



I have no objection in principal to a dog walking/training centre, but this location is unsuitable because :

1. There are already plenty of local facilities for dog walking, so that isn't needed here.
2. Very little provision is being made for on site parking, so, inevitably, there will be parking on the road. Woodbottom Road is narrow and winding, and carries a great deal of traffic. It already has to be driven with great care, and more cars left in the road will increase the risk to the many dog walkers, walkers, runners and cyclists, who use it.
3. A new entrance directly onto the highway risks blocking the entrance to the property on the opposite side of the road which, as well as being used by vehicles, is also a public footpath.
4. The long opening hours proposed will greatly add to noise pollution in the surrounding area, all year round, altering the character from pleasantly rural residential, and disturbing local wildlife. Noise travels upwards as well as down, and resonates around the side of the valley, so properties on the hillside will be affected as well as those down below.
5. The application does not specify precisely who will be using the site, and what the proposed volume of activity will be. Will there be qualified, authorised staff in attendance at all times to open and close the site and supervise, or will owners with dogs be able to turn up as and when they wish ? There seems to be no provision for on-site facilities or proposals for collection of animal or human waste, raising the possibility of contamination of the site over time, and unpleasant odours.

I believe that this proposed change of use would damage what, over the past few years, has become a pleasant, generally restful residential environment, full of wildlife, which has increasingly attracted young families and recreational users. The existing traffic system just about copes, though there are hold ups and near misses at times, but is surely close to its limit. The proposal as it stands seems very vague : it's not clear whether we're being asked to agree to a small scale private development or something which could potentially be much larger and even more intrusive. I wish the applicants would have included more detail, but they didn't, and as it stands I must object.