

Already Ack'd with Prev

'0' CH.

[Redacted]

Sent: 02 September 2010 15:32
To: Planning
Subject: S6/2010/1711/FP
Attachments: viaduct car park2.docx

3 SEP 2010



viaduct car
ark2.docx (18 KB)

Hi there - I sent in an objection to the above application earlier this week and have noticed that now it appears on line it seems to have somehow got corrupted in transmission.

As per my tel con with you just a few minutes ago, I am attaching a hard copy of my comments in a Word document and hopefully you can replace the one you have posted on line with this one so that my comments can be easily understood.

Thanks in advance, [Redacted]

The patch of land behind the flats in Park Close is divided in two by a boundary fence to separate the Estate cottages from the Park Close flats. It is a beautifully quiet, tranquil and naturally matured area comprising communal gardens on the side of the flats and private gardens for the cottages on the Estate side. Within this design the residents of flats and cottages on the Estate alike enjoy a tranquil respite from the day to day hubbub when at home, particularly in the areas of accommodation facing on to the patch of land in question. In fact visitors to the flats often comment on how peaceful and lovely it is.

The potential noise, vibrations and pollution however caused by a car park to the side, and a road through the middle of this area would surely impact on the natural quietness of the gardens and accommodation on both sides of the fence – as well as the wider community of Park Close. Of particular concern is the close proximity to the flats of the proposed residents parking bays on the new access road. The associated noise and vibration of cars manoeuvring, engines starting and doors banging as well as the proposed gravel finish both on the access road and car park area would both undoubtedly be a noise nuisance.

The applicants supporting document states council planning policy regarding noise as:

Policy R19 - Noise and Vibration Control seeks to ensure that new development with a potential for causing noise nuisance is sited away from noise sensitive land uses.

And addresses it at paragraph 6.34, but does not acknowledge the noise and vibrations caused to Park Close by the proposed Viaduct car park and new access road – it simply refers to the Georges Gate car park

Similarly, the Sustainability Check list – Appendix 6 – states:

(b) IMPACT AND FUTURE USE OF THE DEVELOPMENT How will the development satisfy the following criteria? Minimisation of Pollution 1 Minimise noise, e.g. building design, use of quieter technology, operating hours and traffic reduction (A,B,D,E,F).

This is addressed as follows. Complies – moves existing visitor traffic to a less congested access away from Station Lodge opposite Hatfield Station. Route for visitor vehicles from George's Gate avoids close proximity of cars to St Audrey's care home.

The focus here is again on the Georges car park and also addresses the reduction of traffic at Station Lodge, but no mention of the noise nuisance the Viaduct car park will cause Park Close. It concerns me that proper consideration has not been given to the effect of this car park on Park Close as the flats, in particular, are certainly in a much closer proximity to the area in question than Georges car park/St Audrey's care home.

The Park Close flats are set at a much lower level than the estate cottages and as such the bedrooms are at the same level as the proposed access road. Residents sleeping in the rear bedrooms currently enjoy peace and tranquillity in these rooms because of the quietness of the area, as well as the pleasure of sitting in the communal gardens on summer days/evenings. This proposal would impact on the quality of rest at night and relaxation in the day because of the extremely close proximity of vehicles and associated noises.

The details in the support documentation regarding the proposed Viaduct car park are very sparse – we would have a more complete picture if the following were known:

- Days/hours is the Viaduct car park is intended to be in use.
- Traffic flows, capacity predictions and growth requirements.
- Would emergency, utility, delivery and the like vehicles also be accessing Park Cottages 1-4 via the proposed new access road?
- There appears to be a gate at the end of the proposed new access road on the plans – if this is the case will traffic from sources others than Park Cottages 1-4 be using the road?
- Is the ground for the proposed access road sturdy enough to take traffic, bearing in mind it is at the top of a very steep slope.

Whilst I appreciate the need for the estate to improve their traffic flow and parking arrangements, I feel that this proposed Viaduct solution would seriously impact upon the residents of Park Close, Hill House and the estate cottages.