



JFS

12 August 2010

62 Wilbury Drive  
Dunstable  
LU5 4TA

Application Reference 10/02493

Dear Mr Saunders

**Application Number: C3/10/02493/OUT**

**Units 4,5,6,7, 8, 9,12,13,14 and 31 Humphrys Road, Dunstable, LU5 4TP**

With reference to your letter of 27 July 2010, I wish to comment as follows:

I note that this is an application for outline planning permission and no doubt, if approved I will have the opportunity to comment on more specific and detailed applications at future stages of the development. However, I do have concerns about the proposal for redevelopment based on the detrimental effects, which I fear it will have on myself and other residents of Wilbury Drive and Ridgeway Avenue, these are:

1. The proposed erection of up to 45,057 square metres of employment floor space is almost double the previous floor space of 25,091 square metres of the current site, which constitutes a major redevelopment that will result in excessive noise during the demolition and rebuilding phase. It would be essential therefore; that the acoustic fence referred to is constructed at this stage and provisions put in place to reduce demolition dust.
2. Once the units are built, there will be a significant increase in noise and pollution from the heavy goods vehicles, which will be entering and leaving the site.

Paragraph 4.4 of the Noise Summary states

*"In order to mitigate noise emission levels to nearby housing only the component of H.G.V's entering the proposed development would use the Humphrys Road link closest to Wilbury Drive and Ridgeway Avenue (with vehicles exiting the site by an alternative route)".*

I remain extremely concerned that such a high volume of heavy goods vehicles will be using the section of Humphrys Road, which backs onto my property and despite the proposed facilities; I will not be protected from both noise and pollution with possible adverse affects on the property itself. I therefore strongly suggest, that if the Planning Committee is mindful to approve this application that it does so with the condition that the site is redeveloped in such a way (at the expense of the applicants) that H.G.V's enter and exit by this alternative route which is away from residential properties (see map). I realise that this may necessitate alteration to the existing road but feel it is nevertheless a realistic demand in view of the likely detrimental effects that such a flow of H.G.V traffic would have on the residents and properties, which back onto Humphrys Road.

If such a condition is not imposed then I wish to register an Objection to the application at its outline stage.

3. I already suffer a degree of disturbance sometimes at night from the refrigerated transportation Lorries parking on Humphrys Road at the back of my house while taking their rest periods.

I have no objection to this in principle; however the noise of the Lorries running their engines throughout the night disturbs my sleep quite severely. If we assume the redevelopment goes ahead, subject to the condition specified above, I am concerned that the redevelopment will lead to an increase in such occurrences. I would therefore suggest that double yellow lines are placed on the section of the road that backs onto residential properties and that the developer is made responsible for the adequate enforcement (i.e. wheel clamping) of the parking prohibition.

4. I note that there are a number of options for the site layout submitted with the application. Having studied these, I feel that option 3 would be the one that would have the least detrimental effect on the residents of Wilbury Drive and Ridgeway Avenue, as the car park and offices would back onto the residential properties and the impact of the heavy goods vehicles decreased somewhat by the fact that they would be further away. I am assuming that the height restrictions on the office buildings have taken into account that the residential properties should not be overlooked.
5. The conclusions of the various reports that the impact on residents of Wilbury Drive will be mitigated by the acoustic fence stands or falls by the effectiveness of such a fence. I have not been able to access details of the proposed fence. I would hope that if the Planning Committee is mindful to approve this project its members will conduct their own independent research to ensure that a high quality effective barrier is put in place rather than any less effective cheaper option that the developers may be tempted to suggest.
6. None of the material I have read seems to take into account the fact that the land on which the houses on Wilbury Drive are built is considerably lower than Humphrys Road. This fact should be taken into account in determining the height restrictions of the units to avoid any loss of privacy and detrimental visual impact on residents.
7. I am concerned about the impact of the resultant increase in traffic (to and from the site) on Poynters Road, Luton Road and Boscombe Road. Rush hour driving on these roads can be stressful and dangerous because of the volume of traffic already using these roads. The site on Boscombe Road currently being developed will add to these problems and the proposed project will result in additional traffic to these already overburdened roads.

8. While I understand the Council's wish to encourage employment opportunities in the area and would agree in principle with such a philosophy, I would ask that members of the Planning Committee do not allow this principle to detract from its duty to protect the interests of its residents who may be adversely affected. I would ask you therefore to take careful account of the possible adverse affects on the residents of Wilbury Drive and Ridgeway Avenue, in coming to a decision about this application.

Yours sincerely