

**Freya Oldaker**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**22 July 2025**

**To Russell Brown (Case Officer)**

**Wiltshire Planning Department**

**OBJECTIONS TO: Planning application PL/2025/05347**

I have been privately renting 'the barn' (or otherwise known as 'Endellion') which is a residential property located on the plot of 243 Bradford Road for the past 4 years and I am objecting to this planning application.

Upon review of the planning application, I believe that my dwelling has been mis-labelled as an art gallery (the dwelling sits at the back of the plot of 243 Bradford Road, closest to the proposed application site).

My objections to the above planning application are

**1. Noise disturbance and smells**

**Noise**

The proposed dog park is applying for 2-4 cars, 8 dogs and 2 people per car to be able to access the gates every hour from 06:00 to 21:00 (March to Sept) and 07:00 to 19:00 (Oct to Feb) and will run every day including the weekends. (Monday to Sunday).

The proposed business will create a significant noise disturbance to me at my house. I am a lawyer, and I work from home frequently. Regular noise disturbances (as the proposal will result in) will cause me significant challenges during my working day (particularly when I have my windows and doors open during spring and summer).

I will be disturbed throughout my working day (and before and after) by dogs barking, calling/shouting at dogs, commands and whistles to train dogs, washing dogs and associated users' noises. In addition to this the proposal does not provide for anyone to be on site to manage noisy or disruptive dogs or individuals and it is up to residents to report these disturbances before any such remedial action will be taken. This is unacceptable and it cannot be residents' responsibility to ensure that noise is kept to a minimum so that the business owners can increase their profits at our expense.

In addition to this car will be driving up and down the road right next to me, associated noise from opening and shutting gates, car engine noise from stopping/starting and parking on a gravel carpark.

Further, my house overlooks an open garden and the proposed agricultural field, which currently has wire/hedgerow and low drystone walling borders. The field in question is only 67.5 m from my house (the application has incorrectly stated the nearest residential property is more 75 m away).

Another field to the side of me is used for grazing cattle and sheep.

The gate and gravel carpark area are sited right next to the bottom of my garden patio where there is a low dry-stone wall. This means I will be greatly disturbed by cars pulling up next to me and opening the gates to access the proposed car park. This will particularly be the case when using that part of the garden (which I frequently do to enjoy the calm, relaxing and open countryside).

### **Light Pollution**

In the winter months, there will also be light pollution from headlights and torches, which will shine directly into my facing windows.

### **Car Fume Pollution**

Car exhaust fumes will be caused by the cars waiting every hour by the gates to enter and leave. This will be harmful to my health and to wildlife in the fields. Potentially 60 cars a day during opening hours.

### **Smells and hazards from dog waste**

The dog waste will be a hazard and smell disturbance to me, especially during the summer months. The dog bins are to be sited in the proposed car park only 68m from my house. In the summer months, the smells from dog feces and urine will be terrible, so close to my house.

The larger waste collection container has not been identified on the planning application and details of its emptying have also not been fully provided.

The waste disposal information is vague and inconsistent, which potentially suggests that dog waste could be held on site for long periods of time which is also a hazard and contaminant to the nature and land.

## **2. Privacy and Security**

My residential dwelling sits in an open setting and looks straight onto and faces the proposed dog park and 6ft fenced field.

The distance from the proposed dog park to my residential barn property is only 67.5m (the application has plainly miscalculated the distance from the nearest residential property).

The dividing dry-stone wall border is in only 94cm high.

I will be in full view of all the passing 60 cars and users, every day for up to 15 hours a day driving to the gates, stopping to open the gates and closing the gates.

I will lose all privacy and be subjected to constant noise and privacy disturbance.

### **Security Issues**

The low dry-stone wall at the bottom of the garden currently sides onto to secure closed agricultural fields.

The dog park application means the low dry-stone walling will now side onto the open driveway from the main road. This will substantially raise a security risk and make it very easy for someone to hop over the wall into the garden, out of view and makes my property vulnerable and less secure.

