

## **Addendum proof - reference CD76 – PPA2 – Elizabethh Aldous**

Next week I will return to update my evidence in relation to roads and transport. But one point I wish to raise now is that Jane Atkins stated in her original proof of evidence A3 –(a) 9.24 “ The stage 1 Safety Audit process did not identify any significant safety issue that cannot be resolved at the detailed design stage and subsequent Stage 2 safety Audit process.” If you look at A3 –(d) which was tabled last Thursday it highlights a safety problem at Freston X-roads. I would suggest that this should have been made known to us when she submitted her original proof of evidence.

I have been listening to the evidence put forward earlier and I wish to explore the position of this inquiry in relation to the local plan. At this point in time Babergh residents have until March 1<sup>st</sup> to comment on changes to the local plan following the publication of the Inspector’s report. Freston Parish Council considered this at their last parish council meeting and have made comments on the inspector’s recommendations in respect of the housing allocation. And in particular that the Housing topic paper dated August 2004 was wrong to have included--- ‘ Former HMS Ganges 325“ as a “ deemed Commitment”

Babergh Local Plan Alteration No 2 Second Draft dated May 2003 was circulated to all parishes. The Housing Topic paper dated August 2004 was however never circulated to parish councils. Neither I nor the local District Councillors were aware that Babergh District Council had listed this site under deemed commitment. I believe that the development control committee in approving this application in June 2005 were influenced by the topic paper, which had not been disclosed to any of the objectors. At that meeting the development control committee, which comprised of District Councillors outside my locality, chose to disagree with the recommendation of their planning officer. Most people present at that meeting were unable to comprehend why the district councillors came to that decision on the evidence before them.

I would now like to consider the 404-retirement homes application. I am aware that there has been much discussion about this application but as a layperson I am confused.

This outline conditional consent for retirement homes was granted in 1986 and never proceeded with. To include this site in the category “ Deemed Commitments “ along with other sites where planning permission was almost a formality is misleading.

I therefore do not agree that any weight should be put on the new local plan when considering this application. In my opinion Babergh District Council both officers and councillors have not acted correctly in this matter and I would suggest that the Inspector should be considering this application on its own merits.

I haven’t heard any evidence yet that doesn’t accept that this development is in an unsustainable location. One point that hasn’t been mentioned is the

financial aspect of families living so far from an urban area. If you look at the working tax credit for people in work you will see that they do not take into account travel to work, shops or leisure when working out the amount paid to claimants. I suspect that this is one of the reasons why the government rightly recommend that houses are not built in unsustainable location miles from urban areas.

Elizabeth Aldous

Dated 20<sup>th</sup> February 2006