

Dear Mr Weaver

2nd February 2022

Everyone has the right for peaceful enjoyment of their property.

By granting this application we will never have that again! The loss of amenity caused by noise and lights by the use of this route by TWE is huge. The effect on my health from the lights, noise and behaviour of people coming past our house, through what is our back yard, from early morning one day to the early hours of the next, has badly affected my nerves and my health. I have included a letter written by my doctor.

At times I am afraid in my own home. Strangers knock on our door very late at night looking for the venue. I've had death threats shouted at me by drunks in the yard. (Video evidence already held by council). The lights from the traffic, leaving the venue, light up our bedroom and we find ourselves lying there waiting and listening for the next vehicle. There is no noise, or lights in the yard at night, so there is a big contrast when vehicles come through. If they pull up, which they sometimes do, we have to get up to check they are not stealing something. We have a red diesel tank in the yard and farms are being targeted all over the country, we have no security now, whereas we used to close the farm gate every night. The worry that someone using the route, will let the horses out, as police can confirm has happened, is constant. We are constantly scared that someone will set fire to the barn while smoking when waiting for taxis'.

We need to answer some of the claims made by Tournerbury Woods Estate. TWE's continued insistence that, when acquiring the farm, we were fully aware this could happen. We didn't know. Nobody could have thought that. It was a winding, single track, through a farmyard with livestock and working heavy machinery, that runs into a SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and over a scheduled monument, with similar protection as Stonehenge! Who could ever have thought it would be suitable for development as is being suggested?

If this was a new application and TWE had gone through the correct channels, planning would almost certainly have been refused on the unsuitability of the track

On the Wednesday 26th January there was a debate in the House of Commons. This was on unauthorised development, led by Chris Pincher, the levelling Up, Housing and Communities Minister, where they spoke of the end of respective

planning. Just because you do something unlawful for years doesn't mean that it's right or that you should benefit from it.

The insistence that because there have been no accidents (untrue) the track is suitable for the use applied for here, is ridiculous. This is not a reason for deciding a route is safe or fit for a purpose. Risk assessments are done to prevent accidents, to measure the risk, to foresee accidents, not to wait for them to occur or decide somewhere is safe because a serious accident hasn't happened yet. This route is dangerous on many fronts, and not fit for the purpose of allowing uninformed wedding guests, with no thought or knowledge, of the dangers, who have been celebrating, to wonder through it. By allowing this application the council also put the burden of liability on us. This is a real worry as we see how people act and know the dangers, and should someone be injured, say by ending up in the water, as it's on our property, where would that leave us legally?

TWE state that the route is hardly used by people on foot, again this is **untrue**. We have even formerly submitted video of late-night walkers both coming and going from the venue. It is not enough to say the track is rarely used by pedestrians. The facility to allow for pedestrians must be there and must be safe, and it clearly isn't. There is no clear place for pedestrians to get out of the way of traffic where the track is at its narrowest, I know as I've been caught there myself. It is just one of the many concerns that keep us awake at night and has a cost to us in insurance cover.

We would respectfully remind the council, by allowing this application, they will be putting the burden of liability, on us. We have listed over and over the dangers that exist when driving through the yard. These increase 10-fold when alcohol is added. To say there have been no accidents is incorrect. We live with the worry a serious accident will occur and have the burden of responsibility for another business's clients, frequently under the influence of alcohol, that we have no control over. It wouldn't be so bad if Mr Snell and Mrs Snell knew these people, had authorised them individually but they have no idea who these guests are or where they come from. If any damage is inflicted on us by TWE guests, then who is held responsible? The balance of risk would appear to be all ours.

The new track, that we are in negotiations with TWE over, is double width, with passing places wide enough to allow the passing of two coaches, but just as important is that it will be fenced, hedged and tree lined, all at our expense, so there are none of the risks involved with coming through the farm. There are no ditches or deep water, and it allows plenty of room, on the amble grass verges, for pedestrians and cyclists to get out of the way. No one can go anywhere other than straight into the woods. There is no comparison in the suitability of the two tracks. Surely TWE have a duty of care to ensure there are as few risks as possible for visitors to their venue.

The last application was refused, partly on the safety of the track through the farm, and nothing has substantially changed over the route itself except for Mr Snell's encroaching on to our land to butcher our trees, without permission while he knew we were away. The end result is that the track is now **more** dangerous and not less. The vegetation on either side of the narrow track kept the vehicles away from the edge and the narrow verge which drops into deep water. Removing this natural barrier has the result of increasing the speed of the traffic. In one of TWE's previous track reports, it states that the speed of traffic is kept down, and therefore safe, by the torturous state of the track. That was correct and we have indeed witnessed the increase in the speed of traffic now when entering, and leaving, the farmyard. This is a flash point area as the corner is blind coming into the yard and is where the incident with a taxi and horse happened.

We no longer feel it's safe to use the field just outside the woods as it is accessed by the narrowest part of the track and too dangerous with the traffic, with certainly nowhere to safely get out a horse out of harm's way.

