

Appendix 2

EXTRACT: Planning Committee 11th April 2019

Update sheet

Item A

- It has been found that a statement in the submitted *Needs Assessment* document is incorrect. Page 24 of that document features a map which purports to show those equestrian centres with liveries in the area which have closed. One of those is shown as being the South Medburn Farm Equestrian Centre, which is located on the Watling Street near Elstree (2.5km from the application site). However this statement is not correct, as that equestrian centre has not closed. The planning officer visited the South Medburn Equestrian Centre last week (on Fri 5th April 2019) and toured the facilities, which were all open and in use, comprising 2 indoor arenas, 2 outdoor dressage areas, numerous livery stables, staff facilities, and 42 hectares (105 acres) of land, including areas with practice jumps.
- A member of the committee has asked what the distance is between the application site and Immanuel College (Caldecote Towers). That distance is approximately 300 metres as the crow flies.
- A member of the committee has asked how many livery stalls there were in the Caldecote Equestrian Centre which was existing until recently. The applicant's agent has informed us that there were 52 stables and 14 pony stalls. The proposed floor plan shows that 33 stables are proposed in the new building.
- Yesterday (10.04.2019) an e-mail was received by the Council from Sport England, and this has been published by the Council on our website. Sport England had apparently been contacted in the last few days by the applicant's agent, who had sent them a copy of the Committee Report. Having seen the report (notably paragraphs 7.23 and 8.4) they were writing to clarify why the comments that they had sent previously in response to the consultation had not offered any opinion on the proposed development. Sport England explained that the reason why they had commented on the application to demolish the Patchetts Equestrian Centre in 2016, but not on other similar applications such as this one, was that since a change was made in 2016 in the Government's strategy for sport their structure, resources and priorities had changed; and that now their procedure in the case of non-statutory planning application consultations for specialist sports facilities is not to comment themselves but rather to refer the Local Planning Authority to comments from the relevant governing bodies for those sports – which in this case is the British Equestrian Federation. Sport England remind the Council that the BEF are the recognised national governing body for equestrian sports, that they are part funded by Sport England, that they are the umbrella body for other bodies including British Showjumping, British Eventing, British Dressage, the Pony Club and the British Horse Society, and that their comments should therefore be given appropriate weight in any decision making. Their views should not be regarded as subjective because it would not

Appendix 2

be in their interests to have new facilities provided that do not meet a need as that would result in an oversupply of such facilities. The following comments are made in the concluding paragraph of Sport England's e-mail:

"I wish to make it clear that the above observations do not change our position on the planning application i.e. we are neither supporting, or objecting to, the application as we have not considered the application for the reasons explained above, so we are unable to make informed comments on the merits of the application."

- This morning the applicant's agent has forwarded to the Council a three page letter (dated yesterday 10.04.2019) from their drainage consultants SLR (their ref 416.09118.00001). This is a response to the Reason For Refusal 4 at the end of the case officer's committee report. That reason for refusal relates to an objection that has been raised by Hertfordshire County Council, in their role as the Lead Local Flood Authority, who consider that the submitted surface water drainage scheme has not demonstrated that proposed SuDS measures would be adequate to prevent flooding. The new letter from SLR states that (if the application were considered acceptable in other respects) this matter could be dealt with by means of a pre-commencement condition requiring the submission of further details.