

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**12 MAY 2010**

**ADDENDUM TO PAPER K11**

**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>
3	21-25	<p><u>Environmental Health</u> The proposed development is in close proximity to residential dwellings and therefore has the potential to cause loss of amenity due to odour.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the system used for odour extraction is appropriately designed placed and sized to meet the particular needs of the business. However the proposed system is recognised in the DEFRA statement as being suitable for effective odour removal and as such if installed maintained and operated in accordance with the manufactures instructions should minimise loss of amenity at nearby residential properties.</p>
4	<u>26-30</u>	<p><u>Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)</u> No objection.</p> <p><u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u> The ridge heights quoted in paragraph 3 are given as datum levels, the actual heights are: plot 1 = 4.7m, plot 2 = 4.9m and the existing bungalow is 4.7m.</p>
5	31-36	<p><u>Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)</u> No objection.</p> <p><u>Errata</u> In 2006 planning permission was refused for the erection of a dwelling on the site. (B/06/1357/OUT). A subsequent appeal was allowed. Details were approved under B/07/1537/RES.</p>
7	45-52	<p><u>Chief Planning Control Officer</u> Babergh District Council is the owner of the application site. The Monitoring Officer has reviewed the file and is satisfied that the application has been processed properly and normally.</p>
8	53-65	<p><u>Applicant</u> Additional plans submitted showing revised access arrangements to address comments raised by the local highway authority.</p> <p><u>Keith Loveday</u> (Chairman to Village Hall Management Committee)</p>

		<p>Disappointed at the response made by English Heritage. Points out that a new village hall is required to serve the community and the development of the land would help to fulfil this objective.</p> <p><u>Angela Frost</u> (Secretary to Village Hall Management Committee) Points out that the existing village hall is in a poor structural condition and in need of replacement. Finds it difficult to comprehend why the proposals are alleged to have such a profound impact upon the setting of the church.</p> <p><u>Carolyn Dixon</u> (Member of the Village Hall Management Committee) The present Village Hall was built by the community in the early 1950s and has served the community extremely well although it has structural defects (discovered in 1994) and has been closed whilst works were completed to ensure safety of the Hall.</p> <p>A replacement has been planned for some time and the community have been working hard to deliver this and a new school community hall and the development of the village hall site is an excellent way to fund the project.</p> <p>We understand the main reason of objection is that views of the church will be restricted although this is difficult to understand. The dominant feature of the church is the tower which would remain visible; the view of the nave is screened by the trees for a large part of the year. Visual impact of a small housing development would be minimal.</p> <p>We believe we have consulted and taken the advice of the District Council. The community together with the Parish Council are fully behind the present scheme and support for this scheme would be a large step towards securing Monks Eleigh as a vibrant and sustainable community for the future.</p> <p><u>William Dixon</u> (Resident of 4 St Peters Church Hill) Hopes the case will be argued strongly against rejection of the scheme. (Also makes the same points made by Carolyn Dixon above)</p>
10	73-75	<p><u>Glemsford Parish Council</u> Recommend approval</p>

11 May 2010