

PLANNING REF : 251143
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Seaforth Cottage
: Upper Culham Lane
: RG10 8NR
SUBMITTED BY : George & Annie Harper
DATE SUBMITTED : 07/10/2025

COMMENTS:

Having reviewed the revised plans submitted by the applicant, we wish to reaffirm the concerns outlined in our previous submission dated June 2025. The fundamental scale and nature of the proposed development remain unchanged, and our objections stand.

1. Excessive Scale of Operation

The proposal still includes stabling for 150 horses, which is wholly disproportionate for a facility described as "private". The scale suggests a commercial-level operation rather than a private one, and the applicant has not provided adequate justification for such capacity.

2. Increased Proximity to Residential Properties

The relocation of the polo pitch brings it even closer to neighbouring homes, increasing the likelihood of noise and disruption. Similarly, the repositioned muck heap now sits nearer to Upper Culham. Given the volume of waste generated by 150 horses, this poses a significant risk to air quality, odour levels, and overall residential amenity.

3. Visual and Traffic Impact

The revised access road now runs closer to residential dwellings, including direct visibility from Seaforth Cottage. When we purchased our property, it was for its tranquil views over open countryside not to witness frequent movements of articulated lorries and increased vehicular traffic. With a minimum of 60 daily car trips anticipated from staff alone (30 employees making twice-daily journeys), the cumulative traffic impact is substantial and incompatible with the rural character of the area. Furthermore, as Appendix D of the Delivery and Servicing Management Plan indicates, 5 employees (and therefore presumably 5 vehicles) will be arriving on site prior to 6am, further bringing into question the tranquility of the area.

4. Lack of Community Engagement

Despite repeated concerns raised by local residents, the applicant has made no meaningful effort to engage with the community. This absence of dialogue is deeply disappointing and undermines the principles of transparent and inclusive planning.