

Hazel Stub House, Hazel Stub, Burton End, Haverhill CB9 9AF

6th March 2023

Ed Fosker
Planning Officer
Planning & Growth
West Suffolk Council,
West Suffolk House, Western Way,
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk IP33 3YU

Ref: Application No: DC/23/0012/FUL

Dear Mr Fosker,

We would like to OBJECT most strenuously to the above referenced application for the following reasons;

1. The site is currently used for light industrial use during strict specific hours – which means that we **retain our privacy** during the essential hours of before 0730 and after 1830 weekdays and before 0730 and after 1230 on Saturdays and we have our privacy for ALL day Sundays. If this was allowed to change in to a residential site for basically 38 people, - it would be in use with associated traffic 24 hours a day 7 days a week which would mean **TOTAL LOSS OF PRIVACY**.
2. I understand that under JDMP policy DM33 this building is classified as “remote”. This is because
 - a. The building **HAS NO ACCESS of its own. The site does not have its own access roads**. The only way to access the property is by using rights of way on property belonging to others.
 - b. The site is bordered on 2 sides by open agricultural land; on 1 side by woodland; and one side directly on to two residential properties in a small hamlet of just 8 buildings.
 - c. Part of the site is supposed to be set aside for the placement of agricultural equipment by the farmer
3. The proposed change will be incredibly intrusive onto the two directly adjacent properties. The first floor looks directly in to both properties and at night, it means that there will be light and noise from up to 38 residents which will be extremely intrusive. We know this to be fact, because when the upstairs offices have been used during darkness or lights have been left on at night – they shine directly in to both properties and in to rear facing bedrooms.

Hazel Stub House, Hazel Stub, Burton End, Haverhill CB9 9AF

4. External lighting on the site for parking, doors etc will be shone directly on to the rear gardens of both properties.
5. The drawings block and remove access to the rear of Hazel Stub House and more importantly the pathway that we have right of way to use that runs along the edge of our property. **This has now been completely removed and replaced by parking spaces.** The access gate is used regularly as the only way to get oil in to our property which has oil-fired central heating.
6. **The plan does NOT meet Policy DM27:** Housing in the countryside. The site is not **WITHIN** a cluster of 10 or more dwellings (it is adjacent to the rear of three of the properties). As stated previously – it has two sides (most of the property) to open land on a site which is remote from the highway except by right of way passages owned by others. **It is NOT fronting an existing highway.**
7. The proposal undermines the character and distinctiveness of the rural scene and environment and **interferes with the rural character of Hazel Stub.**
8. The site for rubbish bins, adequate to service 38 people looks like it will attract rats.
9. The proposal will diminish the number of jobs in the area.
10. We understand that according to the NPPF 2018 that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate except in very special circumstances.
11. We believe that this will set a precedent for more residential property on this site and will therefore alter the boundaries currently set as Green Belt
12. Drainage system. The current drainage for the area is small bore and is operating at its maximum. To triple the population of this area would cause massive problems within the existing infrastructure.

Our property backs straight on to the proposed development and we will lose ALL of our privacy 24 hours a day 7 days a week which we do not feel is fair or acceptable, so we would kindly request that you refuse the above referenced application

Yours sincerely,


Robert Clive Exton and Maria Angela Exton