

Representation against the proposed development at the Drift Inn [20/00303/FUL]

Speaking reference: CM/080221/14

Despite receiving seventeen, carefully considered, valid objections made by local people the Case Officer's report simply lists the nature of our concerns and then, without further comment, glibly states that four letters of support were received welcoming the benefits the development could have etc. In fact, only one of these solicited support letters was from a Cresswell resident and even he raised concerns about the current traffic issues resulting from the development as it currently operates.

What about the inevitable detrimental effect on the character of the area and the potential consequences of the approval of this unwelcome proposal? If holiday chalets are accepted, as envisaged, doesn't this set a precedent for the remainder of the Village Gardens strip the full length of which is out-with the settlement boundary [Reference CLC1]? Some of us have spent decades successfully fighting against such development.

This can scarcely be construed to be democracy in action?

Such dismissive and shallow consideration of the real issues is totally unacceptable and I would simply ask each voting Councilor and the Chief Planning Officer/Director of Planning to search their own conscience and take proper account of the many letters and photographic evidence submitted against this proposed development. I don't accept that the Planning Officer has given due cognisance to the various relevant CL policies which should have protected the village against this particular proposal.

Cresswell is at a crossroads in its evolution as a consequence of unwelcome development in recent decades, including the regrettable expansion of its intrusive caravan parks and we, the residents, deserve the protection of the Planning Authority and the Councilors we appoint to represent our interests.

Do Councilors and the Planning Authority really wish to see Cresswell develop into something like Seahouses?

We don't need any increase in visitors and, swamped as we are, by caravans and their occupants it is well documented that our village can barely cope even with the present intrusions.

Approval of this ill-conceived development could sound the 'death knell' for Cresswell; a point of no return!

We, who have lived here for decades, certainly don't want our cherished village to be over-developed but we have had to grit our teeth on so many recent occasions when the benefits to the few are put before the interests of the many.

The claims about employment and tourism benefits are entirely subjective and unsubstantiated and it is overwhelming clear that there is only one beneficiary if this application succeeds namely the applicant himself.

Some of the Statutory Consultees will be well aware, from their own experience, that many of their properly intentioned mitigation measures just won't be embraced once the development commences. We, in Cresswell, have seen it all before! Consider the

aftermath of the expansion of the Golden Sands Holiday Park. The conditions of that approval were never implemented and no serious attempt was made to impose them.

As has so often been the case recently, our own Parish Council has failed to consult and express the wishes of the majority of residents allowing itself, rather, to be swayed by the vociferous minority with their own self-interests. Their inept, 'neutral,' stance robs us of a further voice against a proposal that is clearly not in our interests as parishioners

Finally that leads me to the letter you received, dated 28th January, by Mr Ian Johnston, a resident of St Bartholomew's Close, who following the notification of the meeting, has advised the Planning Department that the Applicant hasn't even waited for approval but is already actively engaged on implementation. Indeed the services for the four chalets are already, visibly, installed and the plot clearly prepared for building. This surely sends an unwelcome message to residents, Planners and our Councilors who I hope will regard such flagrant abuse as unacceptable and act accordingly.

Dr P R Kirkwood

The Old School House

CRESSWELL