

Appendix 4: Representations from Local Residents

| Matter Raised | Response |
|--|---|
| B2 uses would be inappropriate in a residential area. | The Noise Impact Assessment and Noise Survey Report conclude that a B2 use can be incorporated on site, without material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties. The Noise & Nuisance Manager has reviewed these documents and accepts the conclusions reached. However, these conclusions are subject to the installation of an acoustic fence and adherence to a Noise Management Plan. These measures are secured via condition. |
| Noise is already an issue and this would be worsened by the proposal, harming living conditions and the quality of life of nearby residents. | The Noise Impact Assessment and Noise Survey Report conclude that the proposals would not materially harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties. The Noise & Nuisance Manager has reviewed these documents and accepts the conclusions reached. However, these conclusions are subject to the installation of an acoustic fence and adherence to a Noise Management Plan. These measures are secured via condition. |
| Noise from loading/unloading would be significantly louder, when compared with works inside the units. | Noise from unloading has been factored into the Noise Impact Assessment and Noise Survey Report. These documents conclude that neighbouring properties would not be materially impacted by the noise disturbance. However, these conclusions are subject to the installation of an acoustic fence and adherence to a Noise Management Plan. These measures are secured via condition. |
| Noise from HGVs would be harmful to living conditions. | Noise from HGVs has been factored into the Noise Impact Assessment and Noise Survey Report. These documents conclude that neighbouring properties would not be materially impacted by the noise disturbance. However, |

| | |
|--|---|
| | these conclusions are subject to the installation of an acoustic fence and adherence to a Noise Management Plan. These measures are secured via condition. |
| The acoustic barrier/fencing is not a solution. | The Noise Impact Assessment concludes that the acoustic fencing would assist in mitigating noise impacts on neighbouring properties. |
| The acoustic barrier/fencing has not been tested. | The installation of the acoustic fencing has been factored into the noise modelling undertaken. |
| Upper floors will not be protected by the acoustic fencing/barrier. | The Noise & Nuisance Manager has not raised concerns regarding this. The acoustic fence would assist in mitigating noise impacts on neighbouring properties. |
| Properties are located on a hill above the site meaning that the acoustic barrier will not be effective. | The difference in land levels between the site and neighbouring properties is not so significant to materially alter the noise modelling undertaken, which concludes that the acoustic barrier would mitigate noise impacts. The Noise & Nuisance Manager has not raised concerns regarding this. |
| There is no acoustic barrier/fencing to the east. | The Noise Impact Assessment and Noise Survey Report conclude that the living conditions of residential properties to the east can be protected, without the requirement for acoustic fencing. |
| The Noise Impact Assessment is flawed. | This document has been produced by acoustic specialists and has been reviewed by the Council's Noise & Nuisance Manager. The Noise & Nuisance Manager has not raised concerns regarding the methodology or scope of the Noise Impact Assessment. Therefore, the Noise Impact Assessment is considered to be a robust measure of likely impacts. |
| The noise testing has not considered impacts on several properties close to the site. | The noise modelling has been updated to assess impacts on the neighbouring properties to the east. |
| The noise survey is out of date. | An additional noise survey has been undertaken in 2023. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Therefore, the noise survey is not out of date. |
| The noise survey was undertaken at an inappropriate time of year. | Noise surveys were undertaken in November 2013, December 2013 and February 2023. The Council's Noise & Nuisance Manager has not raised concern regarding the time of year these surveys were undertaken. |
| The noise mitigation measures do not go far enough. | The installation of an acoustic fence and the measures included in the Noise Management Plan would ensure that noise would not materially impact the living conditions of neighbouring properties. |
| There would be no enforcement of the noise mitigation measures. | A condition is included requiring adherence to the Noise Management Plan. Any possible non-compliance with the Noise Management Plan reported to the Council's Enforcement Team would be investigated. |
| Increased light pollution would result. | A condition is included requiring details of any further external lighting, in order to ensure that inappropriate light pollution does not result. |
| The acoustic fence would result in loss of light to gardens. | The fence would be set away slightly from the boundary with neighbouring properties. This separation, together with the current presence of trees/fencing along the boundary, means that material loss of light would not occur. |
| There would be increased traffic. | The proposed changes to the operation of the units would not result in material uplifts in the level of traffic. |
| There is a lack of parking in the surrounding area. | The proposals would not result in a materially increased demand for parking. |
| There is concern regarding the speed of vehicles using surrounding roads. | The proposals would not impact the speed of vehicles on surrounding roads. |
| The movement of large vehicles would generate safety concerns. | There is no evidence to suggest that the site is unsuitable for the movement of large vehicles. The Transportation Officer has not raised concern regarding the types of vehicles that would access the site following the proposed changes to the operation of the units. |

Increased air pollution and worse air quality would result.

The proposal would not result in such an uplift in trips to the site to cause material impacts on air quality.