

PLANNING REF : 251143
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Remenham Hill
: Po Box 4748
: RG9 9DH
SUBMITTED BY : The Clerk The Clerk (Remenham Parish Council)
DATE SUBMITTED : 25/06/2025

COMMENTS:

On 9th June Remenham Parish Council (RPC) met. It discussed application 251143 (Upper Culham farm (UCF)) in Wargrave parish and the impacts of such a 'world class' polo development on Middle Culham cottages in Remenham parish.

It was AGREED that (after possible discussion with WPC) RPC would object to the application. RPC asked me to submit its comments.

Remenham has some experience of private polo facilities (Malmesbury/Park Place (M/PP)) and subsequent retrospective applications. RPC thinks that the advisor on 251143 is the same as on M/PP. RPC wishes to object because:

(i) there will be an impact on the openness of the Green Belt if UCF (following M/PP) were approved, especially if any owners later lost interest in polo, with easier downstream development,

(ii) there will be huge amount of earthworks required to build this as the site is nowhere near level and the 'existing and proposed levels' drawing shows that the level needs to be raised almost 2m in places and presumably excavated in other places (e.g. the reservoir) making this an enormous building site for months, just like M/PP was, but worse

(iii) flies are more of a problem for some residents after M/PP and will be more so after UCF-M/PP,

(iv) traffic on the A4130 will increase - even on Thursday 12th June 2025 a resident driving from Remenham Church Lane to Henley Bridge was passed by four 17-horse transporters coming slowly up the hill, and

(v) the selected site entrance has blind spots (and is exactly where RPC has already seen vehicles driving at 123 mph) and close to WBC-installed double-white lines because of such blind-spots at the entrance to Middle Culham cottages (and Highways should be asked to comment on this specific point).

Were WBC Planning to consider approving the UCF development then RPC asks Wayne Smith to list the application and in the meantime the applicant should be asked to state if UCF is a commercial venture or private polo facility and why so many more horses/ponies are required than at M/PP. The applicant should also give more precise predictions of numbers of matches, horse trailer movements, rider helicopter movements, numbers of spectators and details of fly control measures (including for Middle Culham cottages) that would be employed. WBC should also ensure there will be no damage to water supplies-drainage caused by the new large 'reservoir' and no future

downstream spin-off hotel-holiday developments. There should (RPC thinks) be no footpath/byway/PROW closures and no above-ground level lighting.

The Clerk to RPC