

Planning Application Reference: APP/26/00607

Description: Discharge of Conditions 20, 27 & 33 of Planning Application APP/24/00405 relating to (20) Pollution Management and Mitigation Plan, (27) Noise and Vibration Monitoring, (33) Details of Works Area/Compounds.

Location: Bedhampton Pumping Station

Condition 27

The Future Water document entitled 'Havant Thicket Reservoir | Noise and Vibration Management Plan | Main Pipeline Works – Phase 1 (Bedhampton) | Rev P04 | Document Reference: HTR-RHD-PS-BP-RP-Z-0003' (dated 20th August 2026) has been reviewed.

The plan identifies appropriate noise thresholds at sensitive receptors in accordance with the ABC method detailed in BS5228:2009 and applies category A thresholds (65dB(A) LAeq, T).

Noise modelling was carried out based upon plant and equipment to be used at this phase of the development, and the implementation of proposed noise mitigation measures was also factored to determine predicted noise levels at sensitive receptors. The proposed noise mitigation measures are comprehensive and broadly align with Best Practicable Means.

The noise model results indicate that the noise threshold is not expected to be exceeded at any noise sensitive receptors. The report then effectively scopes out many of the specific requirements of the condition on this basis.

Similarly, vibration monitoring requirements are effectively scoped out on the basis that vibration thresholds would not be exceeded beyond 18m, and works are expected to be conducted approximately 30m from the nearest receptor.

Whilst the rationale that the more onerous elements of the condition can be scoped out based on modelling indicating that thresholds would not be exceeded is understandable, there are concerns that the plan includes very little contingency in the event that noise or vibration levels exceed model outputs.

As such, the plan is generally considered acceptable to ensure that noise and vibration are effectively managed during this phase of the development providing the noise mitigation measures are implemented and daily noise monitoring detailed in section 7.1.1 is carried out.

However, it is requested that a revised plan is submitted to satisfy element iii) of the noise and vibration monitoring elements of the condition "*Implementation of*

appropriate mitigation actions in the event of any exceedances (e.g. dynamic adjustments to working methods)".

This should include how exceedances will be investigated, what mitigation measures may be deployed, and how working methods will be adjusted where required.

Condition 33

The Future Water document entitled Havant Thicket Reservoir | Site Compound Plan Main Pipeline Works – Phase 1 (Bedhampton) | P03 | Document Reference: HTR-FUW-ZZ-BP-PL-T-1586 (dated 20/08/26) has been reviewed.

I am satisfied that the submitted information broadly meets the requirements of the condition; however, the following elements require clarification.

It is noted that Section 3.1 includes the following statement:

"...potential impacts are only considered for works that last more than 40 days in a 6-month period or 10 days in a 15-day period, as detailed in Table 1 and Section 6 of the NVMP. This is in line with guidance provided in Annex E of BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 'Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites' – Part 1: Noise."

The durations referenced are relevant to eligibility criteria for consideration of provision of noise insulation or temporary rehousing and are detailed under annex E.4 of the guidance.

The application of the duration criteria and its relationship to significance is unclear and appears inconsistent with the broader judgement-based approach set out within Annex E.

The ABC method thresholds are indicative of significant effect, however other project-specific factors, such as the number of receptors affected and the duration and character of the impact must be considered to determine significant effect.

The automatic adoption of noise durations from annex E.4 does not include consideration of project specific factors, and the guidance does not dismiss exceedances of ABC thresholds over shorter periods as not introducing potential of significant effects.

Section 3.1 states that the mobilisation and demobilisation works are not expected to result in significant adverse noise impacts as they do not exceed the duration criteria referenced within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan. The basis for this conclusion is unclear.

Clarification is requested as to whether noise levels associated with these activities are expected to exceed the identified construction noise threshold of 65dB(A) LAeq,T at

nearby residential receptors. If exceedance of the threshold is anticipated, justification should be provided demonstrating why significant adverse effects would not arise, having regard to the duration, nature and character of the works and other relevant project-specific factors.

The plan also states that noise from the generator is not expected to result in adverse noise impacts to nearby residents; however, no technical evidence or noise data has been provided within the report to support this conclusion. Whilst qualitative information has been provided regarding the acoustic enclosure and low-noise design of the generator, the submission does not include source noise data, predicted receptor noise levels, or any assessment demonstrating the likely impact at nearby residential receptors.

It is therefore requested that the applicant provides further information to include:

- generator noise data,
- background noise (LA90) levels at the nearest receptors, and
- an assessment of the likely generator noise impact at the nearest noise-sensitive receptors, including the noise rating level of the generator and justification of the assessment methodology adopted.

Subject to clarification of the above matters, I am otherwise satisfied that the submitted information broadly meets the requirements of Condition 33.

Kind regards,

Craig Milligan

Environmental Health Officer