an internal timber frame, with a maximum ridge height of 3.5 metres for stables. Tack rooms and hay stores should be part of the same building, and each should be of a similar size to an individual stable.*
31. The proposed stables buildings have a ridge height of less than 3.5m, which meets with the guideline set out in the Rural Development SPD. The accommodation that is included is generally accepted for stables, and the buildings would be timber clad and of a traditional outward appearance.
32. *Site treatment: hard-standing areas, access tracks and sand paddocks should be of the minimum size necessary and should not encroach on the open countryside. Careful consideration will be required for the design of storage or parking of horse boxes on site, and fencing should be appropriate to the local vernacular and not suburban in appearance. Sand paddocks should utilise existing ground levels unless absolutely necessary and should not appear built out of the ground and thus alien to the natural contours of the land. Where a sand paddock needs to be above ground level an assessment of its visual impact would be required and appropriate mitigation incorporated into the design. Floodlighting of sand paddocks and yards is generally inappropriate in the open countryside or near to*

neighbouring residents. Where floodlighting is proposed, it should be designed to minimise light spillage from the lit area.

33. As previously discussed, the proposal would result in encroachment of the countryside and so the proposal fails to meet the requirements of the SPD in this regard.
34. *Highway safety/bridleway use: the movement of horses or vehicles resulting from the siting of stables should not create danger to horses and riders, or to other road users. Stables are best sited to have safe and convenient access to the bridleway network or minor roads, although existing bridleways should not become over-intensively used as a result of the development. Wherever possible there should be a designated turning area within the site so that lorries, horse-boxes or towed trailers do not have to be reversed either on or off the highway.*
35. LCC Highway Services has responded raising concerns in relation to parking and access. It is, however, considered that these issues could be overcome with the imposition of planning conditions.
36. *Re-statement: A condition would normally be recommended, which would require the removal of the stables building and restoration of the land to its former condition if the authorised use ceases for a period exceeding one year, in order to protect the appearance of the countryside.*
37. Such a condition could be attached to any grant of planning permission for the proposed development.
38. Paragraph 40 of the SPD states: *"The Councils will require the following criteria to be met in considering applications for developments involving horses:*
- in the case of indoor facilities or commercial stables, the development is within an existing building or forms part of a farm diversification scheme;*
 - in the case of small, private developments the site should be close to existing buildings and well screened by existing trees or local landscape features;*
 - the development would not result in the over-intensive use of the local bridleway network;*
 - the movement of either horses or vehicles as a result of the development would not prejudice road safety;*
 - provision for removing any equipment and re-instating the site once its use for horses is no longer required"*
39. The proposal is for a commercial stables and is not within an existing building or part of a farm diversification scheme. Overall, the proposal fails to comply with all of the criteria set out in the Rural Development SPD, most specifically in relation to its location and siting.

Impact on neighbour amenity

40. The proposed stables buildings are sited approximately 30m from the nearest residential property to the east side of Runshaw Lane. This complies with the 30m guideline set out in the Rural Development SPD. The proposed buildings are of modest height and therefore the degree of separation is such that it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of any residential occupiers. The proposed development would result in an increased intensity of use at the site, bringing activity to the site and vehicular journeys. Given the degree of separation it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of any residential occupiers, subject to the imposition of conditions governing hours of use and prevention of flood lighting and sound amplification.

Highway safety

41. The proposed development would result in a 12no. stable equestrian facility with sand paddock and access road from Runshaw Lane. LCC Highway Services have considered the proposal and have made the following observations.

