

Planning Committee – Update Sheet

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
WD/D/20/000583	82 EAST STREET, BEAMINSTER, DT8 3DT	Item 5a	15-46
<p>Update(s): 2 further representations from occupiers at 54; 60&62; East St – objecting on grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application site is not a garden area hence the proposal is contrary to Policy HOUS6 – no lawful development certificate for use as a garden area. • Outside the DDB for Beaminster. • Contrary to Policy ENV3 Green Infrastructure Network as the site lies next to allotments and on the edge of the rural countryside and provides a zone that should be protected the additional Traffic that will be generated both by the vehicles owned the owners of the proposed houses and also by additional vehicles associated with deliveries, waste and recycling collections all that are likely to use the route in a south-eastern direction down East Street and hence contrary to Policy COM7 and the Highway Authority objected to a previous application WD/D/15/001713 for the construction of three dwellings on land east of 28 to 34 Hollymoor Gardens due to the impact on East Street and this decision was upheld by the Planning Inspector in the inspector’s decision dated 24 March 2016. The Decision Notice published at the time of the publication of the Planning Inspector’s decision states ...”<i>The residential development proposals will generate further traffic and pedestrian movements along East Street, a County highway with variable and limited carriageway and footway widths. In the absence of the construction of, or programme for, a detailed improvement scheme design to provide suitable and appropriate traffic management and safety enhancements for this street, this development would be likely to cause danger and inconvenience to all highway users. Hence the application would be contrary to Policy COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015</i>”. • Ground conditions in the area may not be sufficiently permeable for effective rainwater soakaways and further permeability testing must be required before a decision is made. The capacity of the existing public sewer is not known as Wessex Water has not replied (to date) to the consultation. The ability for rainwater management from the site if soakaways are not feasible is therefore in doubt without an input from Wessex Water. • The public sewer is already overcapacity and without improvement there is a serious risk that problems will arise if further houses are discharging into it. While the application form states that the applicant proposes to connect Foul Sewage to the existing sewer there is no confirmation by Wessex Water that such a connection is technically feasible without overloading the sewer. • The proximity of the development to 54 East St will be detrimental to us as we have windows in all rooms overlooking the proposed development; we will be severely affected due to increased noise pollution, loss of privacy, loss of light. 			

WD/D/20/001014	CREEK CARAVAN PARK, FISHERS PLACE, RINGSTEAD, DORCHESTER, DT2 8NG	Item 5b	47-60
----------------	---	---------	-------

Update(s):

22 further representations. This now includes a revised Parish Council response stating:

In relation to the application WD/D/20/001014, the initial response of Owermoigne Parish Council of 'no objection' was on the basis that there were no objections displayed on the planning website from local residents, but that it appears that the notice was not in a very visible location and due to a lack of consultation with the residents, no-one knew of the application until very recently.

Subsequently several objections have been lodged and we have reviewed and amended our comment in the light of those objections. The formal position of the parish council is as follows:

"Owermoigne Parish Council objects to the proposal to extend the period of occupation for the static caravans from the 31st October to the 31st January consequently increasing the site usage from 7 months to 11 months and to reducing the closed season to 1 month.

Reasons for this include the following:

- *An 11 month occupation is virtually a permanent residence and so this will substantially intensify the occupation and usage of the site and the local access roads and track. This will impact on the relative tranquillity of Ringstead during the autumn and winter months impacting adversely on the local residents and on the intrinsic character of the AONB and Heritage Coast and the harm arising from this is contrary to NPPF policies 170, 171, 172 and 173.*
- *Shopping facilities and services at Ringstead are limited to a seasonal kiosk with a very limited range of stock and therefore it is inevitable that intensifying occupation will increase both individual car journeys and deliveries, impacting on tranquillity for residents and on people using the nationally important south coast footpath that would be directly affected by increased traffic. The cumulative effects of additional journeys on the already struggling access road and the lack of any potential mitigation options means the proposal would be contrary to the sustainability policies contained in Section 9 of the NPPF.*
- *The proposals demonstrate no clear benefits to either the local community or the environment and the stated employment opportunities are negligible. There would however be clear disbenefits to the local community and detrimental effects on the character of the landscape, particularly on its valued tranquillity out of season, potential impacts on the sensitive adjacent habitats arising from increased site occupation and impacts on the enjoyment of the south coast path. The current 7 month season is a reasonable balance between the business interests of the caravan park and the interests of the*

local community and the need to protect the special landscape character of this unique section of the Dorset coastline."

