

PLANNING REF : 250703
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Highway Cottage
: Basingstoke Road, Three Mile Cross, Berkshire
: RG7 1BA
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Siobhan Dudding
DATE SUBMITTED : 14/04/2025

COMMENTS:

We write to object to the proposed variation to the proposed extension to operating hours.

Our reasons are:

- Three Mile Cross is a residential area and the site of the jetwash/garage operation is bounded by private home on all sides. Two of those sides form part of an Area of Special Character, so any further development is not compatible with the council's own designation.

- The site has already been developed significantly over the past few years with the installation of the jetwashes, air and vacuum stations, and the removal of green space to extend the carpark area right up to the boundary of our property.

- The current operating hours to 7pm each day already damage to our quality of life, therefore an extension to these hours is not acceptable.

- There are significant flaws in ES Acoustics' Noise Impact Assessment report. This means the assumptions made and conclusions drawn cannot be considered valid since they do not stand up to scrutiny. These are outlined below:

5.1.1. Noise Sources

The report is based on the consideration of just two noise sources: the jetwash facility and the plant room. It fails to take into account the more significant source of noise generated by customers before, during and after using the jetwashes: i.e. persistent and deliberate revving of engines, loud music, shouting, slamming of car doors etc.

5.4.2

"It is understood that the jet wash bays have operated since they were permitted without noise complaints." This is not true. Over the past years we have made repeated complaints about noise to both the staff and management.

Therefore, the report's argument that "this demonstrates that the mitigation measures implemented when the jet wash bays were established have been effective at controlling noise and mitigating any potential adverse effects" is not valid. Whilst mitigating measures have been taken, it is not true that there are no issues under the current operating hours.

It is not true that "receptors" (i.e. neighbours suffering from noise pollution) will have "gotten used to observing the jet wash use and that it is therefore unlikely that the extension of operating hours would cause a negative impact upon the surrounding receptors".

5.4.3

The report quotes statistics relating to noise within residential homes with typical double-glazed windows. Listed buildings (such as ours) are not permitted to have this type of window so this data is not valid. Nor does the report consider the impact of noise on neighbouring properties' gardens, and the severe restriction that this has on residents' ability to enjoy them.

In light of the above points, we strongly refute JMS Planning's claim that "the proposal will have no adverse impact on the adjoining residents".

Consequently, we request that approval not be granted.

Matthew and Siobhan Dudding