

**Whin Brow
Hood Lane
Cloughton
Scarborough
N Yorkshire
YO13 0AT**

25th March 2017

Dear Mrs Saunders,



Re:- NYM/2017/0008/FL Whin Brow Cottage

I am disappointed by the Committee's decision to grant permission for this development which, contrary to the officer's report, I believe violates Core Policy A and Development Policy 14.

I am also concerned that the Authority is again inconsistent.

In 2011 an application (NYM/2011/0787/FL) was made to convert a workshop into a holiday let, in many ways a similar proposal to this one, except that adjoining properties were further away. Permission was refused and the refusal notice stated:-

"Conversion to commercial holiday residential use proposed under this application would be considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties by means of noise and activity levels within the garden area of the proposed unit arising from a succession of different occupiers which would be a greater and more intense level than normal residential enjoyment of the property. The application is therefore considered to be contrary to Development Policies 14 and 19 of the NYM Local Development Framework which require account to be taken of the impact that development would have on the amenity of adjacent land uses."

For the current application the report said *"It is not considered that the level of use of this area generated by the use as an independent holiday let would be likely to be significantly greater than if used as a domestic annex or a bed and breakfast accommodation"*

Please can you explain why two very similar applications are treated differently? Surely if in 2011 it was believed that the noise and activity arising from a holiday let would be more than that arising from normal residential occupation the same must be true in 2017, consequently since the 2011 application was contrary to Development Policies then this application must be also.

It is important that the Authority's decisions are seen to be consistent and not arbitrary or whimsical.

I am also confused by the statement "Whilst it is accepted that visitors staying in this cottage would be likely to be confined to the small patio area when outside, rather than the wider garden area further away" What wider garden area further away? The owner's garden is surrounded by a high stone wall and protected by a solid wooden door which is bolted from the inside; it is certainly not accessible to visitors.

I understand that the Authority's officers have appraised the scheme and have recommended additional screening of the patio area. This is an excellent suggestion. I suggest that the screening is by means of a high stone wall and gate around the patio area; similar to that which currently screens the patio area from the owner's own residential property. A six foot high stone wall above the patio with a solid wood door would provide visual and acoustic screening.

Yours sincerely,

James A Brace

cc Mr. C France