Other representations object on grounds of:

- This is a peaceful stretch of coastline with little infrastructure to support the opening of the caravan site 11 months of the year. This will likely lead to people taking up permanent residency with resulting strain on the existing permanent residents and the surrounding environment. Also erosion of the landscape, a need for additional public services and damage to the already fragile access road.
- Ringstead bay is a small spot on the Dorset coast of no little beauty. I understand it is a desirable tourist location but I believe any extension to the caravanning season or expansion of the current caravan park would be disastrous for the local area.
- In brief, the current extremely limited facilities available would not be able to deal with any more tourists and their cars. If this application were to go ahead, further development would be necessary and I am sure forthcoming. All such developments would be detrimental to the region for many reasons.
- Ignoring potential future problems for the moment, and focussing on the immediate impact of extending the season and expanding the site, the proposed changes would increase the caravan's sites negative imprint on the area in a number of ways: it would be more visible for walkers on the coastal path, becoming a larger blight on the spectacular views presented than it already is; more cars coming and going in the area would firstly not fit in the limited car park and secondly cause much damage to the very poor roads in and around Fishers place, not least of all the treacherously potted road leading to the site itself; erosion of this delicate area of coastline would increase, endangering natural life as well that of the property of local residents and businesses. This final point is perhaps the most important. The erosion of our beautiful English coast cannot be stopped entirely but we must do our utmost to ensure we do not hasten it.
- To focus on future development, an expansion of the kind proposed would necessitate public toilets being built, roads being developed and extended, and perhaps even an increase in local businesses - shops, cafes, etc. All of these would contribute to the already commonplace and heinous overdevelopment of many areas along the Dorset coast, without making a significant positive impact on employment in the area (it is too small a spot for that).
- The only beneficiary of this proposal that I can see would be the owner of the caravan site. Considering the amount of negatives mentioned not only by myself but also by the other concerned members of the public, this benefit to the few is far outweighed by the detrimental impact on the many and on this place of striking natural beauty.

- Would represent over-development of a sensitive site, with detriment and injustice to the existing residents, and to regular and visiting recreational users of the South West coast path and this area of natural beauty.
- The application has been made at a time of limited scrutiny out of season and in quarantine, and appears designed to edge closer to applying for permanent residence chalets as seen elsewhere.
- I noted that the application also claims that the site is not visible, which is not true, the bin stores, toilet block and most of the caravans are entirely visible from the coastal path, as there is limited screening despite the earlier planning requirement. The caravans are also visible from the beach and from viewpoints along the coast path in both directions.
- Ringstead Bay is a small community of 20 houses, only five of which are currently occupied permanently, and 30 caravans on this site. The caravan site therefore represents more than half of the accommodation available in the settlement. Its impact is limited under Planning law because of the recognised need to preserve the character of the settlement as small, peaceful community with a summer visitor role.
- The proposed extension of occupation from 7 months of the year to 11 months would nearly double the number of dwellings occupied for almost the whole year, changing the fundamental nature of the area, and doubling the population virtually throughout the year.
- There is no public transport. There are said to be 30 spaces for cars at the site, mainly along the coast path, and these are fully occupied in the season. The access is a narrow dirt track which in wet weather, frost and snow becomes hazardous and damaged. The additional traffic if this application were allowed would be to the detriment of local residents who live on the track, and users of the South West coast path which passes along this track.
- There is no shop apart from the beach cafe which is open only between April and October. During the summer, holidaymakers using the caravans frequently have supermarket deliveries, adding to the traffic on the track. Refuse collection throughout the year would add further wear and tear to the already poor surface. Doubling the occupancy would further impact the water and sewage infrastructure.
- The cliff and beach have long been subject to erosion, with the groyne below the site being essential to prevent the whole site being washed away. Every year more erosion happens, with the low cliffs to the east being particularly badly affected as a result of the sea's action on that side of the groyne, and also by people climbing and scrambling onto the cliff sides.
- The front of the site is a low, slumped area of soft clay which is at high risk of complete erosion like the similar areas to both east and west, from visitor action as well as natural causes. Further east the clay cliffs which slip in wet

weather are then damaged by visitors searching for fossils, an activity which would be very likely to increase with additional visitor footfall in the wetter winter months.

