

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/21/03814	Your Ref:	APP/21/00601
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6666	Date:	09 November 2021
DC Case Officer:	David Eaves		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6549		
Application Number:	APP/21/00601		
Site Address:	Land adjacent to Bosmere Medical Centre, Solent Road, Havant		
Proposed Development:	Proposed Portsmouth Water Headquarters building (Use Class E(g)(i) use) and new employment premises (Use Class B2.B8/E(g)(iii) use); widened access onto Solent Road; and associated access, car parking, landscaping and works; including the felling of 7No. trees the subject of TPO No.1801 in order to improve the access and allow for the development. RECONSULTATION REQUEST for revised plans and/or documents received		

Observations / Comments:

I refer to the above application under the Town & Country Planning Acts passed to this Service for comment.

I have read the documentation provided by the applicant, and can comment as follows:

Having read the acoustic report provided I can advise the following:

The day / night background noise levels are taken at one monitoring point only, adjacent the ex. medical centre, over a 24 hour period on a week day. It is possible the existing noise environment has been inadequately characterised. We would expect probably a week's worth of monitoring to be carried out including over a weekend to capture potentially lower noise levels.

The monitoring that was carried out, was at a position not far from Solent Road. The noise predictions and impact assessment are based on these noise levels. Noise levels at nearby noise sensitive receptors are likely to be lower, and for this reason further noise monitoring is required. Being relatively close to the road means that the noise levels are likely to be inflated which may potentially underestimate the impact when carrying out a BS4142 assessment. Also the shielding provided by the proposed units may serve to decrease the background sound level even further and any localised industrial noise could in theory have an even greater impact. I would request clarity on actual ex. BG levels at the two points adjacent nearest residential receptors, as it is suggested that any new additional fixed plant items, for future tenants of the industrial units and or the office tenants, should not exceed the measured typical background noise levels, which is based on those at the monitoring point mentioned above.

I cannot see that any consideration has been given to what the cumulative noise impact would be from all noise sources including the proposed development. It may be that receptors are

already exposed to a poor noise environment which obviously should not be made worse.

There has been no assessment of potential mobile operational activity at the proposed site (other than for HGV movement) including from lorry, fork lift truck and passenger car movements, including impact noises from closing/opening car doors, refrigeration plant of lorries, engine start-up and idling. The report has used British Standard 8233 to assess the impact of HGV movements and in turn underestimates the potential impact. BS8233 should be used for continuous anonymous noise sources which these are not. BS4142:2014 should be used to demonstrate the impact and this is confirmed in the standard itself. The typical and worst case scenarios should be considered and where mitigation measures are required these should be clearly stated and supported by calculations. Equally the prediction of noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive facades should be supported by calculations and included in the report. Special consideration needs to be given to any potential low frequency noise sources as BS4142 may underestimate its impact.

The report compares the predicted noise level from plant to be located on the roof of the Portsmouth water office block against BS8233. As referred to earlier, I believe this is the wrong standard to use and could underestimate the potential impact. However, a BS4142 assessment has been carried out with the predicted noise level compared against the reported and existing daytime background sound level of 58 dB LA90,16hours. As advised prior, we believe that this reported figure may possibly be inaccurate, thereby potentially underestimating the impact. The noise levels as measured, could also potentially be lower once the 4 industrial units are built which could in fact lower the background sound level at noise sensitive receptors at Brockhampton Road especially. Again, the impact may have been underestimated because of this.

The BS4142 calculation does not take into account any low frequency noise which is sometimes problematic with fixed plant. No consideration has been given to the potential impact of plant at night, as it is assumed the office block will be closed at this time; if this is to be the case then perhaps it ought to be conditioned as such. Again we require all of the calculations in the report including reporting of octave / 1/3 octave band levels.

This application includes for B2 use. This can be problematic because in theory any noise from any type of industry can be controlled by essentially sticking it in a sound proofed box. The question is, is whether the mitigation required would be practicable and achievable. It may require that all apertures remain closed, have alternative means of ventilation and if necessary, exhaust ventilation for dust and/or odour. However this will be dealt with when the necessary acoustic reports are submitted, if required.

It is also questionable whether this site could be operated 24-hours day without having any impact on neighbours, albeit it is stated that the assessment demonstrates that the construction and operation of the proposed units will not create noise impacts at adjacent residential receptors.

I would therefore recommend refusal at this time.

As we also have no indication at this time of the final uses of the proposed industrial units, which can include 24/7 working, fixed plant including air moving plant (located internally or externally & also where i.e rear, front or roof?) and the potential use of fork lift trucks, metal cages, external or internal loading / off-loading of HGV's, vans and the like, associated impact noises, reversing alarms and so forth. This would need an additional condition to be imposed to cover this and any additional plant to be associated for the office tenants:

A likely condition in this regard as below:

Condition 1: Noise from plant and equipment & operational noise

Each industrial unit and office tenants, shall provide an acoustic assessment to show that the rating level of any plant, equipment & / or operational noise, as part of their unit, will be at least 5 dB below the existing background levels, which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment must be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant / engineer and be in accordance with BS4142: 2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound. Background levels shall be established at nearest residential receptors.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

External Lighting:

It would appear from the submitted lighting assessment, that there should be limited, if any, impact on neighbouring properties. However if complaints should arise after completion, as a result of light spill impacting on residents enjoying the amenities of their properties, this will be investigated under the relevant nuisance legislation, & the developer may thereafter be required to carry out any remedial measures to mitigate said impact. It is also considered that the lighting to be provided can potentially be on throughout the hour of darkness if a 24 hour operation at any of the units.

The Construction Environmental Management Plan:

The following should be added to the current CEMP and should be in operation for all phases of the development i.e. demolition, excavation, clearance and construction:

- a. no works or ancillary operations associated with the above phases at the development, which are audible at the site boundary, shall take place on any Sunday or Bank / Public Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times: Monday to Friday: 8.00 – 18.00 and Saturday: 8:00 – 13.00;
- b. Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above.
- c. No bonfires to take place on this site, during any phase of the operation;
- d. Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants. It should advise as to what measures are to be put in place for the control of any dust that might emanate from the development site. Furthermore the methods of dust control should be in accordance with the guidance as laid out in the BRE Report 456 - Control of Dust from Construction and Demolition activities.
It should also be noted that besides the keeping of haul roads damp during dry weather conditions, any areas where tracked excavators, dozers and the like are working, are also be kept damp at all times.;
- e. Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours.
- f. Details of measures to be employed to control the emission of noise during the above phases to be provided. BS5228:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise, and Part 2: Vibration (BSI, 2014v) provide guidance on the requirements and indicative noise and vibration levels and criteria;
- g. If any piling is envisaged for this site, full details must be submitted to this office, with regard to the proposed method/s to be employed, and the probable duration of these operations;
- h. Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes to ensure no impact on neighbouring properties.
- i. Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss any of the above matters raised or would like further explanation.

The above comments shall in no way prejudice any response / comments that may be or have been, submitted by Jonathan Driver, Environmental Control officer, Environmental Health.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Moss', with a large, stylized initial 'M' and a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Mark Moss
Regulatory Officer
Environmental Health