

AnnS Jones

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 17 June 2016 13:19
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: Total Fitness

Public Protection response – P/2016/0473

From: Nick Minshall
Sent: 17 June 2016 10:38
To: Matthew Phillips
Subject: RE: Total Fitness

Hello Matthew

I confirm that the EP Section doesn't object to the proposal on the grounds of noise or light from headlights.

I would agree with you that the proposed fence should provide a degree of noise attenuation.

Regards Nick

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 17 June 2016 08:54
To: Nick Minshall
Subject: Total Fitness

Nick,

Further to your comments on the above application, we did impose a condition requiring a scheme of boundary treatment. The scheme is shown on the attached. Essentially there are two sections of new/replacement 1.8m high timber fence to replace/supplement the weakest sections of the existing boundary with new sections of 1.8m high timber fence. This is supplemented by the retention of some existing planting as well as some new planting.

All of the gardens are on higher ground than the parking spaces, although the differences are not as great to the rear of the properties shown as no.12 and 14 on the plan (nos 12 and 14 St James Close). The proposed fence is a standard 1.8m timber fence rather than an acoustic fence, however given the nature of the development, i.e. car parking spaces rather, I consider the proposals should provide a degree of noise attenuation in conjunction with existing ground level differences. I don't think a full specification acoustic fence would be necessary in this instance – clearly circumstances would be different if the properties backed onto a new road or onto a railway line.

Can you have a quick look at let me know what you think?

Regards

Matthew Phillips
Planning Officer/Swyddog Cynllunio
Environment and Planning/Amgylchedd a Chynllunio
Wrexham County Borough Council/Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrecsam
Telephone/Ffôn: 01978 298780

From: Nick Minshall
Sent: 14 March 2016 15:12
To: Matthew Phillips
Subject: RE: P/2016/0141 - Total Fitness

Hello Matthew

I can confirm that the EP Section would not object to the application for additional parking spaces on the grounds of noise or light from headlights.

Regards Nick

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 14 March 2016 12:10
To: Nick Minshall
Subject: P/2016/0141 - Total Fitness

Nick,

It looks like Public Protection haven't been consulted about this one – it is an application for some additional parking spaces at Total Fitness. A copy of the site plan is attached – the proposed spaces highlighted in yellow.

The spaces 17-70 will be closer to the boundaries of adjoining dwellings than existing spaces. Spaces 24-70 are accessed off an existing service road/yard that is currently used informally for parking.

We have had some objections about amenity from some nearby occupiers about noise. I accept that the proposals would allow the existing service road/yard to be used more intensively than at present, particularly on Monday and Tuesday evenings when parking surveys submitted in respect of a planning application for houses at the northern end of the car park (P/2015/0812) indicates demand for parking is highest. However spaces 17-30 are not significantly closer to properties in Mayville Avenue than the existing car park and internal access roads, so the impact upon those properties is unlikely to be significant in terms of noise. Exis

The ground level of dwellings in St James Court immediately to the east is approximately 1.5m higher than the site and most have boundary fences, although not all provides an adequate screen. The ground level of dwellings 54-58 Spring Gardens to the south-west is closer to the car park and their gardens are enclosed by fences.

In terms of noise, would you agree that existing ground levels supplemented by some enhanced boundary treatment where necessary would be sufficient to ensure that vehicle noise doesn't significantly impact upon amenity?

One other concern that has been raised is lights shining into properties, however existing boundary treatment coupled to some additional landscaping/boundary treatment where necessary would, in my opinion, be sufficient.

I'd be grateful for your comments.

Regards

Matthew