

Hayburndene
Staintondale
Scarborough
YO13 0AY

27 May 2017



Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Appeal reference APP/W9500/W/17/3171625

With reference to the matter above, we would initially request that the site visit be carried out between the months of November and May when the trees are not in full leaf and the impact that a large development would have on the neighbouring properties can be fully ascertained. When the trees are bare we have a clear view into the woodland in question from the entire length of our house and garden. The impact that a permanent development in this location would have on our privacy would be huge. Irrespective of whether the property would be in use for 100 or 150 days a year the visual impact on us would be for 365 days a year.

Both site visits that have been carried out to date have taken place whilst the trees are in full leaf and as a consequence it is more difficult for the inspectors to get an accurate view of how our land lies in relation to the appellant's. We feel that this is perhaps one reason that the appeal has been deferred until just before the six-month deadline, so that this is indeed again the case. We would suggest that whilst delaying the site inspection until November would hold up the appeal process for a very short time, the inconvenience of this would be far outweighed by the benefits of the objectivity gained. When considering such a large-scale, permanent structure a delay of a couple of months would be inconsequential.

During the second site visit with the North Yorkshire Moors Planning Committee the subject was raised about the possibility of moving the site of the proposed build to the southern end of the appellant's paddock where the land is more suitable for a dwelling yet further from, and more secluded from, the objecting neighbours, thereby allowing everyone a little more privacy. The Director of Planning during this site visit felt that this could potentially resolve the situation and suggested that the two parties present (the applicant and a representative for the objectors) discuss this possibility further. Mr Dobbie, however, refused to enter into conversation. We feel that this could potentially be a very good compromise. We find it difficult to understand why, when there is a ten acre site, the appellant wishes to develop the corner of it closest to all of the existing houses, thereby having the maximum detrimental impact upon them.



Picture shows the alternative site at the southern end of the paddock as discussed during the committee site visit.

The size of the proposed structure is huge – the footprint equivalent to that of a large detached family house. How can this be a justifiable replacement for a small two-berth touring caravan? Numerous houses in the area have caravans tucked away amidst woodland or in paddocks. The idea that these can all be replaced with large permanent structures is untenable.

The paddock and woodland in question has never hitherto been subject to any development and has never been used for holiday purposes, despite the appellant's insistence that it has been. In fact, the area has been held in trust by the Duchy of Lancaster since 1265 as an agricultural holding and as such we do not understand the claim in his original document that the site is linked 'physically and functionally to an existing business'. It was an ancient and unspoilt woodland until the appellant started to undertake extensive clearing work removing trees, shrubs and the whole hedgerow along the boundary with the road which had been home to variety of wildlife. We are in no doubt that already the work has decreased the biodiversity of the area.

We would also like to highlight the appellant's attempt to mislead with reference to the tree preservation orders and with regards to 'not knowing' that planning was required in order to carry out substantial works. The tree preservation orders were only put in place after concerned neighbours contacted the National Parks Forestry Department when continual and excessive felling was taking place of healthy trees on the site. It is also impossible to believe that the appellant was unaware of the necessity of planning permission. When purchasing the site this would have been made abundantly clear and the appellant has also previously developed two large holiday resorts in North Yorkshire.

Yours faithfully,



Dorothea Benatar and Kelsall Mcewen