

I write, following the update to the acoustic report provided, and comments from the agent on the application to inform the planning committee further on the issues. I'm happy with the amendment in the acoustic report to confirm the location of vibration monitoring. The issues raised by the applicant's agent are the following:

Q. Can I just confirm I understand correctly - there isn't an objection to the levels of noise with windows shut, but it's when residents open their windows they would be subject to noise etc?

My objection is because applicant is using the layout of the proposed building, rather than considering good acoustic design from the outset. As highlighted in "**ProPG: Planning & Noise Professional Practice**" the site is poor. Flats will be impacted from noise on both the railway side and the roadside of the development. This means occupiers of the flats, as proposed, will not have the ability to open the windows to allow for purge ventilation without excessive noise being experienced. I have taken an extract from Pro PG that states:

High noise levels indicate that there is an increased risk that development may be refused on noise grounds. This risk may be reduced by following a good acoustic design process that is demonstrated in a detailed ADS (Acoustic Design Statement). Applicants are strongly advised to seek expert advice.

As noise levels increase, the site is likely to be less suitable from a noise perspective and any subsequent application may be refused unless a good acoustic design process is followed and is demonstrated in an ADS which confirms how the adverse impacts of noise will be mitigated and minimised, and which clearly demonstrate that a significant adverse noise impact will be avoided in the finished development.

Q. Notwithstanding the stance made in the Planning Statement and Noise Report, I would like to highlight a similar planning application APP/14/00975 which was approved. I appreciate every application is determined on its own merits, but there are similarities here, but the EH approach seems very different.

The sites are very different. After reviewing the post validation testing of App/14/00975 the key differences between the sites are the following:

- On App/14/00975 there was one noisy façade, on this application there are two noisy facades where windows face out from.
- On App/14/00975 there were several flats on each level, meaning that in some cases; some flats had some impact from the noisy facades, some flats were not facing noisy facades and some flats were orientated to improve the impact to future occupiers. In this application **all** of the flats are orientated so they have windows facing two noisy facades.
- New guidance ProPG: Planning & Noise Professional Practice Guidance on Planning & Noise May 2017, used by the sector, has informed comments made.

Q. The application involved converting an existing building to flats in a very noisy location. EH decided that the noise mitigation design could be secured via condition, can you detail why a different approach is being taken here?

The key issue is that in App/14/00975 there was the ability to consider mitigation. In the application before me, in terms of orientation and layout (having two differing sources of noise impacting two separate facades) where there are openings, makes considering further mitigation unviable.



David Fitzgerald

Environmental Protection Manager (Pollution & Animal

East Hampshire District Council

Penns Place, Petersfield GU31 4EX

Telephone: 01730 234323

Email: David.fitzgerald@easthants.gov.uk

www.easthants.gov.uk

<https://www.facebook.com/EastHampshireDistrictCouncil>

www.twitter.com/easthantsdc

Your privacy matters, go to www.easthants.gov.uk/privacy-policy



Havant Borough Council

Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre

Telephone: 01730 234323

Email: David.fitzgerald@easthants.gov.uk

www.havant.gov.uk

www.facebook.com/havantborough

www.twitter.com/havantborough

Your privacy matters, go to www.havant.gov.uk/privacy-policy