**From:** Richard Butt
**Sent:** 07 September 2016 16:13
**To:** Nathanael Stock
**Subject:** Objection to 16/01563/F

From: Richard Butt

Subject: 16/01563/F

Demolition of an existing dwelling and a range of large scale equestrian buildings and the erection of a replacement dwelling including associated works and landscaping (resubmission of 14/02157/F) | Muddle Barn Farm Colony Road Sibford Gower

I would once again object to this planning permission being granted for all of my previous submissions plus the Sibford Gower Parish Council's objection to the original application which sums up the reasons very well for why it should not be granted  planning permission along with the policy 817 mentioned at the Parish Council meeting on the 6th September 2016

The previous pertinent objections from local residents should also be taken into consideration, including the objection by Malcolm Bannister in respect of a further drive way on to Colony Road. Despite the applicant saying in his presentation to the SGPC at 8.45pm on 6th September 2016 that the house would be using the "shared driveway" he did not however say how long he would be using the shared driveway before putting in another planning application for a separate drive way if the current application succeeds! In his presentation to the SGPC  he made no comment on how his application would improve the area apart from the discontinuation of the horse boxes going to and from the house.

I would also ask you to consider the fact that  previously (2013) the existing  Muddle Barn Farm house was subject to a "full agricultural tie" How then did the previous owner not pay business rates on what was obviously a large Equestrian  business? By stating that he was a farmer?

A house the size of the proposed house in the application needs to be set in the middle of 600 acres surrounded by 60 feet high trees, not on the edge of 30 acres within metres of the original New Barn Farm House in a farming/agricultural area which overlooks an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty it would not be compatible.

Please reject the application.