

# Forest Heath District Council

**DEVELOPMENT  
CONTROL  
COMMITTEE**

**3 DECEMBER 2014**

**DEV/FH/14/001**

**Report of the Head of Planning and Regulatory  
Services**

**PLANNING APPLICATION DC/14/0585/OUT - MEDDLER STUD, BURY  
ROAD, KENTFORD**

## **Synopsis:**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

## **Recommendation:**

**It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.**

## **CONTACT OFFICER**

Case Officer: Philippa Kelly  
Tel. No 01284 757382

# Committee Report

---

**App. No:** DC/14/0585/OUT      **Committee Date:** 3 December 2014

**Date:** 9 April 2014      **Expiry Date:** 9 July 2014  
**Registered:**

**Case Officer:** Philippa Kelly      **Recommendation:** APPROVAL

**Parish:** Kentford      **Ward:** South

**Proposal:** Creation of a 20-box racehorse training establishment (with associated Trainer's house) and erection of up to 63 dwellings (including 19 affordable units) with associated access arrangements and open space provision. (Major Development and Departure from the Development Plan)

**Site:** Meddler Stud, Bury Road, Kentford

**Applicant:** Meddler Properties Ltd

---

## **Section A – Background and Summary:**

- A1. This application was deferred from consideration at the Development Control Committee meeting on 5 November 2014. Members resolved they were 'minded to refuse' planning permission contrary to the officer recommendation of approval. Members were concerned that the proposal would result in:
1. Prematurity with regard to the Local Plan.
  2. Adverse impact on infrastructure provision in the village.
  3. Detrimental impact on the operation of the training yard, due to use of land for housing.
- A2. The previous officer report for the 5<sup>th</sup> November 2014 meeting of the Development Control Committee is included as Working Paper 1 to this report. Members are directed to this paper in relation to site description, details of development, details of consultation responses received etc.
- A3. This report sets out an update from the officer report presented to the meeting of Development Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> November, and includes a risk assessment of the three potential reasons for refusal.
- A4. The officer recommendation, which is set out at the end of this report, remains that planning permission should be granted.

## **Section B – General Information:**

### **Application Details:**

- B1. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 1 to 5 for a description of the application proposals.

### **Amendments:**

- B2. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 6 to 8 for details of amendments made to the planning application.
- B3. Since the report was prepared for the 5<sup>th</sup> November 2014 meeting, the planning agent has provided correspondence relating to the potential Section 106 obligation in relation to the racehorse training establishment (RTE) element (letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014). This correspondence is attached as Working Paper 2.
- B4. The correspondence from the planning agent dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014 proposes the following:
- Construction and completion of the RTE element prior to any of the new dwellings being occupied.
  - No more than 35 new dwellings to be occupied until the RTE is either sold or rented to an equine operator.
  - The instruction of a reputable firm of estate agents/chartered surveyors, experienced in equine properties, to be instructed to offer the RTE on the open market, either for sale or rent, prior to any of the new dwellings being occupied.
  - Active marketing until such time as a suitable purchaser or tenant is identified.
  - Regular review if it proves difficult to attract a purchaser/tenant on the initial terms offered, including consideration of a discounted sale/rented price.
  - Maintenance of the RTE by the landowners, until such time as it is either sold or rented.

These matters are considered in further detail in Section F of this report.

### **Site Details:**

- B5. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 9 to 14 for a description of the application site area.

### **Application Supporting Material:**

- B6. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 15 to 19 for further details of the material submitted with the planning application.

### **Relevant Planning History:**

- B7. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 20 to 33 for details of relevant planning history.

### **Consultations:**

- B8. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 35 to 49 for details of consultation responses received.
- B9. Additional correspondence has been received from the Council's Equine Consultant, Tony Kernon (letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014). This correspondence is attached as Working Paper 3.
- B10. In summary, the correspondence from Mr Kernon dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014 advises the following:
- A 20 box yard is an appropriate size for this location.
  - It is probable that the yard would be viable.
  - It is likely that there will be a demand for this size of yard.

These matters are considered in further detail in Section F of this report.

