

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
18 September 2008 at 6:00pm**

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Part A

(open to the public including the press)

Pages

9. Amendment Sheet

See Final Amendment Sheet.

**No Page
Numbers**

AMENDMENT SHEET

Planning Committee
18 September 2008

AMENDMENTS OF CONDITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

7.1 080866 – Ruins Field, Shop Lane, East Mersea

The Highway Authority comments on the additional information submitted as follows:

“The additional information supplied regarding the projected vehicle movements do not include any delivery, service or customers vehicles or how they will be managed when at the site.

Would it be appropriate for this information to be supplied before any decision is made?”

Officer comments: *The applicant was asked to list the size, type and frequency of all vehicles visiting the site. Given the size of the enterprise it is likely the numbers quoted include any delivery, service and customer vehicles if any in fact visit the site. This is a small scale hobby farm with a limited number of vehicle movements. The proposal is for a small purpose built hatchery building in place of the make shift hatchery currently located in the barn. It is not considered this modest proposal would result in a significant increase in vehicle visiting the site.*

In view of these additional comments from the Highway Authority it is suggested the recommendation be amended to read as follows:

Defer and delegate to the Head of Environmental and Protective Services, to approve with controlling conditions as set out in the report, subject to a plan being submitted showing how vehicles visiting the site will be managed so they can enter and leave in a forward gear, turning within the site.

7.2 081107 – Fairfields, 74 Chitts Hill, Colchester

Application withdrawn by applicant

7.5 081458 – Old House, Old House Road, Great Horkesley

Since the report was written, a third letter of objection has been received from the adjacent neighbour (The Maltings) to the application site. This letter raised the following issues:

1. The latest set of plans shows the screen at 2.1m above the top step, but the report refers to a 2m high screen. What height will any condition actually seek to secure?
2. The external light on the side of the building has been left on through the night, causing intrusive light pollution to their bedroom window and courtyard area. The height of the screen must therefore address this issue and remove the light pollution nuisance that is detrimental to their health.

With regard to the height of the screen required by the proposed conditions, the condition wording states that the screen must be erected in full accordance with the details shown on the plan, i.e. 2.1m. Therefore, reference to a 2m screen in the report should now be read as 2.1m.

With regard to the light pollution issues, there are no current controls over lights at this building that can be left on 24 hours a day as far as planning controls are concerned. On this basis, the local planning authority should consider other ways of taking action if the problem persists, including those relating to statutory nuisance and with potential remedial that falls within the remit of the Environmental Control team and not planning powers. Therefore, a condition to restrict the use of the light would be unnecessary against the six tests that all conditions must pass.