- The site itself is only in small part within the Special Area of Nature Conservation, and there is no plan at this point to physically encroach further, so the relevant authorities cannot technically object to the proposal. However, the doubling of human use and encroachment on this sensitive environment is very likely to impact upon the fragile geology and the plant and animal life. The current closure period allows rest and recuperation for the natural inhabitants; the proposal would impact directly on the nesting season of creatures inhabiting the hedgerows and the undercliff, and on the successful growth of the rich plant, butterfly and insect life in the area.
- The proposal to abandon the requirement for the land to be maintained in 'tidy order' off season, and the original requirement for a screen of trees on the site further indicate a lack of concern for the protection and enhancement of the valuable natural resources of this coastline, and should not be permitted.
- The proposal of an extended season is claimed to meet visitor demand for UK holidays, employment outside the current season, and operational efficiency. There is minimal local economy in Ringstead Bay, the seasonal shop being the only business, and as this is closed through the winter months it would gain no benefit. The extended opening would presumably extend the one caretaker job on the site itself. Accommodation out of season is already plentiful in B&B and hotels in the larger villages and towns nearby. This proposal offers no genuine economic benefit to the community, the only benefit being to the company which owns the site whose rental income would increase.
- It is the small, seasonal nature of this place which gives its charm and natural setting.
- It will have a negative impact on the picturesque setting of Ringstead, obscuring views and expanding into land on the Heritage coast. The existing infrastructure, facilities and roads do not have capacity and any expansion will further devalue the unique character of the place due to Covid, Lockdown and people working from home, the Application, which was put in 4 weeks into lockdown, did not follow the correct procedures.
- This proposal would further damage the single track lane through Upton Ringstead which is often in gridlock because of the unreasonable number of visitors to Ringstead Beach. Adding longer residency would be disastrous to the small community of Upton with a permanent residency of less than 30. No consideration has been given to us and no notice of this application given. I would particularly appeal to the Highways Department, Country Access Team and Environmental Health to reconsider the impact on our small hamlet. There have been many instances when Emergency vehicles would have been denied access.

- It would inevitably change the whole character of the village, by increasing the number of long-term residents by a very substantial number. I am not surprised that this has caused great distress to the existing residents - and also to many summer visitors to the village who appreciate its unspoilt character.
- A campsite occupied for 11 months of the year - as opposed to the current 7 months - would have a destructive impact on the existing community and on the local environment. It would mean a substantial increase in traffic on narrow country lanes and impose a significant extra burden on water supplies, refuse collection and sewage disposal arrangements.
- Ringstead is located in an Area of Outstanding National Beauty on the Jurassic Coast and the South West coastal path passes along the lane currently leading to the caravan site. The site is already prominent, visible from both the coast path and from the beach and from higher ground further along the coast. Making the site into a permanent residential area would be aesthetically harmful as well as inevitably damaging to the fragile local environment for the currently flourishing variety of plant and animal life, including deer, rabbits and a wide range of birds.
- As there is no public transport to Ringstead, the proposed development would result in an increase in cars and vans using the gravel lane from the private road into Ringstead to the caravan site. Both the road and the lane are already potholed by the current burden of traffic, largely of day-trip summer visitors. A significant increase in traffic would be a year-around nuisance to the current residents as well as a hazard to walkers on the busy coast path. There is also some concern about the prospect of substantial increased demand on water supplies and sewage facilities.
- Whilst we applaud the decision to update and modernise the caravan site replacing the outdated units we do have concerns over the extension of the permitted usage to eleven months each year.
- To encourage up to thirty extra 'households' during the inclement winter months would put untold pressure on the already challenged roads, both council and privately owned, and potentially change the nature of Ringstead.
- The winter period of rest and recovery benefits the ecology of the area and is also enjoyed by the residents. If this is compromised it will change things on this idyllic unspoilt area of the Jurassic coast forever.
- In order to understand why the directors of the Ringstead Caravan Co. Ltd. are seeking an extension from 7 to 11 months of the year, a meeting between some residents and directors of the Company was arranged. It failed to discover their future intentions. They acknowledged that the site was to be cleared at the end of the season with the ending of leases held by the caravan owners and that there was a possibility that the site would be sold. This is a quiet, long established, successful business whose future is unclear. Econ7 (ii and iii) states that Proposals involving a reorganisation or intensification of

existing sites must clearly demonstrate that the development forms part of a long term management plan.

