



The Planning Inspectorate

3/06 Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Direct Line:
Customer Services:
Fax No:
e-mail:

Mrs Wendy Strangeway
North York Moors National Park
Authority
Development Control Support
Officer
The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
York
YO62 5BP

Your Ref: NYM/2014/0151/FL
Our Ref: APP/W9500/A/14/2225476
Date: 21 November 2014

Dear Mrs Strangeway

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mrs Jean Fergus
Site at Shawn Riggs Caravan Park, Glen Esk Road, Ruswarp

I enclose for your information a copy of the appellant's final comments on the above appeal. Normally, no further comments, from any party, will now be taken into consideration.

Yours sincerely

Christopher Nash

217L(BPR)

*You can use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of this case through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - <http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcportal/casereport.asp>
You can access this case by putting the above reference number into the 'Case Ref' field of the 'Search' page and clicking on the search button*





COMMENTS ON THE NORTH YORK MOORS NPA APPEAL STATEMENT

The comments are referenced with respect to the paragraph numbers in the Authority's statement.

Para 4.8 the occupants of the two units will clearly add to the tourist economy of the national park. Indeed, two representations from local businesses (Bridge Inn and A P Jackson, Butchers) in favor of the proposal were attached to the Planning Statement submitted with the application

Para 5.3 here is no definitive settlement boundary to Ruswarp. It is submitted the development is within or at least on the edge of the settlement. The farthest eastern limit of the settlement being the caravan site itself. The site is an infill between the caravan site and the ribbon development along Glen Esk Road.

Site is not prominent for the reasons stated in the appeal statement. The aerial photo in Appendix A of the Authority's statement actually illustrates the manner in which the existing landscaping offer screening apart from 'glimpse views' from the river.

The extra height compared to caravans is insignificant given the recessive colours of the units. Brown timber elevations and green mineral felt roofs would be less intrusive than the inevitable brightly painted, highly reflective metallic caravans.

Para 5.4 A spurious point. The site is clearly within a pocket of woodland. It is surrounded by mature trees. There is no logic in the view that the offer to plant extra trees demonstrates the site is not within woodland. The proposal to plant extra tree screening could be regarded as woodland management if this logic is applied.

Para 5.5 There is no need to plant extra trees, shrubs to increase the screening to an effective level. The landform offers adequate screening and this is supplemented by existing screening. The proposed extra planting is not essential but simply adds to the amenities of the site.

Para 5.7 There would be less cars and domestic paraphernalia from two holiday units as opposed to 5 touring van units. The applicant is prepared to

accept conditions restricting external siting of appurtenances to the holiday units, which doesn't exist, with the certificated site. Five touring caravans necessitate formidable vehicles to tow them. In an annual analysis of vehicular presence on the site it is submitted that this popular certificated site would have more visual intrusion from vehicles than the two-unit scheme as proposed.

Para 5.8 This is not 'sporadic development' as it is within (or on the edge of) a settlement.

Par5.10 The footprint is not substantial and less than 5 caravans. The design is redolent of a quality holiday chalet that one would expect to see in this tourist location.

NYMAN
21 NOV 2014