

Dear Wiltshire Council Development Services,

I live at 243 Bradford Road, Winsley, BA15 2HL and my property abuts the site that is subject to the planning application PL/2025/05347. Dog walking field and associated works.

I am objecting to application PL/2025/05347. Dog walking field and associated works on the following grounds:

➤ **Road Traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety**

Per the planning application the dog park is scheduled to be open between the hours of 7am to 5pm (10 hours per day) during the months of October to February (152 days out of 365 days) and 6am to 9pm (15 hours per day) during the months of March to September (213 days out of 365 days). The planning application also states that a maximum of 2 cars, 4 people and 8 dogs per hour will be allowed at the site. This equates to a maximum 60 separate entry and exits from the site per day in the summer (total for summer is 12,780 entry and exits) and maximum 40 separate exit and entries per day in the winter (total for winter is 6,080 entry and exit from the site).

In addition, the application states that the owners will visit twice a day to clear up the land which is another 4 exit and entries per day (total for the year is 1,460 entry and exit from the site).

Over a year that equates to 20,320 separate entry and exits from the site.

The planning officer needs to know that the entrance to the site crosses a dedicated cycle and pedestrian path. This is the only footpath between Winsley and Bradford on Avon and a dedicated cycle way (put in after Covid and used extensively). This is also the path along which students from St Lawrence school, walk to and from school each day and the only way to get to the Coop on foot which is the closest Convenience shop and post office to Winsley.

This effectively means up to a maximum of an additional 20,320 opportunities per year for an accident to occur from all the additional traffic to and from the site.

This risk is very real as I have had cyclists' cycle into my car as I exit my drive on two separate occasions in the past 2 years and have had several near misses with joggers using the path and not being aware of us coming out of our driveway because they had earphones in and did not hear us. We are certainly not leaving our property twice an hour for either 10 hours a day or 15 hours a day, as cars will be doing from the proposed site and so the chances of a collision from this proposed development are therefore significantly greater.

The exhaust fumes from the cars entering and exiting the proposed site a maximum of 20,320 times a year together with stationary waiting to enter or leave the site plus vehicles coming to empty dog waste will additionally be detrimental to the air quality in the area, particularly at the entrance where people are walking, jogging and cycling.

The entrance to the site is also next to the bus stop for the D1 service from Bath to Warminster via Bradford on Avon. Having the site with so much traffic and being next to a bus stop is not something I believe the highways agency would approve of and again creates a higher risk of an accident given the significantly increased volume of traffic entering and exiting the site and the extended times the site is proposed to be open.

The entrance to the site is on a road with a 40 mile an hour speed limit with cars often exceeding this speed. The entrance is less than 100 metres from the exit from the Winsley roundabout and on a blind bend creating a maximum of 20,320 separate opportunities for a car accident to happen. This risk is significant particularly given the speed some cars travel down that road in both ways.

It is for this safety reason alone that I believe this application should be thrown out and at the very least an impact analysis provided by the applicant to determine the effect on traffic, air quality and nuisance impact of an additional 20,320 times per year from cars entering and exiting the proposed site.

➤ **Impact to agricultural green belt**

The field in which the proposed dog park will be situated has been agricultural green belt for many years, the field that is planned to access the dog park has been agricultural green belt for many years with sheep grazing in it for at least the past 8 years. The field is surrounded by traditional stone walls and field hedgerow. The application intends putting up security gates, security cameras and high fencing across large stretches of this agricultural green belt, a shipping container almost 3 meters tall, shelter for dog walkers, dog bins and in so doing will immediately impact the open look of this green belt – which will now be spoilt by this fencing, camera's etc. This will all be visible from the road disturbing the green belt openness and be visible directly from my property

In addition, cows and sheep are often grazed in the fields adjoining the proposed dog park. Barking dogs so close to where cows and sheep graze will most definitely be stressful for the livestock and impact their wellbeing.

➤ **Smell and noise**

The application states that there will be a maximum 8 dogs per hour, however there is no way to control or police this as there is no one manning the site to ensure rules are followed and the park will be surrounded by fencing so no one can see into the field either.

