Dear Mr Sharpe

The above Council wishes to object to the proposal 3/2015/0750 on the following grounds

**OBJECTION**

1. The overall impact. The proposed site is in a prominent position on the side of Great Todber Hill, and next to the A682. By virtue of this exposed west facing site it will have considerable visual impact.

2. This visual impact is contrary to what is claimed in the Planning Statement/LVIA. It will be intrusive in the landscape which is an R V B C planning policy test.

3. Currently the field proposed for the development is shown as “Recreational Field” in the Great Todber Valley Brochure. This, therefore, is the applicant’s classification of the purpose of this field.

All previous applications 3/2006/0620 and 3/2010/0775 for additional/replacement vans were approved with the following conditions

- Total units to remain at 306. This condition is going to be ignored if the proposed site is developed
- Before new units were sited the old ones to be removed and the site grassed over
- Unused parts of the site only were permitted for development
- And most significantly
  - Under no circumstances should playing fields be used to site units
- Recreation field equals playing field and development is already prohibited for this site.

4. Increasing the number of vans clearly increases the urbanisation of the parish, where even now the number of residents on residential caravan sites is, when all the vans are filled greater than the number of parishioners resident in permanent buildings, The necessary roadway lighting will further develop the pattern of urbanisation and could prove distracting to traffic descending the A682 from Cold Weather Hill.

5. There are bound to be additional traffic movements on a road with a poor safety record.

6. The application is confusing since the forms refer to 27 holiday caravans yet the drawings and LVIA refer to proposed lodge development. The P C understands lodges to be timber clad/log cabins rather than caravans, but since there are no details provided of the external appearance of the lodges the P C cannot make a judgement. Furthermore if the site runs true to form we could expect the usual array
of decking, patios, sheds, and garden areas, increasing the urban effect to which the P C has already objected. Much of the existing Todber site is residential.

7. The FRA/Drainage Plan does not provide any information on the capacity of the recently installed sewage treatment unit to cope with the proposed additional demands of the enlarged site. Until its ability to cope is clearly stated the P C must object.

The Parish Council believes that any one of the 7 objections they raise would be sufficient to reject this application and urges the Planning Department to precisely that in the light of the considerable number of objections that they have listed.

David King
Clerk to the Council
04/10/2015
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