



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 09 February 2026

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/C/25/3359784

Land at Addington Equestrian Centre, Addington Estate Roads, Addington, Buckinghamshire MK18 2JR

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Sercihan Ucur (Equestrian Investments Limited) against an enforcement notice issued by Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
- The notice was issued on 20 December 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is “without planning permission, the carrying out of operational development comprising the creation of hard standing using materials including, but not limited to, gravel and stone, and the creation of an earth bund.”
- The requirements of the notice are to: Step 1: Permanently remove the hard standing and the earth bund shown in the approximate location cross hatched in black on “Plan 1” from the Land and Step 2: Restore the land cross hatched in black on “Plan 1” to its condition immediately prior to the breach of planning control, by sowing the area with grass seed.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: 3 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary Decision: The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Main Issues

1. The appeal is made under ground (a) which is that planning permission ought to be granted in respect of the breach of planning control alleged in the Enforcement Notice (the Notice). I have considered the reasons for issuing the notice and the main issues are:
 - the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the development accords with the relevant development plan policies regarding the location of development.

Reasons

Character and appearance

2. Addington Equestrian Centre is an equestrian centre comprising outdoor and indoor arenas, stables and hospitality facilities. The centre includes expansive areas of grassland and a belt of trees. This, in combination with the ordered layout and form of outdoor arenas, results in an attractive, ordered, verdant character and appearance to the centre. The site is located in the open countryside and is surrounded by expansive fields bounded by thick hedgerows and belts of trees and forms part of an attractive, verdant rural landscape.
3. The site relates to an area of land in the northwestern corner of the equestrian centre which is bordered by a parking area to the south. The breach relates to the

creation of hardstanding and a bund. It is stated that the hardstanding is used for parking vehicles (including lorries) during equestrian events. The hardstanding comprises a large, irregularly shaped area of loose gravel and stone and the bund is an expansive earth bund comprised of topsoil which is located to the west of the hardstanding. The untidy form and appearance of the hardstanding and bund give this part of the centre a disorderly appearance.

4. The hardstanding and earth bund are visible from the equestrian centre and the adjacent fields, appearing as an obvious, untidy and incongruous incursion which detract from the ordered, verdant character of the wider equestrian centre, resulting in harm to the established character and appearance of the area and the surrounding landscape. Conflict therefore arises with those aims of policy NE4 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021) (LP) which seek to ensure that development is not visually prominent in the landscape.
5. Conflict also arises with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character including landscape setting.

Location of development

6. Given the identified harm to landscape character, the development results in conflict with those aims of LP policy C2 which seeks to locate horse-related development where it will maintain countryside character and ensure that development is designed to minimise adverse impact on the locality and landscape character. Given this development plan conflict, the site is not an appropriate location for the development.
7. LP policy S3 sets out the Council's settlement hierarchy and the amount of housing to be accommodated at each settlement, identifying the most sustainable locations for housing growth. There is no compelling justification put forward that this housing delivery policy is applicable to this appeal.

Other considerations

8. The appellant states that the hardstanding is needed for lorry parking which is necessary for the continued operation of equestrian events and which avoids the need to park on 'greenland' parts of the site. There is, however, no substantive evidence before me regarding these parking requirements or the shortfall in existing parking capacity to give substantial credence to.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the unauthorised development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and is not an acceptable location for the development. I therefore conclude that the appeal on ground (a) should not succeed.

Formal Decision

10. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

N Robinson INSPECTOR