

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

17 FEBRUARY 2010

ADDENDUM TO PAPER J190

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE
PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA BUT BEFORE 12 NOON ON THE WORKING
DAY BEFORE THE MEETING AND ERRATA**

Item No	Page	Summary
1	6-10	<p><u>HoNABE (Food Safety)</u> No comments to make from a food safety point of view.</p>
2	11-21	<p><u>Nayland with Wissington Parish Council</u> No objection. Request that the recommendations contained within the Noise Assessment are implemented.</p> <p><u>Local Highway Authority</u> No objection subject to the imposition of conditions relating to access construction, visibility, turning and parking.</p> <p><u>SCC Fire Officer</u> Points out that access must comply with Building Regulation requirements. Indicates that no new fire hydrants are required but suggests domestic sprinklers are installed.</p> <p><u>Nayland Flying Group and Mr R A Harris</u> Continue to object to the proposal and do not consider the interests of the airfield have been adequately taken into account. Consider that the Noise Assessment does not address their concerns or fully assesses the implications of the flight path from the airfield that is of most significance. Point out that the Acoustic Engineer did not visit the airfield.</p> <p><u>HoNABE (Environmental Protection)</u> Has reviewed the Noise Assessment and is in agreement with the conclusions providing the use of the easterly airstrip does not exceed 28 days per annum and the glazing specification is implemented.</p> <p><u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u> The Noise Assessment has been conducted in line with an accepted methodology using noise data gathered within the vicinity of the airfield and generic data for light aircraft types. In response to the additional concerns raised by the Nayland Flying Club supplementary information has been produced by the applicants Acoustic Engineer. This relates to the easterly airstrip that may be used for 28 days in any calendar year and demonstrates that noise levels within the proposed dwellings will be within recommended standards. The Acoustic Engineer's report also concludes that while noise levels in the gardens to the proposed dwellings may be higher than recommended levels when the easterly airstrip is in use, it</p>

		concludes that provided usage does not exceed 28 days per annum the overall impact on residential amenity is acceptable and no further mitigation measures, other than those already proposed, will be required. These mitigation measures include a recommended glazing specification. If Members are minded to approve the application an additional planning condition would be required to this effect.
3	22-28	<u>Mr E Donald</u> Considers the proposal to represent an over development of the site. Points out that the development would result in overlooking of his property which is a Grade II listed building.
4	29-35	<u>Agent</u> Points out that the Inspector when considering a previous appeal on the site was of the view that the slight change in traffic attributable to the proposal would not be noticeable and therefore questions the advice provided by the Local Highway Authority. Suggests the proposal would improve highway safety. <u>Applicants</u> Comment that their agent will address the comments raised by the Local Highway Authority but suggests the access could be improved by the removal of approximately 800mm of the boundary wall to the site frontage. <u>Local Highway Authority</u> Have withdrawn their original objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions requiring the provision of a turning area and parking spaces. <u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u> The planning agreement referred to in recommendations (1) and (3) has been completed since the publication of the report. Recommendation (2) is accordingly revised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out.
7	47-53	<u>Mr and Mrs Knowler</u> Object to the proposed increase in the height of the radio mast because of the impact it will have upon the surrounding area.
8	54-62	<u>R A Fidler</u> Considers there would be insufficient turning and parking space, the proposals would result in a loss of light, the property would be poorly served by public transport services and wildlife interests have not been adequately considered. <u>Mrs V A Woods</u> Considers the proposal would be out of keeping with the surroundings, the access road is too narrow, wildlife interest have not been taken into account, and that the track to their property should be kept clear at all times.

		<p><u>Mrs C Kent</u> Objects to the development. The site is too narrow and the dwelling would sit forward of other properties. The proposal would also lead to parking problems and highway safety issues. There is no footpath or street lighting.</p> <p><u>Mrs M Bailey</u> Objects. Considers the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site, lead to traffic and parking problems, result in a dwelling being sited forward of other properties in the road, and spoil the character of the area.</p> <p><u>Mrs P Watts</u> Notes the revisions to the application but considers the dwelling is still too large for the plot. Considers the proposal will lead to parking and traffic problems. Does not consider that sufficient consideration has been given to wildlife interests.</p>
10	67-70	<p><u>Sudbury Town Council</u> Have confirmed that the operating hours would be 09.00 – 20.30 hours as existing.</p> <p><u>Local Highway Authority</u> No objection.</p> <p><u>SCC Archaeological Service</u> No objection.</p>

16 February 2010