

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**9 JANUARY 2008**

**ADDENDUM TO PAPER G166**

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

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Summary</b>
1	6	<p><u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u> Subsequent to the publication of the report the applicant has asserted that the proposal is for the construction of a <b>replacement</b> dwelling. If this is the case, there would be no requirement under Local Plan Policy HS32 to secure a public open space contribution. Officers are investigating whether the building claimed to be the existing dwelling is a lawful dwelling in planning terms. The recommendation is therefore altered slightly to enable the status of the existing 'dwelling' to be investigated. The contribution would be secured only if it is subsequently deemed appropriate to do so.</p> <p>(2) That, subject to the planning obligation in Resolution (1) above being secured or subsequently deemed not to be required, the Chief Planning Control Officer be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Materials</li><li>• Landscaping</li><li>• Withdrawal of GPDO rights for first floor openings within front and both side elevations</li><li>• Withdrawal of GPDO rights for the erection of extensions and outbuildings.</li><li>• As recommended by LHA</li><li>• Protection of the hedgerow during construction works</li></ul>
2	11	<p><u>Agent</u> Drainage Strategy and Tree Survey submitted in response to a request for additional information.</p> <p><u>Environment Agency</u> Previous objection withdrawn subject to the imposition of planning conditions to control surface water drainage.</p> <p><u>Head of Contract and Asset Management</u> Comments that the removal of the specified trees will have little impact on local amenity and the programme of remedial works will enhance the remaining stock. The application is therefore acceptable.</p>

		<p><u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u> In the light of the comments made by the Environment Agency the Head of Head of Contract and Asset management the recommendation is amended to read: Grant planning permission subject to conditions, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As recommended by LHA</li> <li>• As recommended by EA</li> <li>• As recommended by Head of Contract and Asset Management</li> <li>• Ecological mitigation plan</li> <li>• Landscaping scheme.</li> <li>• Archaeology</li> <li>• Withdrawal of permitted development rights for means of enclosure</li> <li>• Street lighting scheme</li> <li>• Construction management plan</li> </ul> <p><u>Errata</u> Paragraphs 16 and 17 should refer to paragraph 15 above.</p>
4	34	<p><u>J Hatfield and V Woodbridge</u> Object to the application. Express concern at the incremental nature of development on the site, the impartiality of the acoustic engineers report, and the adequacy of the suggested noise attenuation fence.</p> <p><u>Petition from Stone street Residents</u> Fifteen signatories expressing opposition to the application on the grounds that the proposal would have an adverse impact on a residential area.</p>
5	38	<p><u>Addendum</u> The following should be added to the recommendation.</p> <p>(4) That the Listed Building application be referred to GOEast for consideration.</p> <p>(5) That subject to the receipt of no adverse comments from GOEast the Listed Building application is approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Chief Planning Control Officer.</p>
6	43	<p><u>J Youngman and Sons</u> Support the application on the grounds that it would maintain orchards that might otherwise have to be grubbed up.</p> <p><u>Feltons Orchards Limited</u> Support the application and consider it would contribute to the local economy.</p> <p><u>Paul Williamson Limited</u> Support the application as it would protect local jobs.</p>

10	59	<p><u>Roger Prosser</u>          Considers the mobile home should be removed when the occupier no longer fulfils the terms of the proposed condition. Has provided photographs of the site and questions the time taken to remedy the breach of planning control.</p>
11	63	<p><u>Jacqui Eglantine</u>          Considers the proposed development to be sympathetic to the locality.</p> <p><u>George Ashford</u>          Objects to the application. While in favour of development on the site, the size of the dwellings proposed is questioned because they are unlikely to be within the reach of younger people.</p> <p><u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u>          The site area is 0.08 hectares.</p>
12	67	<p><u>Economic Development Officer</u>          Points out that a marketing campaign was undertaken prior to the submission of the application although the details were not submitted with the application. As such there is no objection to the proposal.</p> <p><u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u>          In the light of the comments made by the Economic Development Officer and clarification for the Primary Care Trust the recommendation given in paragraph 9.1 is revised as follows:</p> <p>The planning application be refused for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over development of the site, lack of parking and private amenity space and loss of residential amenity contrary to Policies HS01, HS27 HS30 CN01 and TP15.</li> <li>• Harm to the character of the Conservation Area (including loss of an existing historic building) contrary to Policies CN01 and CN08.</li> <li>• Lack of public open space provision contrary to Policy HS32.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 9.2 remains unchanged.</p>
13	75	<p><u>Applicant</u>          Comments made in connection with the letters of representation received on the proposal. Point out that the bathroom window is an existing opening, there are several two-storey extensions nearby, the photomontage submitted by one contributor is incorrect, the Pinewood Committee Statement is misleading, and that the proposal would not have a negative impact on neighbouring property.</p>

		<p><u>Pinewood Parish Council</u> Object to the application on the grounds that the two-storey extension would be discordant, cramped and appear intrusive, setting a precedent for similar extensions. They do not object in principle to the single storey extension.</p> <p><u>Mr and Mrs Chenery</u> Object to the proposed single storey extension on the grounds that a side window will overlook their garden.</p>
15	79	<p><u>J M McKenner</u> Letter enclosing photographs of the site. Points out that the fence did not replace a hedge and that the land has not been enclosed for the past 26 years.</p>

8 January 2008