- B11. Members are also asked to note that the Planning Service Manager, Marie Smith, has updated the Planning Policy position in the context of the adopted and emerging Local Plan (correspondence dated 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014). This correspondence is attached in full as Working Paper 7, and updates the Planning Policy consultation advice dated 21<sup>st</sup> October 2014 (Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 37).
- B12. In summary, the correspondence from the Planning Service Manager advises that the Policy position leans more towards a refusal of planning permission, in that the development proposals are contrary to the horse racing policies contained in the adopted and emerging Local Plan.

Any further consultation responses received will be reported verbally to the meeting.

### **Representations:**

- B13. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 50 to 55 for details of representations received. Members should also refer to the additional representation received on behalf of the Jockey Club after the committee report to the 5<sup>th</sup> November meeting was prepared. This is attached as an Appendix to this report. Any further representations received will be reported verbally to the meeting.

### **Policies:**

B14. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 56 to 75 for details of relevant policies.

**Officer Comment:**

B15. Please refer to Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 76 to 256 for a comprehensive officer assessment of the application proposals. The officer assessment remains unchanged following the Development Control meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> November.

**Section C - Risk Assessment**

C1. The main purpose of this report is to inform Members of the risks associated with the 'of mind' resolution to refuse planning permission for these development proposals, given that a refusal of planning permission would be contrary to officer recommendation.

C2. As set out in the Background section of this report, Members deferred their consideration of this planning application from the 5<sup>th</sup> November meeting of Development Committee. Members are 'of mind' to refuse planning permission on grounds of i) Prematurity with regard to the local plan, ii) lack of infrastructure to support more housing, and iii) use of land for housing being detrimental to the operation of the training yard.

C3. The subsequent part of this report discusses the potential reasons for refusal cited by Members, before discussing the likely implications of a refusal of planning permission on these grounds.

**Section D - Potential Reason for Refusal 1 - Prematurity:**

D1. Members should also refer to attached Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 94 to 105.

**D2. What does the evidence say?**

- The National Planning Policy Framework does not directly address the issue of prematurity. Advice about the approach the decision maker should take is set out in the National Planning Policy guidance which was published in March 2014. This states:

*'Prematurity arguments are unlikely to justify the refusal of planning permission unless it is clear that the adverse impact of granting permission would significantly outweigh any benefits'.*

- The Authority is now at a relatively advanced stage in the preparation of its Development Management policies. At the time of writing this report, Proposed Main Modifications to the Joint Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Development Management Policies Document are on consultation until 27 November 2014. Policies DM47 to DM50 are material to the consideration of the application proposals. Both Policy DM48 and DM49 have been modified, and the changes are substantive in nature. The full text of the amended policies is set out below:
- **DM48 – Development Affecting the Horse Racing Industry** Any development within or around Newmarket which is likely to have a

material adverse impact on the operational use of an existing site within the horse racing industry (such as noise, volume of traffic, loss of paddocks or other open space and /or servicing requirements) or which would threaten the long term viability of the horse racing industry as a whole, will not be permitted, unless the benefits would significantly outweigh the harm to the horse racing industry.

- **DM49 – Re-development of Existing Sites Relating to the Horse Racing Industry** The change of use of land and buildings, including associated residential accommodation, presently or last legally used as racehorse training yards, stud farms, racecourses, horse training grounds or other uses, directly related to the Horse Racing Industry (and including the sub-division of the yard or site from its associated residential accommodation) will only be permitted if allocated as a proposal in an adopted Local Plan.

The change of use of racehorse training yards, stud farms, racecourses and horse training grounds (including associated residential accommodation) to alternative uses directly related to the Horse Racing Industry will only be permitted if satisfactory evidence is provided that the specific benefits to the horse racing industry outweighs the loss of the existing use.

Permission will only be granted for schemes that conserve and/or enhance the character and appearance of the area and, where relevant and necessary, conditions will be imposed removing permitted development rights to prevent further changes of use.

