JNB

Wendy Strangeway

From:
Sent: 30 March 2016 14:24
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application NYM/2015/0885/FL Ms Bastow

NYM
30 MAR 2016
DV

Dear Ms Bastow,

I am writing to make additional comments to our initial objection to planning application NYM/2015/0885/FL. At the time of writing we had been unable to view the details of the application but have since been given a hard copy of the proposed plans and would like to respond to some of the applicant's statements.

In the introduction it states they are submitting planning for a log cabin. However, the design clearly shows a static caravan. We believe that static caravans are not aesthetically in keeping with the local and immediate area and would in fact be an eyesore, even if clad . Rather than 'giving the appearance of a log cabin', we feel that an actual log cabin would be preferable. We would also like to point out that the plan of the existing plot has been presented in such a way as to suggest there are already permanent structures in existence, when this is not the case.

The application also states that 'the development will not adversely affect the rural character of the area or the adjacent residential properties' and that 'the site is very well screened from both neighbouring properties and the public highway by the woodland and mature hedging'. We dispute this assertion largely on the grounds that the applicant has already removed a substantial number of trees and a large amount of mature hedging and undergrowth, leaving the plot, and any subsequent development, in view to us the entire length of our house and garden. More importantly, the woodland is home to a large amount of bird species, including owls, and deer and we believe the biodiversity of the immediate area will be severely affected. We contest in the strongest possible terms the statement "the existing woodland, heads and meadow will remain intact with no additions or alterations or removals'. The applicant has already undertaken clearing of the site in an insensitive and indiscriminate manner and without the temporary tree protection order imposed last week we believe more mature trees would have been removed. Thus we are deeply concerned about the long term appropriate maintenance of the woodland and the protection of it's wildlife.

We would question the relevance of statements regarding 'internal circulation', 'vehicle requirements' and 'pedestrian circulation' unless this was to refer to a much larger development than the one proposed. We would also like to point out that the 'existing site access....adequate to accommodate the largest vehicle' has in fact already been widened and hard surfaced by the applicant.

Yours sincerely

Kelsall Mcewen and Dorothea Benatar
Hayburn Dene
Staintondale
Scarborough
YO13 0AY