

[REDACTED]

From: Ann Fallows [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 September 2026 20:46
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Objection to Planning Application SMD/2026/0392

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam

Application Number: SMD/2026/0392

Location: Archbury Lodge, Ashbourne Road, Whiston

Proposed Development: Change of use from horse paddock to horse paddock and secure dog exercise field with associated parking.

I **strongly wish to object** to the above planning application.

My property sits directly adjacent to the above mentioned field and the proposal will have a significant detrimental effect on our everyday life. The reasons for my concerns are set out below:

1. Unacceptable proximity to our home

The proposed dog exercise field is located immediately adjacent to our boundary and sits only 6 metres from our residential property. Whilst we currently hear activity in the field, this is relatively quiet, irregular and at a level you might normally expect from a neighbour. The proposed change of use would introduce a commercial/recreational activity involving a continual turnover of visitors, dogs and vehicles, potentially throughout significant periods of the day.

The proximity of such an activity to our home gives rise to a serious and entirely foreseeable impact on our residential amenity. We should not be expected to accept a significant intensification of activity virtually on our doorstep. This would become very intrusive and the impact on us would be immense.

The three proposed car parking spaces will be directly adjacent to our front garden therefore seriously impacting our quiet space. Our garden will become a constant echo of cars manoeuvring, doors slamming, talking, barking and potentially out of control dogs.

2. Loss of privacy

The proposal would result in a significant deterioration in the privacy and enjoyment of our home.

Users of the dog exercise field would be spending prolonged periods within the immediate vicinity of our property, with people and dogs repeatedly entering and leaving the site. This would create an ongoing sense of being overlooked and observed and would materially change the existing relationship between our home and the surrounding land.

The existing horse paddock does not generate anything approaching this level of activity.

The fact that the dog field is described as "secure" does not address the loss of privacy and increased human presence created by the proposed use.

The boundary between ourselves and the proposed dog field is a deciduous hedge and therefore foliage will be lost from autumn through to spring. This seriously concerns me from a privacy point of view with an added concern through winter months when car headlights would become an added issue by shining into our house as they come and go.

3. Noise and disturbance

Noise is one of our principal concerns.

The proposed use would introduce repeated and unpredictable barking, shouting, whistling, vehicle movements, gates opening and closing, car doors, conversations and general activity associated with visitors and dogs.

Unlike the current paddock use, these disturbances could occur repeatedly throughout the operating day. Dog barking in particular can be highly intrusive to nearby residential properties and can carry considerable distances.

The cumulative effect of repeated short periods of noise should not be underestimated. Even if individual incidents are relatively brief, the regularity and unpredictability of the disturbance could have a substantial effect on our ability to enjoy our home and garden in peace.

The planning authority should therefore consider not merely whether noise can be technically controlled, but whether the nature and intensity of the proposed use is appropriate in such close proximity to an existing dwelling.

4. Traffic and Access

Proposed vehicle access to the dog field is via a current, quite concealed and very rarely used agricultural gateway off the A52 Ashbourne Road. This is an A classified road which is subject to a speed limit of 60mph. A primary route connecting Stoke-on-Trent to Ashbourne which sees a large volume of traffic during many hours of the day, everyday of the week. The field gateway sits almost opposite the junction to Shirley Lane and quickly comes open you as you approach the village having come around the bends from the Ashbourne direction.

Having seen an accident on this approach in recent weeks, I urge the council to give careful consideration to the safety matter. Change of use from a rarely used agricultural gateway to a business potentially operating 7 days a week would see a huge increase in traffic pulling in and out. This will come with an increased element of risk not only to ourselves as a neighbouring property but also to other neighbours and all traffic entering into the village using the main A52.

Assuming signage will be a necessity to signpost users of the dog field, I have added concerns that this will obscure our vision as we pull out onto a 60mph busy road on a daily basis. Again, I urge the council to consider the impact.

The proposed parking area raises a further safety concern. The field directly abuts the A52, where the national speed limit applies, yet it has not been demonstrated that the parking area will be securely enclosed when dogs are let out of vehicles, it shows a gate that is to be retained but does not state that this will be opened/closed during each visit. There is a foreseeable risk of a dog escaping onto the busy carriageway, placing the dog, its owner and other road users in danger. The application should clearly demonstrate how dogs will be safely transferred between vehicles and the secure exercise area.