- Policy DM48, including the Inspector's Modifications, is clear that any change of use of land within the horse racing industry will only be permitted if allocated in an adopted Local Plan. Policy DM49 states that alternative uses directly related to the horse racing industry will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, if evidence is provided that the specific benefit to the horse racing industry outweighs the loss of the existing use.

**D3. Have there been any further developments or changes in circumstances which Members need to consider?**

- Yes. Members should note the following:
  - The Planning Service Manager has provided further consultation advice which updates the Planning Policy position.
  - The period of public consultation in respect of the proposed modifications to the Development Management Policies closes on 27<sup>th</sup> November.

**D4. What is the officer view?**

- The Council is now at an advanced stage in the preparation of its Development Management policies Local Plan. The weight which can be afforded to these policies is now seen as 'significant', given that an Inspector has considered the policies following an Examination in Public, and the proposed modifications to the Plan do not conflict with the NPPF.

- The application proposals are contrary to emerging Policy DM49, which only permits a change of use of land within the horse racing industry, if the land is allocated in an adopted Local Plan. The proposals also conflict with this policy by failing to demonstrate why more of the application site does not retain its existing, equine use. On this basis the proposals could be considered premature, and should be advanced through the Local Plan process.
- At the time of writing this report, there is a lack of clarity regarding how much weight may be afforded to the emerging horseracing policies. This is because the proposed modifications in respect of Policies DM48 and DM49 are substantive in nature. This suggests that there are unresolved issues. The Inspector, depending upon the weight of representations received, may make further amendments.
- Given the stage that the Council is currently at in the preparation of its Development Management policies Local Plan, Officers are of the opinion that it could be difficult to sustain at planning appeal a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of conflict with emerging policies DM48 and DM49. Members are asked to note that this is a fluid situation, and the weight to be attached to these policies could change.

## **Section E - Potential Reason for Refusal 2 – Infrastructure:**

### **Primary Education - including cumulative impacts**

- E1. Members should also refer to attached Working Paper 1, Background Section, Paragraphs 209 to 211, and Paragraphs 232 - 233.
- E2. **What does the evidence say?**
- Moulton Primary School is the catchment primary school for the proposed development. The nearest primary school is in Kennett, which is within Cambridgeshire.
  - Moulton Primary School has an existing capacity of 210 places. Evidence demonstrates that expansion of Moulton Primary school will be necessary to supplement further growth in the village (i.e. development that has previously received planning permission, and that proposed by this planning application). A new primary school will not be needed.
  - Moulton Primary School is not constrained. The expansion of the school is the agreed education strategy.
  - Suffolk County Council, as the Education Authority and statutory provider of school places, will seek to mitigate the impact of the proposed development by securing financial contributions. These contributions will be used to extend Moulton Primary School.
  - The application proposals (and any other growth) does not alter the basic requirement for the expansion of Moulton Primary School, but will ultimately influence how large the expansion will be.
- E3. **Have there been any further developments or changes in circumstances which Members need to consider?**

- There have been no changes in circumstances or further developments since the Development Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> November.

**E4. What is the officer view?**

- Officers acknowledge that the demand for 16 additional pupils from this development on Moulton Primary School is a dis-benefit of these proposals.
- The development would mitigate the impact on primary education, by securing financial contributions which would be spent on extending Moulton Primary School.
- Evidence is clear that the impact of the development proposals will be adequately mitigated, such that the impact upon primary school provision at Moulton is not a constraint on this development.
- Officers consider that a refusal of planning permission on primary education grounds could not be sustained at appeal and would not be able to produce evidence to substantiate this reason for refusal.

**Highways – including cumulative impact**

E5. Members should also refer to attached Working Paper 1, Background Section, Paragraphs 125 to 144, and Paragraphs 212 - 214.

**E6. What does the evidence say?**

- The NPPF states that that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- Vehicular access would be provided to the development via Bury Road. The Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application has demonstrated the development would be acceptable in highway terms. There is no evidence to hand to dispute these conclusions.
- Access arrangements were agreed with the Local Highway Authority at Suffolk County Council which has raised no objections to the planning application.

**E7. Have there been any further developments or changes in circumstances which Members need to consider?**

- There have been no changes in circumstances or further developments since the Development Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> November.

