

37 Bumpstead Road
Haverhill
CB9 8QA

May 2020

Planning Department
West Suffolk District Council
Buy St Edmunds

Dear Sirs

Reserved matters application DC19/1010/RM
Haverhill Business Park

Following notification of the revised application submitted in relation to the above site I would make the following further comments:-

In the current revised application B8 use, which the developers have put in, will as Sharp Redmore report states increase noise levels as noise levels from dock levelers is more than noise levels from level access loading bays. Sharp Redmore in their report state anticipated noise levels of 45dB, which by WHO guidelines results in sleep disturbance. The change of the positions of the loading bays will now increase noise levels to our property especially as the unapproved extension works to the service yard have already been completed.

I am unclear from the documentation I have read which units are allocated B1 and B2 and which units are to be used for B8. I assume that Units 1 and 3 are intended to have B8 use. B8 in Unit 3 means all of these noise levels could contravene condition 3 of the decision notice and I would ask the question why cannot Unit 3 be restricted to B1 and B2 use because of the close proximity to No. 37 Bumpstead Road and also to enable it to comply with planning policy DM2. Condition 3 may seem unreasonable to a developer but it is vitally important to neighbouring residential properties, as this would give them more of a chance to enjoy the amenity of their property and live peacefully in their homes. I would also ask the question why the application to change the loadings and extend the service yard to Unit 3 was withdrawn as clearly these works have already been completed.

I can find no mention in the noise reports of anticipated external noise levels for Unit 3.

I believe the current application relating to changes to the service yard and loading bays of Unit 3 would quite clearly contravene condition 3 of the decision notice and in view of the fact that the works to extend the service yard have already been completed this would lead one to wonder whether there was ever any intention to comply with condition 3. Indeed the response from Public Health and Housing has recommended that this condition should be neither

amended nor weakened. I would add that because of the close proximity of unit 3 to my home that during construction when plant vehicles, trucks etc. are being used if I want to read or do anything indoors which requires concentration I have had to wear noise reducing headphones and it has also been quite difficult to have a telephone conversation and this is purely because of the reversing and operating noise of the vehicles, and it was possible to hear the workmen talking to each other when they have been installing the new gabion walls extending the yard to Unit 3 (without permission). The thought of having to cope with this both day and night is quite horrifying and with this in mind **I would ask that restrictions be placed on the operating hours for Unit 3** as by their own consultants admission noise levels will increase and in summer we would be unable to sleep with open windows because of noise levels or sit in or gardens. In an effort to explain the impact that Unit 3 has on us I have attached a photo of the view from our kitchen window and between the building and edge of the platform is where it is proposed that the six loading bays will operate!

Any and all operations during the day will also result in our being unable to sit in our own garden, which I believe is a **loss of amenity**. If this were a residential application DM24 would be a material consideration but as this is a commercial application I would specifically refer you to DM2 g. v. and vi.

I would mention, albeit at a very late stage, that none of the plans, so far as I have been able to ascertain, have any specific dimensions of the individual units. Square footage and volume is quoted together with reference to scales on drawings at A0 size, which is meaningless to most people. This is despite my pointing out this omission to the Planning Officer. I would question whether had the extensive size of the buildings been made clear, Unit 3 being 15 metres high and the proposed size, if the current application is approved, for Unit 1 will be 17 metres on top of an already very high platform.

If allowed the proposed changes to unit 1 would result in the building not only being clearly visible above the tree line by residential properties on Bumpstead Road but also from just about anywhere in the town. The proposals as submitted are for over 290 car parking spaces for unit 1 alone which when added to the number of parking spaces for the other units would mean a potential for some 1200 or more vehicle movements per day plus HGV traffic. This is potentially a huge increase in vehicle movements onto a B road which already suffers from queuing traffic and difficulties with lorry movements turning into narrow roads and at the mini roundabout at the junction with the A143.

Once again I would make the point that it is difficult to understand how the noise from the proposed enormous buildings will impact on the residential properties in Bumpstead Road as the figures quoted are in dB's and it is difficult for a layman to understand and have a reference point for dB levels and how they will affect their every day lives. I believe that the noise levels quoted in the latest noise assessment refer to car movements for Unit 1 as it quoted 'car park assessment', but what is the noise level in relation to HGV traffic. Once the buildings are completed it will not be nearly as possible (other than by

enforcement) to protect the amenity and ability for residents to enjoy their homes and gardens and therefore all we as residents can do is hope that for once the planning committee will consider the effects these buildings will have on everyday life of the nearby residents.



The view from the kitchen window of No. 37 Bumpstead Road

I have been in communication with Highways who merely respond that the number of parking spaces complies with the relevant planning/highway requirements. This would seem to indicate that highways are more than ready to comment if there are not enough parking spaces but not when there are too many. Would it be appropriate for a traffic management plan to be required for the development as a whole or at least in relation to HGV movements, in line with that imposed in relation to construction vehicles. This huge increase in vehicle movements will also impact on increased noise levels to residential units as those vehicles travel along Bumpstead Road either to or from the development.

One thing I would question is whether any or all of the professionals or consultant experts have actually visited the site and are aware of the layout in relation to neighbouring properties or whether their reports are merely prepared by reference to on-line maps.

I would ask the planning committee to :-

- Restrict the operating times of unit 3 to ensure we can rest in our beds at night.
- Restrict the operating times for Unit 1 for the same reasons.
- Consider imposing a traffic management plan in relation to HGV vehicle movements.
- Impose a condition that all external lighting to units 1 and 3 should be below the height of the acoustic fencing to avoid light pollution.

One final point I would repeat from my previous comments is that hardly any of these complaints and problems would have arisen if the original layout had not been changed at the request of the planning officers to facilitate a better street scene on a private road to commercial unit and therefore have no public outlook, with total disregard to the wellbeing of any of the occupiers of the adjoining residential properties. I would also like once again to point out that the residents of Bumpstead Road have always been aware that this was employment land, our objections are not in relation to the land being used as such but that the development should allow this use and ALSO enable residents to live peacefully and be able to enjoy the amenities of their homes. If the Units were in place before we moved into our properties we would be aware of the likely disruption whereas in reality our homes were built before these Units and as such I can see no reason why our rights and loss of amenities should not now be a material consideration in the development of this site.

Yours faithfully

Susan Roach (Mrs)

