

**HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MEMORANDUM**

**From: Environmental Health**

**To: Development Services Manager**

**Our Ref: EH/LTG/ltg**

**FAO: Mrs Sally Smith**

**Your Ref: APP/14/00032**

**Ext. No: 446668**

**Date: 10 February 2014**

**Re: Berewood Phase 2 Development Site, London Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville  
Proposed Development: Reserved Matters Application for 246 residential dwellings,  
phase 2 of the Berewood development within the West of Waterlooville MDA  
development (to meet all the requirements of Condition 6, together with discharge of  
conditions 11 (noise mitigation) and 16 (Construction  
Management Plan), of Outline permissions for HBC APP/10/00828 and WCC  
10/02862/OUT).**

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

With regard to Condition 11, the screening assessment implies at paragraph 4.4 that standard thermal double glazed units in which the panes are 4mm thick, could achieve the internal noise environment targets i.e.

*Maximum noise level (predicted 15 years from completion of dwellings) in habitable rooms, with windows closed and other means of ventilation provided:*

*Daytime 35 dB  $L_{Aeq,16h}$*

*Night time 30 dB  $L_{Aeq,8h}$*

Glass is like many other materials and certain frequencies will cause sympathetic resonance if a particular frequency in the external noise coincides with the natural frequency of the glass (rather like soldiers marching over a bridge). Problems arise in double glazed units with two panes of equal thickness as both panes will resonate and the result is that there will be a dip in performance at that frequency and a dominant tone will be transmitted through. This can result in a distinct annoying hiss, particularly during wet weather. In order to overcome this problem, the two panes of glass should differ in thickness by at least 30%.

The consequence is that if standard thermal double glazed units are fitted, whilst the condition may be satisfied in terms of the noise level expressed as an  $L_{Aeq}$  there is likely to be an unpleasant distinct tone.

I would contend that the condition is intended to require the applicant to submit details of his proposed scheme to protect the dwellings from traffic noise and that whilst a target is set, it shouldn't be the only factor which the Council should consider. I do not believe the buildings could be said to be "protected from traffic noise" if a basic design flaw results in an annoying hiss, which is even worse in wet weather. For many years we have been guided by the CIEH

Environmental Control Advisory Committee's Noise Guidelines for Planning Conditions which recommended a minimum standard of 4:6-20:6 units for sites classified as falling within Noise Exposure Category B under the now superseded PPG24.

In any event, the screening assessment doesn't actually say what glazing is proposed to be fitted at the site merely commenting on the what the acoustician suggests would suit, and appears to make no mention of acoustic ventilators which would be needed for ventilation to ensure that the windows can be kept closed. It also states "...it is suggested further monitoring works are now obtained to support the assumptions made herein and to inform any noise protection scheme, if subsequently required". As a consequence the submission is insufficient to discharge condition 11 and the issue of the glazing and ventilation specification will have to wait to a later date.

Turning to the issue of the Construction Management Plan, I have viewed the CEMP Appendix A - Appropriate Site Management Practices and whilst it is quite comprehensive I note that at section 2.4 it states:

**Agreeing Noise Controls in Advance**

2.4 A Prior Consent agreement with Stoke-on-Trent City Council will be sought for any substantial or particularly noise-sensitive project. Under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 prior agreement can be reached on noise controls, which prevent the need for formal interventions, which may later be introduced without warning, with associated delays and costs. Noise problems as far as is practical will be anticipated in advance and control measures will be agreed with the local authority to prevent problems later.

Clearly the document has been "borrowed" from another development elsewhere and presumably it should relate to this borough. I would suggest that it would merely be necessary (provided I haven't missed other references to Stoke on Trent) to delete paragraph 2.4 since it is not our practice to encourage developers to seek a prior agreement under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

We have found that developers under this procedure would have to submit so much information on what they propose to do (what pieces of equipment they will use, where, when, noise levels for each, predicted noise levels at affected facades, control measures, etc) so that we would know exactly what we would be agreeing to, we run the risk of effectively permitting them to cause a nuisance. We prefer to rely on Section 60 of the Act which permits us to serve a notice on the developer requiring them to take necessary steps to reduce noise if we thought they were not taking the Best Practicable Means of minimising noise. In practice this is rarely if ever necessary.

I trust the above assists.



L.T. Glass  
Environmental Health Team Leader (Environment)