42. Runshaw Lane is a rural lane, which is a route for a local college and links villages to Leyland. The lane has in this location grass verge on either side of the carriageway with hedging on the highway boundary. There is limited street lighting and the lane has a 40mph speed limit. The site does not offer a safe pedestrian route to bus stops on Leyland Lane. It is presumed that visitors to the site would arrive by car or minibus. The route is suitable for cyclists.
43. The requested sightline splays were drawn incorrectly on the site plan and were requested to be to the near-side edge of carriageway, not the opposite side of the carriageway.
44. With regards to the access it was requested that the sightlines were shown 2.4m from the rear of the carriageway to the nearside carriageway edge. The sight lines of 2.4m x 102m to be provided in both directions from the centre of the site access onto Runshaw Lane.
45. The site line requirement is, based on the basic formula for calculating Stopping Sight Distances (SSD) in 10.1 from Manual for Streets 2, the addition of 2.4m the classified speed of the road of 40mph. There is an oak tree, which may be obstructing the sightline splay and this is requested to be shown.
- | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|------|
| 40mph the desirable | 102m absolute | 81m |
| 50mph the desirable | 148m absolute | 114m |
| 60mph the desirable | 201m absolute | 152m |
| 70mph the desirable | 262m absolute | 196m |
46. The applicant was requested to provide accurate details of the required sight line requirement, before determining the application, ensuring the entire sight line requirement is fully over land within the applicant's control and/or over the adopted highway and to fully show all works which would be required to provide the sight lines. The sight line splays would require walls, fences, trees, hedges, shrubs, ground growth, structures etc. to have a maximum height of 1.0m above the height at the centre line of the adjacent carriageway.
47. It was requested that the applicant described the use of the facility in detail with regards to vehicle movements for the times for the staff, lessons, therapy, pony parties etc. This is to ensure the parking is sufficient for the proposed uses and to ensure the applicant allows for the drop off and collection of users. The grass-crete parking was requested to show parking bay dimensions to show the available car parking.
48. The stables are liveried with the owners expected to book the sand paddock at times. It is also expected that other local horse owners may book the sand paddock. It was requested that the parking and turning for a large horse wagon is shown.
49. A turning area is required to allow refuse vehicle and emergency vehicles to turn within the site for the following reasons: -
- The maximum distance a refuse vehicle should reverse is 12m, from Manual for streets and BS5930: 2005.
 - Fire and rescue Services Section should not have to reverse more than 20m from the end of an access road. From Manual for streets and diagram 24 of Approved Document B (Fire Safety).
50. The applicant was requested to prove the turning area layout by swept path analysis for a twin axel refuse vehicle. The applicant was requested to provide accurate details of the required turning area before determining the application and the turning area protected under condition, for perpetuity.
51. The widening of the access requires the culvert over the ditch being extended / replaced. Technical approval of the culverted water course may be required from Lancashire County Councils "Flood Risk Management" team. The applicant would be requested to enter into a s278 agreement for the formation of the culvert and access and full details could be provided in response to a condition.

52. In the absence of these details LCC Highway Services confirmed that they were unable to support the application
53. The applicant responded to this providing an amended updated site plan with revised sight lines and a parking layout with a turning circle and parking for the horse waggon shown. In response to the request for further details in respect of the use of the facility the applicant confirmed that it is intended that owners would access the site at around 7am. There would be two staff in attendance, and it is likely that some owners who have booked livery, would have their horses attended upon by the staff.
54. Lessons and arranged visits to the site would commence at 10am and all would be pre-booked. Lessons would be on a one to one basis during the daytime. After school group lessons, of no more than six persons within the group, would take place at the site. School booking's would be by minibus taking in one minibus per visit. Pony Parties would be on Saturday and Sunday and during school holidays.
55. LCC Highway Services were asked for further comments in relation to the additional information provided by the applicant, however, this has not been received at the time of writing. It is considered that conditions could be attached to any grant of planning permission requiring details of site access, culvert design and hours of use and it is noted that the parking layout has been confirmed, however, it is unknown as to whether the visibility and internal manoeuvring issues have been overcome.

Flood risk and drainage

56. The application site is not located in an area that is at risk of flooding from pluvial or fluvial sources, according to Environment Agency mapping data. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system and in the most sustainable way possible.
57. The NPPG clearly outlines the hierarchy to be investigated by the developer when considering a surface water drainage strategy. As such the developer should consider the following drainage options in the following order of priority:
- a. into the ground (infiltration);
 - b. to a surface water body;
 - c. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
 - d. to a combined sewer.
58. Any development of the site should incorporate a surface water drainage system that has been designed in line with the hierarchy set out above.

Ecology

59. Policy BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 seeks to safeguard protected and endangered species and their habitats. There are no known ecological reasons why the application should be refused permission, subject to conditions being attached to ensure biodiversity enhancement measures are employed at the site and works take place outside of bird nesting season. The proposal is, therefore, considered to comply with Policy BNE9 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026.

Other issues

60. It is noted that outline planning permission, ref. 13/00566/OUT, was granted in 2013 for the erection of three stables and a tack room at the application site. The proposal was, however, of a much smaller scale, for private use, in a different position and was determined under a different Local Plan and SPD, compared to the current proposal. The assessment of facilities for outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt has also evolved in response to case law relating to facilities for outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt that has emerged since this time.

CONCLUSION

61. The proposed development of the site for stables buildings and associated infrastructure is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and results in other harm to the Green Belt through the degree of encroachment into the countryside. The design and scale of the proposed stables buildings is appropriate and is consistent with a private stables development, however, this does not overcome the harm to the Green Belt. It is not considered that there are very special circumstances to overcome the definitional harm to the Green Belt and additional harm caused through encroachment. It is, therefore, recommended that the application be refused.

RELEVANT POLICIES: In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

Ref: 13/00566/OUT **Decision:** PEROPP **Decision Date:** 14 August 2013
Description: Erection of a group of 3 stables plus tack room and change of use of field from agricultural to equestrian use for domestic animals (horses)

Ref: 22/01166/FUL **Decision:** REFFPP **Decision Date:** 20 January 2023
Description: Erection of two stable buildings, covered midden and other associated development including sand paddock, stone access tracks, grasscrete parking area and an amended vehicular access from Runshaw Lane