We have no option but to set the record straight over the Tournurbury Woods constant accusations of wrongdoing on our part. This may have little to do with planning, but TWE has continued to tell the council to ignore any submissions by AG Phillips & Son Ltd, and particularly ourselves, in somewhat aggressive terms.

TWE using the agricultural track through the middle of our Farm has impacted on our lives in so many ways. The amounts of weddings and events that have been inflicted on us this summer has been untenable. Mr Snell's ongoing filming, despite being asked to stop, made us very uncomfortable and left us

no choice but to involve the police. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Never at any point have we ever wanted to stop TWE from having their wedding venue. Hence taking on all the costs of building a new track to facilitate their plans for the wood, losing an acre of land and absorbing the entire cost of building a track that he first asked for in 2012 and again in 2017. The reasons given by Mr Snell in his 2012 and 2017 applications, to get the new track approved, still stand today. Back then, Mr Snell could see that the amount of traffic, even then at low levels, would cause problems with health and safety, security, and inconvenience to the farm. The suggestion that we are no longer a working farm just is totally untrue. We have submitted CTS records on cattle movements and during the events season there no change to our farming life. Cattle still come in the barns for vet treatments, tb testing and worming.

When large Machines are being reversed out of barns, drivers on the track just keep driving as if they were on the highway and have the right of way, they have no awareness that they are often hidden by the arm of the forklift. It's something that wedding guest seem oblivious to. On occasions even driving under a big (1/2 ton) bale of Hay being moved on the forklift. The likes of photo (B).

Despite having been put on stop, last year we had a whole summer of almost back, to back traffic and events. Take July, when it appeared that there was only one day when there wasn't an event. Offering to cut the number of Weddings to 65, plus 3 extra, if need be, does not consider the open days, camping, and numerous other events which aren't weddings that will continue to take place which will continue to inflict grief, worry, and insecurity to our lives, if he is granted any type of permission through the farm.

TWE comments have painted a picture of industry in the Farmyard and made statements that we want to correct. The Farmyard runs in daylight hours and only our staff and people we have approved, that know the dangers, come into it or through it.

We have parking for visitors between the two houses, so even our own guests do not pass through the Farmyard itself. The Farmyard at night is totally quiet,

very dark, with no outside lighting. Only Bats and Barn owls, (that some years nest in the barn), and the odd fox use it.

- A. The Tea Caddy (formally Tee Times) is only reached by foot from the car park of the golf course. Which is down the drive and only deliveries and disabled traffic is allowed up to the building itself. **No café or golf course traffic come into, or through, the Farmyard.** The café has been there for many years and has been a licenced premises for many years. It is only open from 9am to 2pm.
- B. The Wave Music Festival is a Charity event, is held here once a year. It is held on the Driving range, which is outside the AONB, run under licence within every restriction, we close the course and the range, as our donation, and once again, **no cars or pedestrians come into, or through, the Farmyard.** We have **not** applied for any other events.
- C. We **do not run an illegal waste burning business.** Following similar accusations to the Environment Agency, we had an inspection and still hold our licence to burn waste that is generated from the farm.
- D. We wish to categorially state that there have been no ransom demands by us. Heads of terms over the new track were submitted to TWE last July, and bar asking for an electronic version, we still have had no official response. Like all heads of terms these are just a starting point of open negotiation, and **no demands** have been made by us. We **are not** responsible for hold ups in reaching an agreement on the alternative track!
- E. TWE seems to be confident that we are under investigation by the council for some wrongdoing. We have no knowledge of what this might be and if this is correct, please would the council be kind enough to contact us.
- F. It is wrong for TWE to state there has been **no accidents** on the route through to the woods. This is incorrect. Our family dog was killed by a vehicle. A speeding taxi caused a women leading her horse to need stiches in a head wound, cars have left the route and ended up in ditches and stuck in the mud. Vehicles, despite having instructions and signs, frequently drive up to and over the golf course. We have listed over and over the dangers that exist when driving through the yard. These increase ten fold when alcohol is involved.

G. TWE state that the route **is hardly used by people on foot**, again this is **untrue**. We have already submitted video evidence (please see files for previous applications and the appeals) of several walkers both coming and going from the venue. Taxis Drivers have knocked on our door, looking for people that have **walked** through to meet them.

If it is required, we can submit all the photographic and video evidence that we have previous submitted as it all applies again for this application.

To conclude - TWE wedding/events venue has had an enormous effect on the amenity of our lives, affected our sleep, our wellbeing, and caused us enormous stress and worry. This is echoed by the occupants in the other house opposite.

We do not think that anything has change with this new proposed application. Please can the council take everything that we have previously submitted into consideration including all the files of videos and Photographs.

We would also like to make it clear that we were not consulted as we should have been.

This planning application should be refused.

Because of the huge importance to us, we would like it to be determined by planning committee.

Please do not hesitate to get back to us if you have any questions

