

**Dawn Paton**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 21 August 2016 15:50  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** NYM/2015/0885/FL

Kelsall McEwen and Dorothea Benatar  
Hayburn Dene,  
Staintondale,  
Scarborough,  
YO13 0AY.

20 August 2016



Dear Ms Bastow,

With reference to your letter dated 4 August 2016, we would like to raise some objections to the proposed development.

Our initial objection is the size of the proposed building. It's footprint is 76 squared metres, just about the same size as the average 4 bedroom detached house in the UK (78 squared metres). To place a building of this size on a plot with no previous development, a site valued for its unspoilt woodland and meadowland is, in our view, unacceptable.

We would also like to point out that as these structures, according to the manufacturers, have a life expectancy of at least 40 years, the applicant is effectively asking to replace a very small touring caravan with a house.

In terms of reducing the visual impact of the construction by moving this building 25 metres further into the woodland area, this may well move the project away from the road but will not reduce it's impact on any of the neighbours. That particular plot runs the length of our garden and would be in full view to us. It would also be extremely close to it's immediate neighbours, the Carrs at Bridge Cottage, an elderly couple suffering health problems who are very worried about the potential impact of the development. Mr Dobbie's assertion that the view of his house would be screened by holly, broom and hazel is of course not relevant in winter months when the predominantly deciduous nature of the trees and bushes surrounding his property allow us full view into the meadow. Furthermore, as documented in our previous letter to you, we are concerned at the rate Mr Dobbie is removing trees and shrubbery from his property and we believe that he will continue to do this.

From our point of view we would prefer any development to be sited in the south paddock where this really would minimise visibility for us, our neighbours and the community. It is a much flatter, clearer site so would reduce necessary levelling earth works and require far less removal of existing trees and shrubs.

Furthermore, a septic tank and soak-away will be required for his proposed two bathrooms. The waste from this soak away will end up in the river just below his proposed site. Repositioning to the south paddock would at least give the waste an opportunity to soak into the ground rather than the river. Connection to mains electricity and water would also be less disruptive in this location.

The sentence "We do not anticipate any further engineering works other than placing of some road stone" is worryingly vague. The applicant has a track record of opportunistic development. As soon as a TPO expires he continues felling until another one is quickly put in place. He continues to develop the site in anticipation of being granted planning permission. The whole roadside aspect is totally unrecognisable from a few months ago.

Finally, we would like to comment on his request for 150 days a year use for invited guests. This is actually more than the national average occupancy rate for holiday cottages (21weeks or 147 days). The resultant noise and light pollution would seriously impact on the surrounding houses – particularly their closest neighbours at Bridge Cottage. We also wonder how this would be enforced.

We are also confused by a statement made that 'This site is physically and functionally linked to an existing business.' We do not understand the meaning or implications of this statement. However, we are sure that no commercial business has ever been linked to this site.

We would appreciate the opportunity for the Staintondale and Cloughton Parish Councils to discuss this matter. They meet on the 15th and 5th September respectively. We realise that the deadline for comments on this application falls before these dates but would request that an extension is granted.

Yours sincerely,

Kelsall McEwen and Thea Benatar

