37 Bumpstead Road

Haverhill

Suffolk

CB9 8QA

11th August 2019

Planning Department

West Suffolk District Council

Dear Sirs

**Planning Application No. DC/19/1010/RM**

I am writing in response to the amended plans and acoustic report relating to the above application.

Unfortunately it would seem that neither the Developer or the Planning Officers appear to have taken any notice of any of the objections in relation to the orientation of the units as raised by various consultees and the people who actually have to live adjacent to and be affected by the development in their pre-app meeting. It would appear that the only points covered by the amended plan is the provision of a footpath and change of entrance to Unit 5 and amendments to squeeze in additional parking spaces to accommodate B2 and B8 use. Unit 5 now appears to share an accessway with the already established builders merchant and I question the safety and feasibility of this, in that all vehicles using both the new unit and the established unit will criss cross all day.

There appears to be no mention either of the fact that there is no continuous footpath along Bumpstead Road to enable workers who have no transport to safely walk to work. As previously mentioned I believe this renders the development unsustainable.

The acoustic report has been prepared based on hypothetical usage of the units and states that all findings are likely to change dependent upon the use of the various units. I am at a loss to know how the impact upon our homes can be considered by this report when it has been prepared dependent upon the final use of the units, unless of course the data had been taken from identical scenarios. I appreciate that there is indicative data taken from other developments but this can in no way reflect the impact that the orientation of these units will have on the use of both the residential units and their gardens.

The predicted noise levels within Table 11 refer to 37 Bumpstead Road as having levels over and above those referred to in Table 2 as being acceptable by WHO levels. Reference is made in the survey regarding the provision of acoustic fencing to Units 3 and 4 but with respect the roadways leading to Units 1 and 2 and more particularly the service yard to Unit 2 are equally liable to cause noise levels to increase to residential units with light pollution, more particularly during the winter months when there is no leaf cover from the deciduous trees, and diesel and particulates to affect the occupants of the residential units.

Indeed all of the noise levels in the servicing calculations in the table in Appendix D in relation to most of the residential units would appear to be within the parameters of noise disturbance. As a layperson I point out out that the report findings are extremely technical and as such are very difficult, indeed almost impossible, to understand, perhaps by design, as no-one can predict the final usage of the units. If any of the units were to be used along the same lines as Culina, from experience, this would make living in any of the homes fronting Bumpstead Road extremely unpleasant. We would have to live with the constant banging of shutters, lorry reversing warnings and raised voices of workers trying to make themselves heard over vehicle noise and could well mean that sitting in the garden on a summers day with a book and trying to relax impossible. Not to mention that this could well go on all through the night.

I can find no mention of any provision of acoustic fencing to mitigate the noise levels to the residential units as contained in the original proposed site layout plan.

I can only add to the above that none of the points of objections or the necessity of an additional acoustic survey would have been required if the new owners had kept with the original layout plans which had been designed to cause the minimum amount of disruption to the residential units.

I would respectfully ask the planning committee to include in any final planning documentation all of the suggested mitigation and additional conditions as recommended by the various consultees or preferably require the developers to revert to the original site layout plans as contained within the 2017 application.

Yours faithfully

Susan Roach