

**BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

6 FEBRUARY 2008

ADDENDUM TO PAPER G195

**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	6-14	<u>Head of Contract and Asset Management</u> No objection subject to the imposition of planning conditions to protect the trees.
2	15-21	<u>Errata</u> The date for determination is 29 January 2008 and not as stated. The site plan is also incorrect and a revised drawing will be available at the meeting.
3	22-26	<u>Agent</u> Letter indicating that the applicant is willing to enter into a planning obligation agreement to secure an open space contribution if required. <u>Errata</u> The site plan is incorrect. A revised copy will be available at the meeting.
4	27-30	<u>Errata</u> Paragraph 1, Second Sentence should read, " <i>The site is under separate ownership and measures approximately 0.13 hectares, with a width of approximately 18.5 metres and a depth of approximately 68 metres.</i> " Paragraph 23, Final sentence should read, " <i>The obligation could not in fact prevent the submission of further applications for residential development on this site, and therefore does not mitigate the risk of precedent outlined in paragraph 22 above.</i> "
5	31-33	<u>Hadleigh Town Council</u> No Objection. Note that the property was previously used as a dwelling.

Item No	Page	Summary
7	38-42	<p><u>Errata</u></p> <p><u>County Archaeologist</u> No Objection</p> <p><u>Mr E Edwards on behalf of Holy Family Catholic Church</u> Comments that the Church has no reason to agree to the proposed improvements to the track from Brantham Hill since there is no public right of way over it. Entry from Brantham Hill is dangerous due to poor visibility and only those who have acquired rights to use the track should be using it.</p> <p><u>Mr and Mrs P Dudman</u> Object to the application. The proposal would give rise to additional noise and activity and anti social behaviour. Concerned that the installation of bollards on the track to the rear of their house would block access.</p> <p><u>Mr and Mrs Abbott</u> Object to the application. Comments made in connection with fencing to garden areas, the availability of parking space/land for the construction of garages.</p>
9	45-47	<p><u>Addendum: 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>
10	48-50	<p><u>Addendum: East Bergholt Parish Council</u> Object: Adverse impact on street scene by virtue of increase in height.</p>
13	59-62	<p><u>Errata</u> The applicant is Philips Avent Limited and not as stated.</p>
15	67-81	<p><u>Errata</u> The site location is OS 0889, Lings Lane and not as stated.</p> <p><u>Mr and Mrs Clark</u> Support the application and refer to the deteriorating condition of the site.</p>

5 February 2008