**From:** Noel Mason   
**Sent:** 08 December 2014 08:59  
**To:** Bob Neville  
**Cc:** Caroline Roche; Public Access DC Comments  
**Subject:** Comments re : Planning Application 14/01762/F - Swalcliffe Equestrian Park

Dear Mr Neville,

I attach my comments regarding the latest planning application detailed below as I am unable to deal with this via your website which is unavailable due to maintenance

**Comments re Planning Application 14/01762/F**

A number of points seem to have been raised, both for and against the proposed application.

Whilst in principle the development of a business that increases the value of an area, through either the provision of either increased local employment or the availability of amenities possible to be enjoyed by local is whole heartedly supported, the proposed development at Swalcliffe Equestrian does raise a number of points:

1. **The increase in local noise issue**. It should be remembered that sound is measured with a logarithmic scale, therefore a 10db increase in noise effectively doubles the loudness of a noise. This is due to the issues with measuring sound, nuisance and loudness objectively and quantitivly.

Sound level or noise level is a physical quantity measured with measuring instruments.  
Loudness is a psycho-physical sensation perceived by the human auditory perception or the human ear/brain mechanism. That is not the same.  
We are told by psycho-acousticians that a level 10 dB greater usually means "double the loudness" or "twice as loud".  
A decibel is one-tenth of a bel, which is the logarithm of the ratio of any two energy-like quantities or two field-like quantities.  
   
Ratio doubling means:  
− a power level of +3 dB, or a sound intensity level of +3 dB   
− an electric voltage level of +6 dB, or a sound pressure level of +6 dB  
− a loudness level of about +10 dB  
− 10 dB more SPL means 10 times increase in amplifier gain (amplification).

1. **The question of the “28 day rule”**

Perhaps CDC would be so kind as to explain and confirm how the 28 day rule would / could apply if the current application is successful?

The “28 day rule” is applicable for a temporary change of use for land from, say, agricultural use to equestrian use.

At present (in the absence of planning consent for change of use from agricultural to equestrian use) the 28 day rule would seem applicable.

However if consent is granted, the land would be used for equestrian use through planning permission. An event in excess of the limits of number of riders per day (in accordance with planning permission) would not be a change of use, but a change of scale of current use and as such is not provided as a permitted development and could not be done lawfully in accordance with the 28 day rule.

It would seem irrelevant under planning law if the use is a competition or training day – it remains equestrian use.

If the proposal was to host (for example) a Sunday market then that would be a change of use, rather than an increase in normal use.

There appears to be no provision within the permitted development rules allowing 28 day use for an increase of scale of use of equestrian land. Therefore CDC is invited to offer an explanation as to how such a proposed increase of use would be lawfully available, as it is clear that is the applicant’s intent, but is not part of the formal application.

It is argued that the events and operation that are being proposed for operation within the “28 day rule” should be subject to planning approval.

1. **The question of access**: It would seem that the owners of the farm have already appeared to have increased the use of one local road due to the installation of the anaerobic digester on the Taylors farm, which was approved by Oxford County Council without any public consultation.  Perhaps a more realistic option for the residents of Swalcliffe, The Sibfords and Burdrop, would be if the owners of Swalcliffe Equestrian funded the improvement of the road access to the site from the Tadmarton Heath direction before any further consideration is given to their planning applications for the site in question.  This would certainly help reduce the impact of traffic to the villages closest to the proposal,  and would help reduce the impact of vehicle noise during operation.
2. **Toilet provision**: It is noted that little provision has been made on site for operations that may have up to 50 riders per day (that is ignoring the “special events” where up to a thousand people may be on site).
3. **Removal of business from local businesses**. It’s noted that during the “special events” there is significant evidence of the provision of numerous vendors providing onsite catering. Surely the unlimited provision of such facilities does not help the local shops and pubs to benefit from the events.

Yours sincerely,

Noel Mason

Tyne Hill House, Sibford Gower, Banbury, Oxfordshire,  OX15 5AD