

**King, Vicky**

---

**From:** David Moorse [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 October 2020 13:01  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Re: Planning application 2020/00874/RG3 proposed replacement primary school including additional nursery provision and associated works.

Dear Mrs Robinson,

Further to your most recent letter dated the 8 th of October , I have reviewed the documents on the planning application portal and can see no modifications or changes from the previous documentation/plans and therefore my comments/ objections and observations remain unchanged so please consider my letter of the 15 July to Mr Slater to encompass these.

An exception to this is that I note that there is now a noise report included, but although our property is highlighted

I cannot see any conclusion or recommendations in this report .

As noted below noise is a major loss of amenity issue for us and once again I urge that noise mitigating measures are taken.

Yours sincerely

D J Moorse

Tregwynt

St Nicholas

Sent from my iPhone

On 21 Aug 2020, at 13:21, David Moorse <[djmoorse@me.com](mailto:djmoorse@me.com)> wrote:

Dear Mr Robinson ,

Thank you for your letter dated 14 th Aug concerning the proposed school redevelopment.

Please see below my comments to Mr Slater .They remain unchanged so please consider them my objections , comments and requests concerning the above application.

Please send a mail by return confirming your receipt .

Yours sincerely

David Moorse

Tregwynt

School lane

St Nicholas

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** David Moorse [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 15 July 2020 at 15:50:26 BST  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Proposed development at St Nicholas School

Dear Mr Slater ,

My property Tregwynt borders the west boundary of the School for some 150 feet , as such with the proposed building in close proximity we are the most affected property in terms of loss of amenity due to the visual impact of the proposed building and the impact of increased activity and noise, thus my objections/ observations/ requests and questions focus in these areas.

Dealing with visual impact first , the proposed design presents as a huge bulk close to the north east corner of our property . In short it is too tall with the main roof at approx 7M

rising to 9.5 M , by contrast the highest point of the existing building ( the hall) is less than 6M . There can be no practical reason for such great height and consequent visual bulk and I request that it is substantially lowered to better fit in a rural conservation area village location.

It should not present such a high and bulky roof as to resemble a sizeable industrial unit.

Concerns over noise pollution and its detrimental effects on amenity are of great concern , to this end I re request that this forms a fundamental aspect of the design brief . I previous requested this in earlier communications.

Having researched the issue I learn that school playgrounds are frequently bounded by 3 M acoustic fencing . These can substantially reduce nuisance noise and are available in a multitude of colours and finishes to reflect the surroundings/ building design. Furthermore they are cost effective, a quote for 150 ft of the highest spec 3M fencing was less than £8000 fitted.

I request that such acoustic fencing be fitted to abut the front ( not entrance) elevation , i.e. On our side to run in front of the tank enclosure and then down the School boundary some distance beyond the playground so as to funnel the noise down the playing field.

On the matter of noise I note that the outside plant enclosure will contain air source heat pumps , my research suggests that these can be as noisy as 60 db and that good planning practice is to place them as far as possible from neighbouring properties , to this end I request that this installation is shifted to the mid point between the two neighbouring properties so as to minimise their noise impact . This would place them directly outside the internal plant room which may have some practical benefits . I note that acoustic enclosures for such heat pumps are available and frequently used to minimise disruption to neighbours and should be adopted .

Soft landscaping is an important aspect in a conservation village location both from the visual aspect but also to diminish the effects of pollution from idling diesel vehicles as they enter and exit the drop off point. Too this end I request that the hedge abutting our boundary be extended to meet the tank enclosure and that the hedge be 2.4 M tall ( approx 2M on our side) , dense evergreen and as thick as practicable , this would also help with noise absorption.

Surely from a visual aspect the two trees at the front of the School boundary should be maintained and is appears from the proposed plans that this could be achieved with little or no modification. Keeping with the frontal aspect we are concerned that the bin store would be an eyesore , the current proposal shows that it is the only area without a hedge abutting the road ? Is this an oversight? However we request that the bin store is moved to the position vacated by the plant , which is practical due to the closeness of the kitchen door. This would allow its previous position to benefit from hedging / grass area as the other entry and exit areas planned.

We very much appreciate that the entrance as planned is a short distance from our drive and would strongly object to it being moved closer .Lastly a question , what will be kept in the tanks?

To summarise;

1/ lower building/ reduce bulk

2/ place cost effective acoustic boundary around playgrounds

3/ shift potentially noisy plant to from neighbouring properties to outside

internal plant room

4/ shift bin store from front boundary position to that vacated by plant near kitchen door

5/ bolster soft landscaping wherever possible to include , extending hedge along our boundary, retaining trees at front of School and hedging/ grassing the area vacated by the bin store.

Yours sincerely

Mr D. J . Moorse

From

Sent from my iPhone