Marc and Brenda Vandamme

 Partway House

 Swalcliffe OX 15 5HA

January 9, 2015

FAO Mr. R. Neville

Cherwell District Council

Bodicote House

Bodicote

Banbury OX15 4AA

Ref: 14/01762/F

USE OF LAND AT GRANGE FARM FOR MIXED USE COMPRISING EQUESTRIAN

TRAINING/COMPETITIONS (USE CLASS D2) AND AGRICULTURE , TOGETHER WITH

EXTENSION OF EXISTING VEHICLE PARKING AREA

OBJECTION LETTER

Further to Paul Walton Associates numerous documents sent in at the end of Dec 2014,

we would like to express our objection once again to the above-referenced

Planning Application. Firstly, because the Applicant’s Planning Consultant tries to

make the report have a semblance to the original Planning Statement when in fact ,

it is vastly more intrusive and large in scale than before. The amendments and new Maps

attempt to portray organisation when the actual operations and layout equates to complete disorganisation and contradictions.

We believe that the Planning Application goes against all of those Local Development Policies

and National Framework Policies as mentioned in all of our Planning Consultant’s previous Objections as well as our lawyers. In addition, we believe that it will cause Statutory Nuisance

and go against those Planning laws that protect our right to enjoy our home and its surroundings.

This revised Planning Statement completely changes the Application in its scope and increases its level of intrusiveness, and its impact on Noise, Nuisance, Landscape Deterioration , Traffic and Highways , and the Environment and Character of the countryside . Finally , Cherwell Council could not possibly approve this Application when there is no way that Conditions could be properly drafted to protect the community and its residents nor is there a manner in which Cherwell could possibly police such a Planning Permission .

This Amended Planning Statement is supported by the same old Transport Assessment, Noise Assessment, Ecological Impact Assessment, etc as before thereby not taking into consideration

the additional 28 days of Large Competition Events that the Applicant wishes to include in this

Application now.

These Assessments do not refer to the increased size of the Parking Areas and the increased size

of the Training and Schooling Fields , which by default will also be used for Competitions for

up to 50 Horses 365 days of the year. These new drawings and Site boundaries dramatically

reach our hedge row and those of our 2 neighbours, Grimston and Boycott. They also allow

for an Overflow Parking Area 365 days a year and a Large Parking Area so as to park 30

15-20 ton Horse Lorries to ruin even more the High Value Landscape.

This Application should be thrown out and an Article 4 Directive placed on the land in question
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as well as those additional fields that surround our property. The Council should oppose such development and have the applicant look for alternative sites. We have suggested the Council

to look for Alternative Site and we have also written to the applicants in May 2014 to request this. We strongly object to Paul Waltons ‘ comments that the Applicants have been considerate and that they have asked Objectors where and how to set up SPE operations.

The Taylors have tried instead to run an Equestrian business with no planning permit and have committed breaches . We believe that the Council should enforce immediately in accordance

with the planning rules . The Council should have hired a specialist equestrian consultant to advise them as they have acknowledge no experience of equestrian matters . They should have asked for internal officers to make their own investigations and measurements both for Noise and Traffic instead relying solely on Applicant and Objector reports ( Please see Walter Beak Mason email of

Friday Jan 9,’15) In addition, the Council should have insisted on new Noise and Traffic , Pollution, Anti-Behavior and other reports considering the new Amended Planning Statement.

We initially complained in August 2013 and we were to contemplating a January 22, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting to refuse this third application. Now, this has been postponed once again all in the name of allowing the Applicant more time to alter and change and broaden the Planning Application instead of the Council enforcing.

Several points in the Amended Planning Application warrant mention :

Point 4: SPE was incorporate in 2011

Point 5: Equestrian activities is not the running of a couple of shows for kids . We moved in 2004

 and there were no equestrian activities in these fields. These fields have been

 agricultural and received agricultural subsidies through 2012

Point 6 : This is untrue and rewriting history as per our detailed account in Judith Norris ‘

 numerous reports

Point 7 : The land at Grange Farm is too small to accommodate large Cross country courses

 \*\*\*\*All other major British Eventing locations have much more land and no Residential

 Houses overlooking the activities.

 The Existing Car Park never received Planning Permission for large vehicles nor do any

 Permanent jumps have permission. SPE is trying to regularise all in one Planning

 Permission and this is not acceptable.

Point 8: SPE will continue to host larger events and horse trials up to 250 riders ( this can mean

 500-600 horses) . There were 16 in 2012 according to Paul Walton . There were

 11 according to SPE in their r letter of Dec 3,2014 .

 Who are we meant to believe . Now they want 28 and an increase of the Training

 and schooling Area in this Amended Planning Statement to 365 days a year !

