

Comments on Officers Report (20/07/2026) for Roundwood 24/02889/FP

Page 15/16 and 18/19 Paragraphs 3.30 and 3.31 outline the BHS requirements and Highways related matters

Page 24 Proposal does not include horse needs as set out in pages 15/16 and 18/19

Page 3 4 Paragraph 34 talks about pedestrian desire line to Botany Bay and on to the prow. No mention that there is a DMMO upgrading this to a bridleway.
Strongly suggest this DMMO is expedited BEFORE the Planning Committee meeting in October otherwise this will be lost as it won't be in the deliverables – see Para 4.00 comment below.

Page 35 Paragraph 4.48 mentions horses in the context of the eastern boundary pedestrian circular route.
This needs to be a PROW bridleway.

Page 46 Paragraph 4.99 talks about the same Botany Bay link as an ATE route but nothing about shared with horses or as a bridleway – see DMMO comment above.

Page 48 Paragraph 4.103 talks about this ATE route as 2m wide tarmac surfaced path, not a 50/50 with a soft surface for horses and others.

Paragraph 4.106 is the HCC Rights of Way Team consultation. It talks about the Botany Bay route to be Restricted Byway or Bridleway and a desire to upgrade Graveley 010 to Restricted Byway or Bridleway. Plus a resurfacing of Graveley 010 subject of s106 funding.

I suggest these should be a condition of approval.

Page 49 Paragraph 4.107 requires a signed off RoWIP and improvements to the footpath will be via s278, but not upgraded to bridleway as the path is outside the applicants ownership.

Paragraph 4.109 states that Graveley 010 will have two connections to the site in the northwest and northeast (my reading of the plans does not show that, not the link to the eastern boundary 'bridlepath').

Paragraph 110 considers that proposed developments would be acceptable to the BHS. I suggest not.

Page 51 Paragraph 4.117 6.10.4 states the tarmac area will be reduced to 2m tarmac and 1m minimum grass verge for the usage by horses. It doesn't say this will be a restricted byway, nor any mention of signage for horses to remove any possible conflict of users.

Page 75 shows the s278 contributions and only refers to Graveley surface improvements.

Page 89 has the Rights of Way Condition and need for a signed off RoWIP. I suggest this sign off must include explicitly our requests for the avoidance of doubt of what should/must be delivered. This will include reference to the Botany Bay DMMO, the Botany Bay link to be a bridleway (as well as an ATE route), the eastern boundary bridlepath to be a prow bridleway with connections to the Botany Bay bridleway and the Graveley 010 footpath (assuming this cannot be upgraded to a bridleway, the Back Lane stopping up to be a restricted byway, and anything else I may have missed in my quick run through.