

OBJECTION to planning application Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2024/0070 David Lloyd, Greystoke Avenue, Southmead, Bristol City, BS10 6AZ

From: Cllr Caroline Gooch, Bristol City Councillor for Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze Ward.

I wish to log an objection on behalf of my residents for the planning application by David Lloyd for their Spa Garden extension. This was previously submitted to Bristol City Council (BCC) and then withdrawn whilst their retrospective application for padel courts went through BCC's planning process. That application garnered a lot of objections and was called-in to committee by Cllr Kye Dudd, in whose ward the site sits. The back of the site is on the ward boundary with my ward of Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze and I am currently dealing with noise complaints from residents neighbouring the site who are being driven to distraction by loud plant noise, music and parties and a reluctance from David Lloyd club to engage with them.

I am concerned that David Lloyd used the planning inspectorate route for this application to reduce the number of objections they would receive and prevent councillors from calling it into committee. The BCC application listing merely says that 'comments cannot be made at this time' but does not redirect the public to the planning inspectorate site. I have alerted several interested parties to this, but I believe this process has succeeded in reducing the number of comments you will receive. In addition, by taking this route, the applicant has circumvented having to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which would be very useful to spend in Southmead which is an area of deprivation.

I sit on Development Committee B to which the paddle court application came, and noise was my primary concern. I asked the noise specialist at what point cumulative noise becomes a material concern. His answer was that he would be concerned about more of the same noise than the addition of a different noise which the addition of padel was.

In the case of the current application for the Spa Garden, there would be an increase in plant noise. Since November of 2023, the plant noise from David Lloyd has been especially troublesome. It is now at the level of a Significant Observed Adverse Event, in that it is present and disruptive, and arguably very disruptive in that residents of the houses on Homewood Gardens which are closest to the proposed Spa Garden are currently exposed to 44dB constant plant noise 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Sound levels on the street side of their houses, sheltered by their buildings from the plant noise are 34dB. I have measure this myself on my watch, and the householders have bought meters and measured it themselves. Furthermore, these figures are corroborated by the sound recording data submitted by David Lloyd themselves in their padel application [Ref. No: 24/00137/F Retrospective application for two padel courts, social area, and associated flood lighting]. My residents must keep their back windows always closed to be able to sleep, and even though they are modern double-glazed windows, you can still hear the plant noise. One of my residents is having to take sleeping pills to sleep through the noise. To me this fits the criteria of an Unacceptable Adverse Effect according to the Government Noise Exposure Hierarchy defined as, *"Extensive and regular changes in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response and/or an inability to mitigate effect of noise leading to psychological stress, e.g. regular sleep deprivation/awakening; loss of appetite, significant, medically definable harm, e.g. auditory and non-auditory"*.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5d39a87ce5274a4010e33fef/noise_exposure_hierarchy.pdf

I am very surprised at the noise report that has been submitted for the current application. I note that they report prevailing noise at receptor at 43-49 dB, this is in line with my own experience, but this is the noise from the plant, and yet they claim the plant noise nighttime level from the two new plants will only be 34dB. It is already 44dB!

The applicant has blocked the numbers of residents in Homewood Gardens and refuses to engage with them by email meaning they cannot have any useful discourse about the plant noise or loud music that is currently generated by the site. As their councillor I am extremely worried that their quality of life will deteriorate further with this new development so close to their properties.

I would suggest that to mitigate impact the new building ought to be up to the David Lloyd property boundary, with the plant located on the inside of the site so that the noise from plant, relaxation and social areas is screened, but the current design puts all the noise on the outside of the site around 10 metres from the nearest house at 8 Homewood Gardens. Additionally, the residents would like soundproofing of the existing and new plants. Whilst the proposed screening might have a little effect, the existing wall surrounding the site does little to stop the existing noise, so I am concerned that 2.5 m panelling will also fail to help.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Gooch

Cllr for Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze ward, Bristol City Council.