**E8. What is the officer view?**

- Officers do not consider the development proposals would, in isolation or in combination, lead to severe transport impacts. Officers consider the development proposals would have suitable and safe vehicular access. This view is shared by the Transport Assessment accompanying the planning application and the Local Highway Authority which has scrutinised the planning application.



- Officers consider a refusal of planning permission on highway grounds could not be sustained at appeal and would not be able to produce evidence to substantiate this reason for refusal.

**Section F – Potential Reason for Refusal 3 - Use of land for housing would be detrimental to the operation of the training yard:**

F1. Members should also refer to the following attached documents:

Working Paper 1 - Committee Report from 5<sup>th</sup> November meeting of Development Control Committee.

Working Paper 2 – Letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014 from Mr Thomas Smith, URS Infrastructure and Environment UK Limited (planning agent).

Working Paper 3 – Letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014 from Mr Tony Kernon, Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd (Council’s Equine Consultant).

Working Paper 4 - Planning Appeal Decision in respect of Planning Application Reference F/2012/0766/OUT (Meddler Stud, Bury Road, Kentford, Outline planning application for residential development).

Working Paper 5 - Letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from Mr Tony Kernon, Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd (Council’s Equine Consultant).

Working Paper 6 – Email correspondence dated 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2014 from Mr William Gittus, Jockey Club Estates.

F2. **What does the evidence say?**

- In the context of the previous planning application for the residential development of the site in its entirety, it was the Planning Inspector’s opinion that:
  - The complete loss of the whole site to housing would result in the unjustified loss of a site used in connection with the horseracing industry.
  - A 20 box RTE would have a reasonable prospect of success.
  - The boxing, travelling and unloading of horses to central gallops and other facilities in Newmarket is not impractical.
  - The dependence of a future trainer upon central gallops and facilities does not show that a small-scale RTE would be unviable.
- The Council’s Equine Consultant, Mr Tony Kernon, has confirmed in his correspondence dated 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014 that the development proposal provides what could be a very good starter yard.
- Mr Tony Kernon, in his letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014, concludes the following:
  - A 20 box yard is an appropriate size for this location.
  - It is probable that such a yard would be viable.

- It is likely that there will be a demand for this size of yard.
- No objections have been raised on the grounds of conflict of potential uses by technical consultees.
- In relation to the detailed design of the proposals, Tony Kernon, William Gittus (Jockey Club Property Director and Managing Director) and Nick Patton (Jockey Club Training Grounds Manager) have considered the design of the RTE and commented as follows:
  - The RTE should be protected by a 2m high close boarded fence, particularly along its boundary with the highway, the access road to the proposed development and any public open space.
  - The horse walker should not be situated in the middle of the exercise track.
  - The exercise track will need to be built up in order to allow the drainage to work effectively.
  - The intended layout/design of the POS area should be clarified.
  - Consideration should be given to reducing the tightness of the bends on the exercise track.
  - Stables in a barn as opposed to a more traditional 'courtyard' design tend to be more efficient to operate which is critical for a small RTE.

**F3. Have there been any further developments or changes in circumstances which Members need to consider? –**

- Yes, additional correspondence has been received from the Council's Equine Consultant and the Planning Agent. This is reported at Paragraphs B3 – B5 above.

**F4. What is the officer view? –**

**Design and Layout of the RTE**

- The application proposals relate to the principle of the development and access arrangements only. The detailed design and layout of the RTE are matters which would be reserved for subsequent planning applications. The specialist advice received in respect of the design and layout could be incorporated into relevant planning conditions and advisory informatives, should the scheme be approved.
- Officers consider that a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of the design and layout of the RTE could not be substantiated at appeal and would not be able to produce evidence to substantiate this reason for refusal.

**Delivery of RTE**

- Members will note from the 5<sup>th</sup> November Committee Report (Working Paper 1, Paragraphs 119 – 122) that the delivery of the RTE is

considered by officers to be an essential part of the planning process.