5. Hours of Business

Given the nature of the proposal, this business would have the potential to operate 7 days a week, from early in a morning through to late at night particularly during the summer months. Without wanting to go over the noise and disturbance issue again, I urge the planning authority to consider the impact this would have on ourselves and other neighbouring properties. Do the council agree that restricted operating hours would have to be enforced?

6. Environmental Health and Pollution

a. Unmanaged dog waste can cause nutrient enrichment in local soils and unpleasant odors for nearby residents.

b. Rainwater can wash accumulated waste and bacteria into nearby ditches, watercourses and/or agricultural land therefore posing a water pollution risk.

c. The application form claims that the proposal is exempt from mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain because the development site is 0.2 hectares or below. However, the red-line application site appears to extend to approximately 5,000 m², equivalent to approximately 0.5 hectares, and therefore substantially exceeds that exemption threshold. The exemption relied upon appears to be

incorrect and it is unclear why the application has been validated without the required biodiversity information. The Council is requested to review this matter and require a completed biodiversity metric and appropriate habitat information unless the applicant can demonstrate that another statutory exemption applies.

d. Inadequate waste disposal infrastructure can attract vermin and/or spread parasites to local wildlife and livestock.

What steps will be taken to ensure dog waste is disposed of promptly and securely to ensure the above adverse consequences are avoided? Can the planning authority set out a condition to the applicant that neighbouring properties should not and will not be effected by poor waste management.

7. Proximity to Livestock/Grazing Sheep

Numerous surrounding fields accommodate livestock and over the last several months we ourselves have grazed sheep in the field to the rear with only the boundary hedge between them and the proposed dog field. What precautions will be put in place to avoid an unpredictable dog getting to such livestock? Can the planning authority confidently commit that the field would be secure enough to avoid such an horrendous situation?

8. Intensification of use

This application represents a significant intensification of the existing land use.

The current horse paddock is not comparable to a dog exercise facility. The proposed development would introduce a commercially operated destination where customers would deliberately travel to the site to exercise their dogs.

This inevitably creates additional activity that does not currently exist, including vehicle movements, parking, pedestrian activity and dog-related noise.

The planning authority should assess the proposal based on the **actual likely intensity of the new use**, rather than treating it as a minor variation to the existing paddock use.

9. Impact on residential amenity

Taken as a whole, I consider that the proposal would have a materially harmful impact on our living conditions and residential amenity of our home.

The combination of:

- the extremely close proximity to our property;
- increased human activity;
- loss of privacy;
- barking and other dog-related noise;
- vehicle movements;
- parking activity; and
- the proposed intensity of use

would fundamentally alter the existing character of the site and its relationship with our home.

This is not simply a case of a neighbouring landowner making a general objection to change. The proposed use introduces a new and substantially more intensive activity immediately alongside an established dwelling, with predictable consequences for noise, disturbance and privacy.

10. Cumulative impact

I ask the planning authority to consider the combined effect of all of these factors rather than considering each issue in isolation.

Even if individual aspects of the proposal could potentially be mitigated, the cumulative impact of dogs, customers, vehicles, parking and associated activity in such close proximity to our home remains unacceptable.

Screening or fencing cannot eliminate barking, vehicle movements or the presence of visitors, nor can it restore the quiet and privacy currently associated with the horse paddock.

11. Relevant Planning Policy

The proposal should be considered against Policies DC1, SD4, T1 and SS10 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan. These policies require development to protect residential amenity, avoid unacceptable noise, light and other pollution, satisfactorily address highway safety and be appropriate to its countryside location.

Policy P3 of the August 2026 National Planning Policy Framework also requires development to avoid unacceptable effects upon living conditions from noise, artificial light and other pollution. National Policy TR6 states that development should be refused where it would have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I **strongly object to this planning application**.

In my view, the proposed change of use represents an inappropriate intensification of activity on a site that is simply too close to neighbouring residential accommodation and insufficiently suited to the scale and nature of the proposed dog exercise facility.

The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, privacy, noise levels and general disturbance, while the proposed site and parking arrangements raise further concerns regarding whether the land is capable of safely and appropriately accommodating the proposed use.

I therefore respectfully request that the Planning Authority **refuse the application**.

Should the applicant seek to amend the proposal, I would ask that any revised scheme be assessed afresh, with particular attention to the separation from neighbouring dwellings, the true capacity and size of the site, operating hours, maximum number of dogs and customers, noise generation, vehicle movements and the adequacy of the proposed parking and access arrangements.

Yours Sincerely

Ann Fallows