 \*\*\* When we moved in 2004 , there were less than a handful of small shows.
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Point 9: “ It is clear that the day to day is the core business” .It’s not clear at all. No Business Report

 or details have ever been provided so for whom is it clear? Also, the actual figures

 of schooling and training for up to 50 horses clearly demonstrates 1) how many days that

 SPE is over the allowed 28 days PDR and how many days more they could have horse

 activity , which is about 3-5 times the current usage , ie 365 days 8am -8pm .

Application Proposals :

14. Once again , there is inconsistency ….it’s either Change of Use or Use ….the Applicant

 changes it all the time. Is it really Mixed Use ?

15. Application 14/00801/F was withdrawn as it did not allow the TAYLORS TO HOLD UP TO

 28 LARGE DAYS OF EVENTS OF UP TO 250 RIDERS OR 500+HORSES.

16.It is not clear that equestrian has been on these fields for 10-12 years or the Applicant would

 have applied for a Certificate of Lawful Use and it is not true that the Operators were unaware

 that they needed planning permission for all of these activities including new gates , solid jumps,

 keeping of caravans, installing water pipes, storage facilities, etc . The Taylors have known

 that these were required and are playing for time with the Cherwell Council

17. It is not clear planning status which is at hand but rather the blatant abuse of the Planning

 System with large gaps, including passing over fields outside the planning application and

 setting up of jumps and all structures for shows. The number of set up days for 28 days could far

 exceed 100 days. Where is that Permission Requested for these days of setup?

 There is total confusion on the basis of the Amended Material provided as compared to the

 Letter sent by SPE on Dec 3, 2014. Nothing makes sense.

18. This is untrue .

19. This changes the boundaries and is a new application in terms of the land that the

 Applicant wishes to use and the implications to Landscape, Noise, Loss of Amenity,

 Loss of Character of the Environment, Traffic, etc . This is much more intrusive and

 there is again confusion as to Change of Use or Use ???

1. What is unrestricted equestrian activities???? Up to 50 riders could mean

100 horses ….300 horses . It’s absurd.

1. What will the Council do ? Inspect the log of people who do not already

 abide by rules and regulations ? What good is that to police or set conditions?

1. Equestrian Events up to a maximum of 28 days with 250 riders could mean upwards of

600+ Horses and this is not acceptable for the amenity of those on the border of this

Planning Application nor the 2 communities on either side. It will no longer look like the

Countryside but a junkyard/ Glastonbury all year round.

20. “ The applicant now requests explicit planning permission for the larger events .

 **On the basis of Cherwell Council ‘s earlier approval of the last Application that was**

 **withdrawn, Cherwell had already confirmed to the Applicant that each Large event**

 **would require a Planning Application and this is the way it should be as per the PDR rights**

 and the development and planning laws.

 **The PDR should be withdrawn , a Stop Notice issued and Article 4 imposed.**

21. “ This level of usage , as proposed in the application will ensure the impact of the development

 within the locality is limited and in fact though the changes now proposed , is reduced from the

 Present “ **is simply untrue**. Paul Walton is trying to triple the number of events from 11 events

 as confirmed by SPE to 28 Events and he feels this will protect the countryside further.

 This statement is lacking in logic to say the least. Of course, these Amendments in the Planning

 Statement will dramatically increase the usage .

22. An additional area of parking is proposed actually means a tripling of the current Parking

 Area which already never had any Permit. In addition , they wish Permission for an

 Overflow Parking Lot for 365 days! Plus a parking lot next to our house for 28 days .

 When are you adding back in the 2 Olympic Arenas Mr. Walton ?

 This deterioration of the landscape was already commented on by the

 Landscape Officer since Application #1 and yet the Landscape Officer has yet to comment on the

 Amended Planning Statement . The height will be over the height of the roof of the Stable as the

 Vehicles are taller and also of the colours of the rainbow!

**Conclusion**

**Nothing** in this Planning Application abides by National Planning Framework Policies

regarding Horse Development :

1. **The Proposal Has an Adverse Effect on the Character and the Appearance**

Of the Countryside and the Landscape

1. **The Proposal is Entirely Detrimental to the Amenity of the Neighbouring Properties**

and the 2 Conservation Village Communities

1. **The Proposal does not comply with Local Development Plan Policies nor National**

**Framework Policies**

As Judith Norris has stated in her report , this Application does not meet Policies AG5, C7, C8,C10,C13,R2,EN40 AND TR7 of the Cherwell Local Plan , it breaches Policy EMP 7 AND EMP 11 of the Non-Statutory Local Plan as well as the Policy ESD 13 of the Emerging Local Plan . In addition,

The Core Planning Principles and Pragraph 32, 109, and 123 of the National Planning Framework are

not met.