

PLANNING REF : 241926
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 36 Concorde Way
:
: RG5 4NF
SUBMITTED BY : Miss Ayo Okunuga
DATE SUBMITTED : 28/12/2024

COMMENTS:

Subject: Objection to Application 241926 to Remove Condition 32 Restricting Nighttime Deliveries to Units 9 and 10

I am writing to formally object to the application to remove Condition 32, which restricts deliveries to Units 9 and 10 between 11:00 PM and 7:00 AM. I believe that retaining this condition is essential to safeguard the residential amenity of the surrounding area, including Lilly May Court and other nearby streets such as Concorde Way, where my family and I have lived for over seven years. Condition 32 was included to mitigate adverse nighttime noise impacts, as noted by the Environmental Health Officer. Removing it would have significant and detrimental consequences for the residents of this community. Below are my detailed responses to the applicant's arguments:

1. Lack of Real-World Data: The applicant's reliance on predicted noise levels based on hypothetical workflows does not reflect the potential reality once Units 9 and 10 are fully operational. Until actual delivery operations are in effect, it is impossible to accurately assess the noise and disturbance that will arise.
2. Precedent and Comparisons with Adjacent Sites: While it is true that adjacent sites do not have restrictions, there are significant differences:
 - The Noise Act 1996 defines nighttime hours as 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM, and many businesses voluntarily adhere to these guidelines to minimize community disruption.
 - Traffic data in the applicant's report (ACCON UK, Table 6) does not distinguish between HGVs and standard residential vehicle movements, leading to misleading conclusions about noise impacts.
 - Lilly May Court was constructed after the company on the adjacent site began operations, necessitating added protections for residents through Condition 32.
 - Previously, only one light industrial organisation operated with access to Viscount Way. Now, with 10 additional units designated for industrial and distribution use, the volume of industrial vehicles will increase significantly, placing a disproportionate burden on Viscount Way and ancillary roads. Granting nighttime access to Units 9 and 10 sets a dangerous precedent for other units to request similar exemptions.
3. Viability of Daytime Deliveries: The current restriction does not preclude necessary deliveries but merely limits them to reasonable hours. There is no evidence to suggest that deliveries cannot be scheduled within these hours without undue hardship to businesses.
4. Noise Levels and WHO Guidelines: The applicant claims that predicted nighttime noise levels will meet WHO guidelines, but these predictions lack transparency and are overly precise. The Noise Act 1996 sets a clear standard of no more than 34 dBA during nighttime hours, and any deviation from this should be thoroughly substantiated. Moreover, the cumulative impact of increased nighttime deliveries on residential streets like Concorde Way and Lilly May Court must be accounted for.
5. Broader Impacts on Residents: The adverse effects of unrestricted nighttime vehicle access extend beyond Lilly May Court. Heavy-duty

trucks currently cause noticeable vibrations in buildings along Viscount Way, including my home on Concorde Way. Allowing additional nighttime HGV traffic would exacerbate this issue, disrupting the peace and structural integrity of residential properties.

6. Current Disruptions from Construction Traffic: Since the construction of the new units began, residents have already faced increased disturbances, including work lorries, vans, and staff vehicles parked along Viscount Way. This has effectively turned our small residential street into a business site, further highlighting the need for strict delivery restrictions to protect our community. Conclusion: The restriction on nighttime deliveries between 11:00 PM and 7:00 AM is both necessary and reasonable. It ensures that residents including families, the elderly, and those who work irregular hours can enjoy uninterrupted rest, which is a basic human right. Removing Condition 32 would undermine the quality of life for residents, jeopardize safety, and set a harmful precedent for future applications.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the removal of Condition 32 and urge the planning authority to uphold the existing restriction in the interests of the community.