- The recommendation of approval was based on ensuring the delivery of the proposed RTE - with build out and operation of the RTE to be secured through the Section 106 process. At the time of the November committee meeting, the finer detail of the Section 106 had not been agreed - although the planning agent had suggested a trigger point for the provision of the RTE being completed before the occupation of the tenth residential unit.
- Officers note from subsequent correspondence received from the planning agent dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014, that the applicant is agreeable to construction and completion of the RTE element of the development, prior to any of the new houses being occupied. This can be secured by way of a relevant clause in the Section 106 agreement.
- With regard to securing an operator for the RTE, the applicant has confirmed the acceptability of including provision for the marketing strategy to secure an operator, through the Section 106 process.
- In terms of the actual operation of the RTE, the applicant has proposed that no more than 35 new dwellings be occupied until the RTE is either sold or rented to an equine operator.
- The proposals which have been put forward by the applicant to secure the delivery of the can be formalised through the Section 106 process. Officers consider that these proposals represent 'best endeavours' to secure the RTE, although acknowledge that this is not an absolute guarantee of its delivery.

### **Conflict of Uses**

- There is no evidence to suggest that the use of land for housing in proximity to the training yard would cause material harm. In reaching this decision, officers are mindful of the current situation in respect of the proximity of residential properties to Meddler Stud.
- Officers consider that a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of conflict of uses could not be substantiated at appeal, and would not be able to produce evidence to substantiate this reason for refusal.

### **Section G - Implications of a refusal of planning permission:**

- G1. It is likely that should Members subsequently resolve to refuse planning permission the applicants will appeal that decision.
- G2. At the time of writing this report, Officers consider that it would be difficult to defend a refusal of planning permission on the grounds discussed above, given the weight of evidence demonstrating the development proposals would not be harmful in these respects and the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary.
- G3. A refusal of planning permission for any development on indefensible grounds is likely to lead to planning permission being granted at appeal. This outcome could have significant implications for the Council.

- G4. Firstly, the Council's reputation would be adversely affected by its inability to properly defend its reasons for refusal at appeal.
- G5. Secondly, if a Local Planning Authority experiences more than 20% of its major development appeals allowed in any two-year period, it is deemed a failing authority and would face Government sanction. This would include introduction of a right for applicants proposing major development to submit planning applications directly to the Planning Inspectorate, effectively taking the decision making power out of the hands of the Local Planning Authority.
- G6. Finally, the applicants would have the right to recover their appeal costs from the Council should the Inspector appointed to consider the appeal conclude it has acted unreasonably. Advice about what can constitute unreasonable behaviour by a Local Authority at appeal is set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 49). Three of the numerous examples cited in the advice are as follows:

What type of behaviour may give rise to a substantive award against a local planning authority?

Local planning authorities are at risk of an award of costs if they behave unreasonably with respect to the substance of the matter under appeal, for example, by unreasonably refusing or failing to determine planning applications, or by unreasonably defending appeals. Examples of this include:

- preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted, having regard to its accordance with the development plan, national policy and any other material considerations.
- failure to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal on appeal.
- vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis.

- G7. In the absence of evidence to substantiate its reasons for refusal and the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, officers consider it would be difficult to defend a potential claim for the award of costs at appeal. An award of costs against the Council is likely to have significant financial implications and when combined with its own costs is estimated to exceed £100,000.

**Section H – Conclusions:**

- H1. Members should also have regard to Paragraphs 248 to 256 of Working Paper 1 where officer conclusions and assessment of the 'planning balance' of issues are set out.
- H2. Officers are concerned that the Committee resolution that Members are 'of mind' to refuse planning permission for this development on grounds of prematurity, impact on infrastructure and conflict of uses, are ill-founded and not grounded in evidence. The evidence available to date demonstrates that these three matters of concern to Members would not be adversely

impacted by the development.

- H3. Officers consider that should planning permission be refused on one or a combination of the three grounds for refusal resolved at the last Development Control Committee meeting, the Council would find it difficult to defend the decision at a subsequent appeal and is likely to face a claim for award of cost against it (on top of having to fund its own defence).
- H4. In considering the merits of this planning application, Members are reminded of the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework for the decision maker to balance the benefits of the proposed development against its dis-benefits and only where those dis-benefits would significantly and demonstrably out-weigh the benefits should planning permission be refused (reference paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework).
- H5. In this case, the weight of evidence is clear that the dis-benefits of development are significantly outweighed by the benefits of development proceeding and clearly points to the grant of planning permission in this case.