If clients stick to a maximum of 8 dogs per hour that is a maximum of 80 dogs a day during winter months and 120 dogs a day during the summer months all of which include public holidays, weekends etc. This equates to a maximum of 37,720 dogs at the site in any given year. To suggest that this many dogs will not cause a noise with barking etc is clearly false, this many dogs coming and going there will be significant barking especially at change over and during each hour.

The gate to access the site will be opened and closed a maximum of 60 times a day in the summer and 40 times a day in the winter. Plus, the applicants state they will visit the site twice a day plus any other traffic needed to access the site mean that there will be constant noise of either dogs barking, cars coming and going or turning to exit, doors slamming, people talking / shouting at their dogs, gates opening and closing. This all happening for 15 hours a day in the summer and 10 hours a day in winter, all literally 2 meters from our seating area with BBQ, patio, table, chairs hammock etc where we often sit and enjoy the weekend, warm afternoons and the evenings or in the winter sitting under the stars.

We have a 30 meter long, dry stone wall which abuts the access to the proposed dog park and this dry-stone wall is only 0.9m high, with the proposed access road 2 cars wide running the full length of it. We will see and hear every single car and every single person that enters and exits the site.

In addition, this many dogs will create a maximum of approx. **12.9 metric tons** of dog excrement (0.37 Kg per dog is the average amount of excrement a dog creates). This excrement poses both a smell and health risk. The applicant states that dog waste will be moved from dog bins to a larger container before being periodically removed. There is nothing in the application saying how often such waste will be removed, there is no-one on site to even manage this. Even if collected once a month this equates to over a metric ton of dog waste sitting, festering waiting to be collected. This will attract flies, rats and disease.

The volume of dog waste will be significant and anyone walking past a full dog bin knows how much they can smell particularly in the summer. The fact that everything will be collected into a larger container which is situated only a few meters from my property and where we often sit is unacceptable and poses not only an odour issue but also a health and safety issue with rats, flies and other insects attracted by this.

It is unacceptable that the waste bins, entrance, buildings, access road etc are all situated in the plan so close to our property and directly next to where we sit in our garden.

It is additionally unacceptable that a 2-lane road will be put in along the length of my rear garden when such a road could have been put in somewhere else.

➤ **Impact on wildlife**

We have foxes, deer, badgers regularly in our garden. Putting up solid fencing will most definitely impact their habit and their lives.

Bats roost in the area and the field is in their flight path as we can see them at night. Having this proposed dog park open during darkness (winter after 4pm) and dusk in autumn will impact their lives. In addition, light pollution from car headlights, torches and seating area will add to problems for bats who have until now been able to fly freely in the area without any light pollution, noise or odours.

Birds of prey circle regularly and sit in the mature trees in our neighbours' garden looking for mice and voles in the proposed dog park – having dogs in the field with their noise and scenting etc will likely mean less wildlife for the birds of prey.

Dog waste if not picked up and dog urine is highly toxic to the environment (particularly in such a confined area). There are several studies which outline how much more toxic dog urine and excrement is vs that of other wildlife and that is before you even consider the potential volume of such waste that will be created. This will not only kill the grass but also drive wildlife away due to dog scenting, noise etc and the urine in such high concentrations will most definitely impact the soil.

➤ **Alternative dog walking parks already exist in the area**

The application states that there is a need for this park because there are “no alternatives available” but there are. There are dog parks in Holt, Westwood and South Wraxall. These are all only within 3 miles of this proposed site. There are others within 5 miles. In addition, a search on the internet shows Wiltshire as a county has over 60 such sites, so to suggest there is a need for this is misleading. Add in the hundreds of miles of bridle paths, woods, canal paths and river walk's available to walk dogs and there is not a need for another dog park.