- This small, exposed site is unsuitable for short let holiday accommodation in the winter months. It has no onsite facilities, shops, entertainment, or any of the indoor activities found on the larger sites and required by visitors. Local plan 4.5.19 encourages extending the season to these sites.
- The access from the A353 runs for 2 miles along roads and unmade track half of which is privately owned. There are frequent awkward bends and many places where two cars are unable to pass. The final unmade section is on the SW coast path. During the winter months the ice and snow drifting on the steep privately maintained summit can make it impassable for days. This access to the site presents many road safety issues. Parking by the site can sometimes be a problem with larger vans and trailers extending over the SW coastal path, 30 spaces for parking is optimistic. Other infrastructure such as the sewerage system and electricity supply may also become compromised if the site's operations intensify.
- The site is a CCMA at high and immediate risk of erosion and flooding. Land instability and slippage is common along this part of the coast. The increase in extreme weather events, both wind and wave, during the winter months make this cliff top site particularly vulnerable. As a Section 73 application this is seen as a new application for planning permission under the 2017 Environment Impact Assessment Regulations, and should have been accompanied by a screening. The NPPF looks to reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development.
- Disagree that extending the season "would reflect the current operation of other sites in the area"; research shows 8 months is normal on even the larger more suitable sites such as Haven Seaview and Durdle Door. Ringstead does not benefit materially from the caravan site and the site's benefit to the local economy is unknown.
- The extension of the site's season from 7 to 11 months of the year will change it from providing summer holiday accommodation to what is in effect an all year round residential park, with all the attendant difficulties of policing. It would create a precedent that could creep to the neighbouring site and the property beyond, The Creek, which is also owned by some of the directors of the Ringstead Caravan Co.Ltd.
- The anticipated increase in traffic, noise, pollution, and disturbance will affect our quality of life as usually experienced in the winter months.
- Ringstead plays an important role in providing access to the beach for tourists and local people during the summer months. The local plan acknowledges the pressures of tourism on local communities and the need to retain the sense of remoteness and tranquility in rural areas. This is achieved here during the winter months when, as the only 2 business here, the car park shop and

caravan site close and our hamlet is returned to its residents and the walkers along the coastal path. The changes being proposed will bring year round commercialisation to Ringstead, change its unique character and could swell our winter population tenfold or more.

- Oppose the removal of condition 3 - It states the times when the caravans should be unoccupied during the year thereby ensuring it does not become a residential site. Ringstead is an area where open market housing is normally refused.
- The reasons given for both condition 2 and 3 are to reserve to the LPA control over the long term use of the site, I would not wish this to change.
- Oppose the removal of condition 4 - The need for the planting of trees for screening of the site is ongoing on this exposed site and should remain.
- Ringstead is a unique coastal hamlet having an influx of visitors in the summer months because of its beach and timeless ambience. It is fondly known as 'the locals' beach'. Residents accept and welcome this seasonal intrusion despite suffering the consequences of increased rubbish, noise and disturbance. The winter months, however, should be a time when the locality has respite from thousands of tourists and regains its identity as a small Dorset rural community.
- There is no public transport to Ringstead, the nearest bus stop is over two miles away. Access is by car. The caravan site is off an unmade stretch of the SW coast path which is rutted, potholed and hazardous in Winter. Residents frequently become stuck in the hamlet because of snow and ice. Further disturbance for residents as noisy cars crunch down the path in all hours with head light intrusion in the winter months is unacceptable.
- From November to late March the caravan site is likely to be lit for safety reasons thus increasing light pollution in a dark sky. This is detrimental to the nocturnal wildlife that inhabits this area. Residents also enjoy the dark and the chance to see night skies particularly towards the north and east. A peaceful, less disturbed winter season is necessary for the continuation of the bio-diversity of the area which is rich in wildlife and plants.
- The intentions of the caravan site owners to invite new lodges or caravans to be placed on vacated plots and thus the likelihood of an increased population of tourists occupying such dwellings for 11 months of the year raises alarm that Ringstead's population could reach a stage where caravan dwellers easily outnumber the residents and become the *raison d'être* for Ringstead as it morphs from a unique Dorset hamlet to a tourist park. Indeed to allow 11 months is to invite nigh on permanent residency with opportunists circumnavigating the regulations for yearlong residence.
- Ringstead in many ways during the Winter months is as unspoilt as in 1962. I cite part of condition 1 in the original 1962 application 207350 where it refers to

a 'coastal locality' of ' high scenic and landscape value' I urge rejection of the present proposal which will have an enduring impact on Ringstead and change its unique character to the detriment of all.