### **Section I – Recommendation:**

I1. That outline planning permission is **APPROVED** subject to:

**(1) The completion of a S106 agreement to secure:**

- Affordable housing – 30% of the total dwelling units.
- Primary school contribution –£194,896.
- Pre-school contribution - £36,546.
- Libraries contribution - £13,824.
- Highways contributions - cycle improvements: £28,490; public transport infrastructure: £2,000.
- Healthcare contribution - £26,000.
- Open space contribution – TBC.
- The build out and operation of the RTE.

In the event that there are any substantive changes to the S106 package, then this will go back to Members for consideration.

**(2) And the following conditions:**

1. Outline time limit.
2. Reserved Matters to be agreed (appearance, scale, layout [including internal site layout of roads and ways] and landscaping).
3. Compliance with approved plans.
4. Highways – details of proposed access.

5. Highways – details of bin storage.
6. Highways – details of surface water discharge.
7. Highways – details of carriageways and footways.
8. Highways - details of car parking and manoeuvring areas, including cycle storage.
9. Highways – details of turning space.
10. Highways – provision of visibility splays.
11. Highways – provision of pedestrian crossing.
12. Archaeology – implementation of a programme of work; site investigation and post investigation assessment.
13. Contamination – remediation strategy.
14. Contamination – further investigative work if necessary.
15. Details of surface water disposal.
16. No piling or investigation boreholes using penetrative methods.
17. Scheme to provide flood plain compensation.
18. Scheme of surface water drainage/surface water strategy.
19. Scheme for provision and implementation of pollution control.
20. Foul water disposal details.
21. Surface water drainage details.
22. Construction management plan.
23. Hours of construction.
24. Design code.
25. Details of boundary treatment.
26. Samples of materials.
27. Detailed scheme of hard and soft landscaping.
28. Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
29. Tree survey and management plan for tree belts, including planting details.
30. Tree protection details, including details of tree works for retained trees.
31. No development within RPA of existing trees.
32. Landscape management plan, including enhancements for biodiversity.
33. Recommendations of Ecological Risk Appraisal and Protected Species Survey to be implemented (including mitigation and enhancement plan).
34. Details of bat licence.

35. Details of lighting.
36. Provision of fire hydrants.
37. Waste minimisation and recycling strategy.
38. RTE – full details including boundary treatment.

### **Documents:**

#### Application documents

All planning application documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

<http://planning.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=N3AHSMJD1G00>

Alternatively, hard copies are also available to view at Planning, Planning and Regulatory Services, Forest Heath District Council, District Offices, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk IP28 7EY

#### Other background documents

The following documents are attached to this report as background document:

- i) Email correspondence received on behalf of the Jockey Club after the committee report to the 5 November 2014 meeting was prepared (Appendix 1)
- ii) Committee report from 5<sup>th</sup> November 2014 meeting of Development Control Committee (Working Paper 1).
- iii) Letter dated 17<sup>th</sup> November 2014 from Mr Thomas Smith, URS Infrastructure and Environment UK Limited (Planning Agent) (Working Paper 2).
- iv) Letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014 from Mr Tony Kernon, Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd (Council's Equine Consultant) (Working Paper 3).
- v) Planning Appeal Decision in respect of Planning Application Reference F/2012/0766/OUT (Meddler Stud, Bury Road, Kentford, Outline planning application for residential development) (Working Paper 4).
- vi) Letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014 from Mr Tony Kernon, Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd (Council's Equine Consultant) (Working Paper 5).
- vii) Email correspondence dated 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2014 from Mr William Gittus, Jockey Club Estates (Working Paper 6).
- viii) Updated Planning Policy advice received 21 November 2014 (Working Paper 7).

Case Officer: Philippa Kelly.....Tel. No. 01284 757382