

Wiltshire Council

Chippenham Area Board

10 September 2013

Item 8 – Chippenham Skate Park Task Group Report

Charles Pitt, Chippenham Resident

Question 7

The sound reports produced by Mach and Hoare Lee, relied heavily on the exact positioning, dimensions and plan of the surface of the proposed skatepark, to enable the production of an accurate forecast, of the likely sound levels received in the gardens of the properties adjoining the Park but the Task Group has denied the existence of any plans or dimensions, for the proposal, saying that "those issues will be a matters for the planning stage" and indeed further to that, their Chairman Mr Hutton, at the town meeting, took issue with a leaflet that published, the location, the dimensions and the suggested mitigation of the proposals, describing the information as a "Fabrication" by the authors, and that charge was taken up by supporters of the proposals. on websites and in a broadcast on BBC radio.

There is a plan with the dimensions and the sizes of the suggested mitigation published, on page 17 of the Mach report, which was the one used in the leaflet, so clearly not a fabrication.

Is the plan and the mitigation in the Mach report the one used for the purpose of sound reports ? because if it is not then calculations in the reports are incorrect. ,

As the Mach report concludes on page 18 that, the noise from the skatepark, without mitigation, will exceed acceptable levels at number 8 Sadlers Mead and there is no built in safety margins in the reports, to allow for other variables, not taken into account, in what was mostly a paperwork exercise, reliant on data collected from sites that are different in topography, surroundings and nature, add to that the amount of rewrites by the author's of the reports, how can anybody have confidence, in the report's forecasts of the likely noise nuisance.

Therefore are the Council taking an enormous risk with the future of Monkton Park, the residents right to enjoy their homes and the Tax Payer's money, particularly in view of the previous experience with the site and the fact that they cannot specify exactly the dimensions of the proposal, it's exact positioning, or even produce an illustration of what it might look like.

Response

The indicative size and position of the provision shown in Figure 15, Page 17 of the Mach report (page 122 of the Committee report) is as given to both the acoustic consultants, for modelling purposes. Also supplied were cross sections of the

topography obtained by the Council, again for modelling purposes and reproduced in the Hoare Lea report as figure 1(A) (page 146 of the Committee report).