- In refusing an appeal to planning in 1961, it was recognised that any intensification in the number of caravans on the site would be "detrimental to character of this beautiful and secluded locality": thus limited to 30 caravans. Conditions 3 and 4 were reserved to the Local Planning Authority to give them control over the long term use of the site, because the site was recognised as being 'in a coastal area of high scenic and landscape value'. Condition 4 was imposed 'to safeguard the amenities of the locality'.
- In what I presume is the licence under which the site is presently operating of 1979, no mention is made of the need for screening with trees as it is one of the conditions on the 1962 permission. This requirement is lost under the new proposal. In such a heavily protected area where further new development would not be allowed, the reasons for imposing these conditions remain as valid today as they did in 1962.
- There are other buildings on the site which do not appear in the 1962 permission. The residential chalet started life as a small site office with no residential element. Accommodation for the site manager was off-site in what is now Gulley Cottage. This chalet is to be the subject of a further application to confirm its status; what is its current planning status? I could find no local site of comparable size operating for 11 months per year. Many of the larger sites with on-site facilities and good links to public transport operate for 7-9 months; a closed season allows the site to regenerate.
- In the absence of any indication of the intentions of the applicant in requesting 11 month occupancy, one has to make assumptions. While the applicants' assertion is that it will not change the nature of the development, the removal or relaxing of any of the conditions opens up the likelihood that detrimental change will occur. Ringstead is a less than ideal site as a winter holiday destination; marine activities can be severely restricted and water logged ground can be a problem and snow and ice can cause the road to become impassable.
- Historically, Ringstead has suffered from erosion of the cliffs and beach. This erosion is ongoing to the east and west of this site where there are no hard sea defences. The hard sea defences around the site were provided with public money and are subject to ongoing maintenance.
- The Local Plan recognises that any development requiring increased coastal defences would be harmful to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site. In a time when climate change is expected to increase incidences of extreme weather, any development should be directed away from areas subject to coastal erosion or land, such as would be required to provide concrete bases on which to station caravans or lodges which could be detrimental on such a geologically fragile site.

- In respect of the contribution to the local economy, with an 11 month occupancy, privately owned caravans/lodges would in effect become second homes but without the attendant council tax obligations, so contributing little to the this aspect of the economy.
- The present trend for converting from static caravans to fully residential is also of concern in the request for 11 month occupancy. Ringstead has always been a popular place to visit in summer, especially by local people. It supports a large summer population, some resident, some walkers on the South West coast path, and day visitors. But in winter it slows down. There are still day visitors, but the resident population of 5 houses by the shore and 4 further in land enjoy a more tranquil environment with dark skies at night, less noise disturbance and less traffic, giving the place a more isolated feel.
- The caravan site has been a part of Ringstead summers for many years, offering affordable holidays, however existing caravan owners have been given notice on their pitch leases, many after 20 years and more. The applicant is operating a successful business under its present conditions and the proposed change to those conditions should be resisted to prevent detriment to the natural environment, tranquillity of the location, and impact on local residents.
- A public footpath Right of Way S34/19 runs through the site; this does not appear on the applicant's plan.
- I would also like to draw Committee Members' attention to the consultation process: of the 8 permanently occupied houses, the 7 who have no direct involvement with the site were unaware of the proposal until an article appeared in the Echo on 16 June, there was no planning notice in the Echo. There was one notice on the site notice board, but during the pandemic people were staying at home and this was insufficient Public notice to properly inform residents during this period, and therefore reduced the time available for comments.
- The proposed increase will impact the precious coastline that is 1 of 46 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in England, Wales and Ireland that are protected for our future generations. It is well known that the cliffs surrounding the Jurassic Coastline are not stabile, therefore I fear an increase in tourist numbers over the months of winter will de-stabile the cliffs further.
- The change from a summer season site to all year-round occupation will change the character of Ringstead and will dwarf the resident population.
- Access to and from the site during the winter months can be treacherous making this an unsuitable site for all year-round occupation.

