

Thank you for hearing our concerns.

We would like to start by highlighting inaccuracies in this application and planning officer's report where it relies on the 'location plan' drawing. This drawing is inaccurate and not to the scale described. It underrepresents the distance of the proposed development from our boundary and is therefore very misleading. This is important as the planning officer uses this for the basis of her decision that it does not impact our amenity.

6.8 "the proposed stables are approx. 35m from the boundary" is incorrect. The distance measures 20m, nearly 50% less. In para 6.4 the officer says the stables are to be "sited close to the machinery store" which is on our boundary further highlighting this discrepancy. The rest of this paragraph about the impact on our amenity is based on this incorrect measurement and therefore understates the actual impact on our amenity. We are also concerned that Environmental Health Officers may have also been misled if they relied on this.

The Planning Officer states the arena is 52m from our boundary which is incorrect this is more accurately measured at approx. 40m.

Other inaccuracies in the report include:

6.4 "riding arena within the area of land enclosed by mature hedges"- this is incorrect it is in the field outside these hedges.

6.4 "largely screened by established planting" is not accurate- it will open onto a field on two sides and visible at all times from our home.

We also wish to clarify that the replacement of buildings is only for the machinery store. The whole stable complex will be new, additional buildings.

The proposal is excessive for what is needed and contradicts the principles of development. In particular it does not meet "identified needs and maintaining strong local economy" statement relied on and as it is for domestic use it expressly does not provide a "diversification opportunities".

The plans do away with the previous small stables (inaccurately described as redundant garden buildings) and replaces them with a large equestrian facility. This will impact our amenity and the character and appearance of the area. We believe it will be "unacceptable if it appears to urbanise an attractive area or spoil a key view...". That this will just impact our home, rather than several as with the previous application is not a reason to disregard the guidance.

If regrettably consent is to be granted, in line with the principles of development, the arena should be limited to 40m in length (the normal size for a domestic arena) and not cross beyond the fence line, reducing the impact and the lighting strategy (or planning consent) should expressly prohibit the use of floodlights in the arena in line with the dark skies policy.

What is being proposed here is a large equestrian complex of an arena, stables and yard very close to our home. We object to this because of the intrusion it will have on our ability to quietly enjoy our home in this beautiful AONB.