

**ADDENDUM FOR THE MEETING OF DEVELOPMENT & REGULATION
COMMITTEE 22 May 2009**

**Item 5a DR/28/09 (ESS/04/09/TEN) Plumpton Farm, Alresford,
Colchester**

Page 3 POLICIES

Delete existing section and replace with:

The following policies of the Tendring District Local Plan 2007 (TDLP), the Minerals Local Plan 1996 (MLP) and National Policy (NP) provide the policy framework for this development. The following policies are of relevance to this application:

	<u>MLP</u>	<u>TDLP</u>	<u>NP</u>
Country Wildlife Sites		EN11C	
Landscape Character		EN1	
Coastal Protection Belt		EN3	
Amenity	MLP13		
Biodiversity and Geological Conservation			PPS9

Page 6 REPRESENTATIONS

Eighth paragraph of observation column should read "The access with the B1027 is dangerous".

Page 8 APPRAISAL

C IMPACT UPON THE HIGHWAY

Third paragraph should read, "The Highway Authority has raised *no* objection. The site benefits from a clear visibility splay in both directions onto the B1027."

Page 9 APPRAISAL

D IMPACT UPON HABITATS AND NATURE CONSERVATION

After fourth full paragraph on page nine, add additional paragraph:

"Planning Policy Statement 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) has the primary aim of 'preventing harm to biodiversity and conservation interests' and requires that 'where significant harm to those interests would result Mineral Planning Authorities need to be satisfied that development cannot reasonably be

located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no harm'. In this case it is considered that it has been demonstrated that the proposed angling use would not significantly harm biodiversity and conservation interests."

Page 10 RECOMMENDED

Condition 7 should be changed to read:

7. No fixed lighting of any kind shall be installed on site.

.....

Item 5c DR/30/09 (ESS/57/04/TEN) Wick Farm, Ardleigh

Page 2 BACKGROUND

Second paragraph, change "...Secretary of State and the application..." to "...Secretary of State, however the application..."

.....

Item 6a DR/31/09 (CC/COL/05/09) Friars Grove Infant School, Upland Drive, Colchester

Page 3 PROPOSAL

First paragraph on page three, last sentence, delete,

"It is unlikely to consist of volume by being raised due to the main buildings floor levels."

Replace with:

"Due to the main buildings internal floor levels the proposed decking is unlikely to be significantly raised above ground level."

Page 3 CONSULTATIONS

COUNTY COUNCIL'S NOISE CONSULTANT - As the canopy is a closed structure it is probable that noise from the children's activities will be reflected back down and out of the ends and front. As a result it is feasible that there may be an increase in noise levels in the areas surrounding the ends and front. Recommend the imposing the following conditions 1)The existing closeboarded boundary fence is extended where necessary to ensure that the entire section of adjoining land with the houses is screened. 2) Where possible the height of the fence is increased to reduce the amount of noise passing over the top 3) Should this not be sufficient we recommend that the hardstanding surface is altered to a more noise absorbing one such as those suggested above.

LOCAL MEMBER (Parsons Heath) - It would appear that the noise problems started in 2003 when the application to make a hard surface playground was given permission. The noise levels have increased as the hard surface does not absorb the noise. No remedial noise barriers were added on the school side. Indeed the barriers eg the trees and bushes are all on the residents' side. The fencing which separates the school from the properties is chain link in many areas. The addition of the canopy has had the effect of funnelling the noise such it would appear to be acting as a loudspeaker directing the noise towards the residents of the close. The residents do understand that living next to a school that there will be some noise, but believe that works done the last 6 years have amplified the noise.

If permission were to be granted I would like the following conditions to be applied:

1. Noise absorbing materials are added to the canopy.
2. The school considers some remedial planting on their side of the fence to help absorbed the noise.
3. Any future materials used to replace the hard surface of the playground area are those designed to absorb noise.
4. The noise levels are monitored on a regular basis so as the preserve the tranquil nature of the close, and reported to the residents.
5. If in the future the school is ever rebuilt that the whole layout is reconsidered as it seems that all recent work is on the boundary of the site closest to residents.