### **3. Highway Safety and Traffic**

The change of use of agricultural land to a potential dog park business will create a substantial increase in the volume of traffic crossing and joining a busy road.

Bradford Road is a 40mph busy commuter road, with buses, a bus stop and a recently installed cycle and pedestrian path on the side of the proposed site entrance. Cars frequently go past much quicker than 40mph.

The dangers of a significantly increased number of 60 cars daily entering and leaving the site, potentially 4 cars every hour (2 in and 2 out) would greatly increase the risk of an accident with a pedestrian, school child or cyclist.

The site has always been agricultural, and the area/road is not suitable for this volume of extra traffic. The number of cars entering/leaving the site is more than most business uses in urban areas. The D1 buses also use the road and there is a bus stop next to the proposed site entrance adding further hazards.

This application therefore poses a significant increased risk of pedestrian/cycle/car accidents.

.

#### **4. Agricultural Green Belt Open Land**

The erection of high 6ft fences and gates around the perimeter of the dog park would seriously impact and harm the “protected openness of agricultural green belt”

The agricultural green belt field in the application and all the surrounding agricultural grazing land is currently divided by natural hedgerow and dry-stone walling.

The proposed application would significantly destroy the “agricultural openness” of this agricultural area. It would create a very stark and bleak 6ft fenced and gated area which would be on full view from the road and surrounding properties.

#### **5. Safeguarding Countryside**

The area of the proposed site has been used to graze sheep since I have lived and rented the barn house for the past 4 years at 243 Bradford Road.

The fields are full of wildlife, including deer, foxes, bats, rabbits, mice and birds of prey. I see these animals and birds daily in the garden and the adjoining fields and I watch the bats flying in the early evening.

The smells, scent marking and threats from untrained and aggressive dogs from a permanent dog park would deter this wildlife from passing through and living in their current habitats and may possibly force them to move away from the area.

Some of these dogs may also be aggressive and may cause stress to the grazing cattle and sheep in the adjacent fields.

#### **6. Buildings on Agricultural Green belt and setting a Precedent land or future Developments**

Most current dog parks are on land that current farmers own to raise extra funds. The applicants do not live on the land (and do not even intend to manage it on-site). They do not farm on the land and have purchased the land for the sole purpose of trying to change its use for a lucrative business (while destroying its agricultural character and disturbing local residents). The land has always been agriculturally farmed since I have lived here for the past 4 years.

There is no need for another dog park here because there are 3 dog parks within a 3-mile radius of Bradford on Avon and many more within a 10-mile radius, so a dog park here is not necessary and is only sought for monetary gains.

Within 3 miles of the site

3 miles Walkies Secure Dog paddock, South Wraxall, Bradford on Avon.BA152RR

2.5 miles Bradford on Avon Dog Walking Fields, Granby House. BA152AL

3.5 miles Holt Dog Park, Bradford Road, Holt BA146PL

5 miles Walkies Secure Dog Paddock, Warminster Road, Claverton Down, Bath BA26XJ

8 miles Paws in Keevil, Trowbridge BA146LT

7.5 miles Hound Haven at Shaw, Melksham SN128EG

9.5 miles Vinnys Getaway, Melksham. SN127RB

9.5 miles Brokerswood Dog Field, Westbury

13 miles Halfpenny Field, Chippenham SN147BS

## **7. New Buildings sited on Agricultural green belt**

The shipping container and covered rain shelter cabin will be visible from my house, and they are not in keeping with the openness of the land. It may set a precedent for the erection of other building structures on surrounding agricultural green belt land.

## **8. Unmanned**

The proposed dog park intends to be unmanned, so they will not be aware of the noise/smell disturbances, privacy disturbances and security disturbances that I will be going through.

They do not live on the land, and intend to manage the business remotely, online and by telephone.

So, noise, smell and privacy disturbances will need to be constantly monitored and reported by the surrounding residents to the owners or the police.

This is not a viable business model for the surrounding community.

The CCTV that will be used at the entrance gates to monitor users, does not state who will monitor the footage or what will happen to the footage. This could violate my privacy rights due to the low stone walling.



