To: DCAdmin
Subject: Planning application 2019/90988 - comments
Date: 02 August 2019 16:10:33

I have previously commented on this proposal and am now responding to the updated proposal. There continues to be a lack of specificity and detail relating to how the planned provision will be delivered and effectively managed and the revised documents fail to effectively address the questions and objections I and have raised.
Some specific instances I would point to include:
1. The issue of inadequate toilet facilities, ie, two composting toilets to meet the needs of the pods, vans and bushcraft users, fails to be effectively discussed. Assumptions are made about toilet usage that may not be realistic. There has been a very limited reduction in overall anticipated site usage in the updated proposal. .
2. Water supply issues continue not to be addressed.
3. Lighting issues are only addressed in terms of solar power lighting being provided on pods. How would safe access across the site be assured outside daylight hours and the safety of users protected, especially given the proximity to open water? Conversely, if electric lighting was installed, how would that fit with the ecological aims of the site?
4. The mention of electric car charging provision seems to imply that mains electricity will be laid on the site - again, this is not followed through in any detail and/or its implications discussed.
5. The provision of boundary hedging and lockable gates are put forward as answers to security issues but raise more questions than they answer. How would a hedge stop entry, especially as it doesn't cover all potential access points to the site? The provision of high hedging around the site and further lower hedging within the site brings with it heightened safety concerns re the safety of users and their possessions. Given that users would presumably want vehicular access in and out of the site during a stay, how can locked gates be sustained? Aren't there issues around the hampering of access for emergency vehicles? Much more detail and discussion was needed on this.
6. The restriction of entry time onto the site to weekday evenings and weekends has been put forward as a means of regulating the entry of traffic onto the site. While it might be possible to regulate incoming traffic in this way, it cannot help in the management of user traffic in and and out of the site both during and at the end of their stay. The proposal also talks of the encouragement of the use of alternative means of transport. It is however impossible to project the potential impact of this.
7. The important question of the management of potential nuisance is inadequately addressed. The majority of the proposals rely on users adhering to guidelines, e.g. re playing of music, lighting of fires. Importantly, there continues to be no mention of any on-site staffing providing active supervision. This is not only pertinent to how nuisance can or will be actively managed . It is also pertinent to the whole area of how user safety will be managed. This includes protection issues that arise from the potential involvement of in bushcraft activities on a site simultaneously occupied by adult pod and campervan users.
8. Much is made of the wooded nature of the proposed provision. However, as the trees are not protected, the landowner has the rights to fell them without seeking permission. As such, this needs to be taken into account in any decision on this proposal's desirability.

In light of the continuing deficiencies in the application, I would like to continue to register my objections.