➤ **Distance from my residence**

The application states that the proposed dog park is 90 meters from my property when in fact it is only 67 meters from the edge of my house. The entrance and building works about my garden and the entrance, cars, people and dogs will be seen from our ground floor windows that face the proposed entrance to this proposed dog park. The original dry-stone wall is 0.9m high so anyone can see into my garden, this also creates an additional security risk that people will realise how easily it is to climb over the stone wall into our garden or see straight into our house. This significantly impacts our privacy (10 hours a day in winter and 15 hours a day in summer) and we will have to keep windows closed and curtains drawn, is a security risk as we have no idea who is coming or going, especially in winter when it gets dark before 4pm (park closes at 5pm) or before sunrise in winter and autumn and anyone could hop over the dry stone wall into our garden.

In addition, as stated above, our seating and BBQ area is literally next door to when the proposed entrance is and cars will be driving back and forth past our property with every car 100% visible to us and us to them. It is unacceptable that the entrance to this proposed dog park is so close to our property given the size of the field the proposed dog park is to be sited in.

➤ **Residential impact**

The application states that all there no residential properties near the proposed site and references Art Studio. This is also incorrect. There are 4 residential properties all with people living in them and which all, abut the site.

➤ **Setting a dangerous precedent for commercialisation of our Green Belt should this be approved**

The individuals who bought this green belt land last year, did so with the sole purpose of putting a dog park business on it. If the council allows this to happen it will set a dangerous precedent for others to do the same with any piece of agricultural land that comes up for sale. The number of dog parks springing up across the country and particularly in Wiltshire shows how this is already happening.

➤ **No on-site management**

The planning application talks about creating jobs for the community but then goes on to say the site is unmanned so the applicant statement is a falsehood as its not creating jobs at all. In addition, the application goes on to make many statements about how the site will be run and what will be done but with no one onsite to manage it. How can any of their statements as to what will be done or enforced at the site ever be delivered. The statements they make have absolutely no way of being guaranteed and are therefore not supportable.

The application states that any disputes between dog owners or site conditions not being followed should be raised with the applicants and they will address, but this relies on the residents impacted by this site raising these concerns with them as they have no way of knowing about the issues themselves (given there is no one on site managing it).

The applicants say they live a short walk from the site. This is also not true, they would have to drive to the site as there is no access to the dog walking site other than from the main road and to get to the site from where they live by foot would take at least 30 minutes.

How is it possible with no management on site to prevent the site being used for something else. There will be a high fence put around the field which will mean what is inside the field will not be visible. They applicants could do what they want on the field and no one would be any the wiser.

➤ **Privacy**

Planning application has security camera's being installed. Putting to one side the idea that security camera's being installed on agricultural green belt, how do I protect my privacy with camera's being installed and I having no control as to where they point or what they record.

This is addition to the fact that any vehicle coming to or from the site can look directly into my property which given the length of time the site will be open means having the curtains closed most of the day.

I also work from home permanently. So, this privacy issue is a critical one as I will be personally impacted every single day by this site and the noise it will now create.

The site will be open on public holidays and every weekend, so there will not be any respite then either on days when we are all supposed to unwind and have a break from the rigors of work and life.

➤ **Conclusions**

The application for change of use will:

- Significant increase traffic in a way that will create a much higher risk of serious injury or accident to person or persons.
- Significantly damage the openness of green belt
- Have a significant impact on wildlife and therefore Biodiversity of the area
- Not preserve the character of the area
- Damage the site with toxicity of dog urine (from maximum of 37,720 dogs a year) and uncollected excrement
- Not provide something that is needed given the number of dog parks within the immediate area and other places to walk and exercise dogs
- Certainly, harm residents of the 4 properties that directly abut the site some of which are only a couple of meters of the proposed entrance
- Create very considerable noise and nuisance from maximum of 37,720 dogs, maximum of 18,860 people, 20,320 entry and exits from the site each year.
- Create smells and health concerns from the amount of dog waste potentially on site all of which is to be stored near the entrance to the field and a few meters from residential gardens
- Impact my privacy from the considerable traffic that will visit the site
- Not provide any additional employment opportunity as not manned at all.
- Set a dangerous precedent that anyone can buy up agricultural green belt and change its use to a dog park, thereby taking over green belt land.

Regards

Julian Oldaker

Owner 243 Bradford Road, Winsley, BA15 2HL