- The lighting required for winter use will impact on the environment and habitat of the wildlife, particularly Barn and Little Owls.
- If the caravan site is given this extension it will affect the character and uniqueness of this heritage coastal location. Ringstead has always been a busy summer location for tourists and locals alike. In the winter months Ringstead's appeal to many is through the lack of tourism this extension to all year-round tourist use will have a significant affect on the small resident population. The winter months allow respite for the environment and the residents of this small hamlet.
- Application document - Under 4. Description of proposal. This proposal was started on 1/1/1962 and finished 1/4/61. Under 6. Site visit. The site is clearly visible from the Beach and SW Coastal path. Under 8. Ownership Certificate. I do not believe the applicant is the sole owner.
- We are regular out of season visitors to Ringstead Bay and the surrounding area, the primary attraction being the peace and solitude to be gained once the holidaymakers have gone home. We are therefore somewhat dismayed to learn that the caravan park at Ringstead has applied for such a large extension to its season with the inevitable consequence of the loss tranquillity at what must be considered to be one of the jewels of W. Dorset.
- We fully accept that the tourist industry is in great difficulty at the moment but we strongly urge you therefore to consider the long term implications of this application and thus reject it.
- The wildness and fragile environmental beauty of Ringstead on the Heritage Coast would be severely affected by almost year-round occupation of the caravan site, and the increased pressure this would put on the very limited infrastructure. Ringstead is a small residential community and the poor quality and very steep access road is completely unsuitable to winter tourism, with no access by public transport.
- There are very few local amenities on or off site, meaning this application isn't a viable option. Ringstead bay is of outstanding natural beauty, and the winter months offer a rare opportunity to experience and enjoy this solitude, which could be destroyed by this application to extend the use of the caravan site.
- I object strongly that permission is granted that would allow the site to open 11 months, with all the extra footfall, the extra cars, in a time of the year when access can be a problem with the weather and gives no benefit to the local residents, the walkers, the fragile Environment or the coastal areas.
- I am also very concerned that because there was no Site visit, parts of the actual Application have not been checked and there are significant errors in fact. Ownership of roads and tracks, parking north of the site, National trust Boundaries, route of South West Coast Route are some of the errors, plus there are others that have been mentioned in the Objections.

- It would seriously damage the peace and tranquillity of Dorset's heritage coast during the winter months. This is a time when there are fewer tourists, therefore the shop is not open during the winter months, meaning the proposal will have no positive impact on the immediate local economy. The West Dorset Weymouth and Portland local plan greatly emphasises the need for preserving areas of peace and tranquillity and Ringstead during the winter months is one of these places. The proposal will increase strain on footpaths, and road access which in the winter months is difficult coming down a steep slope. Further to this, more than doubling the number of residents there during the winter months will have a big detrimental effect on light pollution at night. During the winter months storms batter the coast, which poses a serious health and safety risk for caravans near the front. To summarise this proposal will have a major negative effect on the heritage coast in this area, and further weaken Dorset councils' position to preserve it.
- The 1962 planning consent does not refer to the chalet then known as Elizabeth Chalet and now known as Coast Path Cottage, which is used as a residential dwelling. The current application refers to 'confirming the planning status' of this building, which implies that the owners are aware that this building is being used for residential purposes without appropriate permission.
- It should also be noted that the consultation notice which had been displayed on the site notice board was removed last week before the end of the consultation period, and before the end of the lockdown, when the leaseholders returned.

An 11 signatory petition has also been submitted objecting to the application on grounds of

- Commercialisation of Ringstead and that the non-occupancy period currently in force adds to the peaceful environment of this hamlet set in an AONB/World Heritage Jurassic coast area and
- requests from site owners to clear the site by the end of 2020 season.

