

[REDACTED]

Sent: 20 February 2026 14:19
To: Planning; ehl
Subject: [REDACTED] DC/25/0450 Objection - further evidence of unmanaged use of the fields
Attachments: PXL_20260220_124038335.RAW-01.COVER.jpg; PXL_20260220_123017793.RAW-01.COVER.jpg; PXL_20260220_123103745.RAW-01.COVER.jpg; PXL_20260218_093811876.RAW-01.COVER.jpg; PXL_20260214_153820943.jpg; Track-5 20260220-135858.m4a
Categories: Comments Received

FAO Halima Chowdhury and Environmental Health

Today at least 6 dogs and 3 people were in the eastern field - photo attached. This is contrary to item 10, and possibly 13, in the dog / noise management plan submitted by the applicant. Photos and sound recording are attached. One user parked their car within the field. Another blocked Water Lane - a public highway - photo attached.

The field is routinely left unlocked - as shown in previous photos submitted to you, with people coming in prior to 0800. Contrary to items 12 and 14, and what's stated in the Addendum.

Dog waste is still present in both fields and no bin is provided, contrary to item 18, and the response to Environmental Health in the Addendum. See attached photos.

There is no signage - contrary to what's stated at item 8 and the Addendum.

In addition, the WSCC response put online today highlights that no change to the planning application has been made. However, the applicant has proposed to put in a hard-standing immediately adjacent to a PROW which lies outside the 'red line' planning boundary previously submitted by the applicant. This would invalidate the planning application. Use of a hard-standing would further increase the risks posed to the public by the fields being insecure and their unmanaged use.

Overall, there is no effective management of the site and safety/ public liability issues have not been addressed. The application does not comply with the NPPF. It should be rejected.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]









