

8th October 2026

To Russell Brown (Case Officer)

Wiltshire Planning Department

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

_____ and the land concerned [until its sale to the current owners who purchased the land in March 2025] has always been used for agriculture purposes which we can verify as we had a long-standing Agricultural Lease commencing 1st July 1998 after one of the landowners died; prior to that, we were permitted to use it as pasture for our animals.

However, it should be noted that the area concerned is off the **Winsley Road** on the **B3108** and **NOT Bradford Road** as incorrectly quoted/shown on the application map.

We do have further objections to the above planning application as follows:-

1. Highway Safety and Traffic

In addition to our previous comments, vehicles will have to cross the 'Pedestrian and Cycleway' adjacent to the busy B3108. It should be noted that the stated opening hours will mean that the school children for St. Laurence and Winsley Primary schools will have to cross the vehicular access leading to the proposed dog-walking field twice each school day while using this 'Pedestrian and Cycleway'; considering the proposed opening hours, this will mean that, on occasions, pedestrians, cyclists and mums with pushchairs or anyone else, will have to make the crossing in total darkness as **THERE IS NO STREET LIGHTING ON THIS PART OF WINSLEY ROAD!**

The proposal appears to be a purely commercial enterprise for financial gain as there are many other dog-walking facilities in the nearby area; there are 3 such dog-walking parks within a 2.5-mile radius of Bradford on Avon. The increase in traffic entering and leaving the premises all day is unacceptable on this currently hazardous stretch of road being a main route between Bath and Bradford on Avon with traffic, possibly, travelling at 40mph or more; it, substantially, increases the risk of 'an accident waiting to happen' as there is no street lighting as mentioned above and there appears to be no assessment of this potential hazard.

The land concerned is, also, directly opposite a large layby which abuts our property on Winsley Road and, of course, it does increase the level of traffic movements at any time of the day which can be very busy and include HGV'S and coaches.

When this site was used for agricultural purposes, there was very little traffic going in or out of the field with some grass 'growing' months with no traffic at all!

Cont.

Cont.

[REDACTED] we have observed a dramatic increase in traffic; it should also be noted that the recent narrowing of Winsley Road has reduced the safety of this road yet again. It should be pointed out that with the proposal of winter opening hours to be 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., it will mean that much of the 'rush hour' traffic will occur during twilight or in darkness, making it highly dangerous due to there being no street lighting.

2. Noise and disturbance [Refer to para 6 below]

The applicant, again, gives no details of how the noise of dogs barking etc. will be controlled and limited.

3. Proposed Shelters and other Structures

A number of buildings and structures are proposed in their new positions; however, in this part of the countryside between Bradford on Avon and Winsley, they will still be very visible from the public highway if not more so in the new positions than they were before. This area has enjoyed the "protected openness of agricultural green belt" and so this new application amendment we consider is still not in keeping.

This, together with the parking, the high fencing [which will damage the openness of the land] and new access forms a much wider change to our countryside which is, mostly, 'Green Belt' or A.O.N.B. This, therefore, could set a precedence for further development if allowed and not controlled now.

4. Wildlife

Please can we be assured that the local deer population, and other wildlife currently in the vicinity, will not be restricted by the use of 1.8m fencing which can only be an eyesore?

5. Unmanned Business

We reiterate the following: - on the original Application Form it stated '1 Full-Time employee' is proposed, but at the same time it is said that the site, with its proposals, will be 'unmanned' so where is the employee going to be situated and how will they know about noise, privacy and security disturbances if they are not on site? It should not be up to neighbours to police this proposal! If there is any damage caused by dog-walkers to neighbouring properties or animals, do the owners have adequate insurance to pay for repairs and vets bills?

Also, the owners usually drive to the site as there is no access on foot across the fields which are subject to flooding.

Again, as they do not live on the land, the only way they can manage the business is to monitor it remotely, online or by telephone but who will carry out this and view the CCTV 24 hours a day and what will happen to the footage? This is an intrusion on the privacy of neighbours and the public, but will there be security lights flashing on/off when there is a passerby on the pavement? If there is noise, smell, privacy disturbances or break-ins then the responsibility appears to rest with the neighbours who view it to report it to the owners or to the police, which is completely unsatisfactory and is an intrusion on their time

In consideration of the above, we strongly object to this planning application for change of use and request that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Stuart and Elizabeth Burrell