6 further representations in support stating:

- Do not expect the number of cars driving along Fisher's Place to increase hugely as a result of an extended open season.
- Over the last 42 years the caravan site has never been at full occupancy outside of 3 weeks during the height of the summer. There is no reason to expect this to change, especially in the colder months of the year.
- Caravan owners come as day visitors in the winter months to spend a few hours in their caravans and enjoy the peace and quiet of Ringstead out of season. What this extension would offer them is an opportunity to stay over and enjoy those quiet times that other holiday home owners (houses) at Ringstead currently are fortunate enough to enjoy.

- Improvements in caravan design and insulation has meant that over the last 20 years many caravan parks around the county have now applied for and received planning permission to extend their season for their owners. However even modern caravans are still caravans (as I used to say to our visitors they are really just tin cans - you can hear every rain drop and feel every gust of wind against the sides) so in the colder, wetter months of the year they still won't offer the same experience as a summer holiday in a caravan or a winter holiday in a house. It just isn't comfortable or convenient.
- It would be lovely for some of them to experience a Christmas or New Year at Ringstead if they want to, and to experience the camaraderie that exists here in the winter months amongst residents and holidaymakers alike. Would welcome the idea that there might be a few more people around for security reasons alone.
- Just because our owners are not lucky enough to own a bricks and mortar holiday home here at Ringstead doesn't mean they feel any less strongly about preserving the uniqueness and beauty that is Ringstead and I think if they are allowed to stay over out of season they will add to, rather than detract from, the quality of life here.
- I think it would be really great if the caravan site was open longer as more of us would get a chance to visit and stay over.
- We would support the Caravan site extending the season so we can enjoy the bay in peace, whilst also not spending an arm and leg. It would be encouraging to know there is a holiday waiting for us towards the end of the year. I think the season being extended would appeal to people in our situation who can't afford the prices during the summer anymore. Anyone who knows Ringstead understands that by holidaying there in winter time they will likely be spending a lot of time indoors, except for the occasional walk, so I doubt it would greatly affect the locals enjoyment of their home. Life is going to be different from now on, it can't stay the same and people need to support local businesses and the environment by holidaying locally and responsibly.
- Ringstead is a small community and the infrastructure of the roads and local amenities do not make this a viable option. The rest of the tourist facilities based around the caravan are ALL seasonal. The bay is outstanding beauty and needs the months in between summer visitors to recuperate. It is certainly not designed or ready to be used all year around.
- I've been coming to Ringstead for many years because I love the peace and quiet. The natural beauty is amazing and I feel privileged every time I visit. Recently having got a dog, I now enjoy the numerous walks the area has to offer, not just the lovely beach. I've found the people to be welcoming and have been visiting almost daily over the last few weeks.
- I've also been lucky enough to have stayed in some of the holiday cottages in the area over the years. However this year they all were booked up so quickly

once holidays were allowed again, even into next year, so there is nothing left in my price range. Covid-19 has also reduced my income, meaning I can't afford to stay during the peak holiday season anymore.

- If the caravan site was open longer then I would very much welcome the opportunity to holiday out of season. It would be cheaper for me, there would be less competition for dates and I can have a peaceful stay in a place I love without having to travel there each day.
- Most people who come to Ringstead appreciate its unique beauty, and want to take care of it, myself included.
- I think it's a fantastic idea, and I'm writing to voice my support. I have been visiting the area for several years, as my partner's grandmother lives nearby. I've come to love and enjoy the Dorset Coast, and in particular, Ringstead beach and the adjacent caravan site. My favourite time to visit the area is during the off-season. Smaller crowds and more affordable off-season prices is extremely appealing. Especially at this time – having suffered an income reduction due to Covid-19, and generally hoping to avoid crowds, offseason visits are ideal.
- Also, the opportunity to enjoy Ringstead without having to make daily visits when the caravan site is closed (as is the current situation) would be a huge improvement to our experience.
- I care about preservation and protection of the area as much as anyone. I doubt that extending the season would alter the nature and appeal of the caravan site. If anything, it might provide more resources and reason to better preserve it for future generations
- **Ringstead Protection Society Committee** state - We understand that current residential occupancy- ie. .overnight sleeping- in the autumn up to the end of October is not great at the present time. It seems unlikely it will continue at the same level during the extra months which are amongst the coldest of the year. Caravans in winter on a site exposed to gales are not the most enticing places to stay. It might well be different if the site had modern, well insulated chalets, equipped modern energy efficient heating and modern bathrooms. If an application to build those was made, the Society would be concerned. Owners are entitled now to visit their caravans for the day at any time of the year and a successful application will not change that. We do not however believe that many people will be wanting to stay there in the additional months if permitted, other than perhaps for half term or over Christmas.
- It does not believe there will be a major increase in traffic if the application is successful and certainly not of a size that would justify refusing the application.
- For the above reasons, the Society does not propose to lend its support to the objectors.