Page 3 REPRESENTATIONS

Since the time of writing the report two additional representations have been received:

Mrs Allington of 11 Mountain Ash Close raised the following points;

- Most of the detached houses in Mountain Ash Close have, or originally had, a first floor flank elevation window. Other first floor windows also overlook the application site. I would also like to point out that 11 Mountain Ash Close, complete with first floor flank elevation window, was in existence before the Infants' School building.
- The amenities of people living nearby have already been harmed by reason of noise and visual detriment.
- A new play area was recently created adjacent to the boundary of my property. This play area connects directly to the area of the proposed canopy by an area of hardstanding. The area of hardstanding has replaced a small path adjacent to my boundary. The said path was previously used only at the beginning and end of school by parents and children arriving and departing from school. This extra usage by children playing and riding their toys during the school day has resulted in a large increase in noise because it is used during the day as well as for arrivals and departures.
- When the proposed canopy was erected in 2008 it was used as an external classroom for a large part of every school day. This resulted in an enormous increase in noise over a long time. The use of this external classroom also resulted in an increased use of the play area and the adjacent hardstanding.
- Even with double-glazed windows closed it was impossible not to hear a great deal of what was happening at school.
- The children and parents start arriving about 0830 and leave about 1515 - a total of six and three-quarter hours. This represents a large proportion of daylight hours when excessive noise had to be endured in my home and garden and windows had to be closed because of the noise even on hot days.
- Since the canopy has been removed the area has had very little use and there has been very little noise.
- Can noise monitoring be put in place?

- Could the hardstanding adjacent to my boundary be treated with something to absorb some of the noise?
- Please note the school only has a 1.5m high wire netting fence. The 2 m high fencing and vegetation along the shared boundary mostly belong to the neighbouring properties.
- The extension is visually unpleasant and intrusive.
- The extension is entirely out of character of the area. The school has a flat grey roof; the surrounding houses each have a sloping grey tile roof.
- The school is square and there appears no barrier to extending on any of the other three sides. A logical alternative site for the canopy would be on the south east side of the school next to the new play area.
- The Colchester Borough Environmental Health Officer has suggested that '*some form of cover inside the roof of the structure may absorb some of the sound*'. If the canopy is re-erected, could a wall or barrier be erected between the structure and the adjacent boundary to deflect some of the noise and screen the view of the bright white pyramids?

Page 4 REPRESENTATIONS

Top left section of representations, change "Planning Investigations Officer had visited....." to "Colchester Borough Council's Planning Investigations Officer..."

Page 6 RECOMMENDED

Additional Condition:

3. Within 3 months from the date of this permission a noise attenuation scheme, incorporating either new boundary treatment with landscaping at the boundary of the application site and the nearest noise sensitive property to the south of the canopy or noise absorbent treatment material for both the canopy and ground surface directly beneath the canopy, shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

.....

**Item 6b DR/32/09 (CC/BTE/14/09) Sandiacres Travellers Site,
Long Green, Cressing**

Page 3 REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of representation has been received which raises no new issues other than already addressed in the committee report.

Page 4 APPRAISAL

Delete existing second paragraph and replace with

“Cressing Parish Council are unable to support this application as they feel that the existing amenity is already functioning beyond the natural capacity of the site and the introduction of this additional accommodation would constitute further overdevelopment of the site especially given its rural location. The applicant has stated that the proposed expansion of the site is well within its operating capacity. It is considered that there is sufficient space to accommodate 2 additional pitches and would not constitute the overdevelopment of the site.”

Delete third paragraph in its entirety.

Page 6 RECOMMENDED

Delete condition 4.

Page 6 BACKGROUND PAPERS

Should read: Ref: P/DC/Glenn Shaw/CC/BTE/14/09 and not CC/BAS/02/09

.....