Finally the applicant has responded direct to a number of the objections by stating that :

- The timing of the application is because we want to regularise the site planning regulations, which are very old and incorrect as part of the improvements to the company and the site we are making.
- Ringstead Caravan Company has not applied for permanent residence in its planning application and has never indicated it would ever want to do so.
- As a company we have always complied with our site licence and planning and never allowed anyone to use the caravan as their sole and permanent residence and will continue to do so. The caravan site has been there since the 1930s older than a vast majority of the houses in Ringstead. A season extension will not change the view, as the caravans stay there 365 days a year.
- The Ringstead Caravan Park plays a major role in addressing some of the issues of concern to residents with regard to littering by daily visitors to Ringstead. See the section on waste.
- No additional development is required or has been made in the planning application. All pitches have their own utilities and do not require any additional public services.
- No public transport is currently needed when it is open now. The season extension will have even less need for public transport, I have no data on deliveries and neither do I imagine the complainants. The caravan site is used for many delivery drivers and services such as domestic refuse collection of the residents to turn around as it is the only place big enough to do so. We have never objected to this and are always keen to help the community.
- The caravan site pays £1040 to use the road far more than any other property in the village. It also voluntarily repairs the road asking no contributions from any other residence or holiday accommodation business. As far as we are aware no one else does this in Ringstead.
- There is no expansion of the numbers of people using the caravan site. As previously mentioned we are by far the single biggest contribution towards the upkeep and repairs of the road.
- The caravan site collects waste and recycling for two houses the council can not reach further up the track.
- We also collect a huge amount of waste from beach visitors (nothing to do with us) and provide the only dog waste bin in the village at our own expense.

- In our closed season we do not have bins and so there is a build up of waste left by day visitors who do not take their waste home with them. Hopefully with an extended season we can help reduce this.
- The caravan site has its only toilets and drainage facilities and will have no additional strain on any public facilities.
- The caravan site actually hosts the drainage and pumping facilities for the village on our land and is maintained at our expense. The Caravan site was central to the decision to fund the groin as it increased the number of people who would benefit from the project in the cost benefit analysis, thus enabling the project to go ahead.
- Council engineers think the rate of erosion has been significantly delayed by the presence of the groin which is of benefit to all the residents and visitors to Ringstead.
- We are not increasing the number of vans or overall numbers of visitors to the site so this objection is irrelevant.
- It is in our site licence and we will continue to do all of this work as required in the site licence. As well employing local trades persons and being able to offer all year work to cleaners and other contractors we promote local events, tourist attractions and businesses to our holiday makers. An extension would help the all year round economy of local business.

WP/19/01016/FUL	St Nicholas Church, Buxton Road, Weymouth	Item 5d	79 - 97
------------------------	--	----------------	----------------

Update(s):

A letter of objection from Mr Hillary:

Following our earlier objection we now believe the proposed building will block TV signals to our property

A letter of support from Cllr Sutton:

Dear Sir/Madam

I am unable to attend for this item on Thursday but please find below my submission for the committee's consideration. With many thanks, Cllr Clare Sutton, Rodwell & Wyke.

.....
Having carefully considered this application and the comments submitted, I fully understand why some residents in the vicinity within my ward are opposed, or would wish the building to be just 2 storeys. I agree that it is important to protect the

character of our neighbourhoods, especially within a conservation area. However, I am also aware of how the lack of affordable housing blights the lives and life opportunities of many individuals, couples and families both in my ward and across Weymouth as a whole, where around 104 new smaller housing units, as proposed in this application, are needed per year. I cannot therefore in good conscience object to this application, or propose that the number of units be reduced by 33%. These potential homes are just too precious to their future occupants.

On the aesthetics, these always come down to personal taste, but I quite like the design. Yes, 2 storeys would fit in better with the locality, but this, for me, is outweighed by those much needed 6 homes. I therefore support the application as it stands.