

Subject: FW: Pollution comment: PN/23/96355 Cockpit Farm Barn, Knowle Lane - Prior Approval under Class R of the General Permitted Development Order, for conversion of part of existing building to light industrial use (Class E(g)(iii)).

Rebecca

Thank you for consulting us on the above application, we have the following comments.

We have not been able to find a detailed plan showing the layout of the proposed use, particularly the location of access doors or loading / unloading areas. This makes it problematic to put the comments of the noise report fully into context.

The noise report by 24 Acoustic, ref: R10250-1 Rev 1, dated 27/9/2023, contains the results of a noise survey carried out and considers the impact of noise on the permitted residential uses forming part of the same building, PN/22/92315.

It assumes:

- Operational hours (including deliveries) of 07:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays
- a single HGV visiting the site every hour
- access doors are located in the gable end of the building
- no noise rating penalty applies

On this basis it concludes that the noise impact would be negligible.

However, as highlighted above as we have no definitive plan showing the location of the proposed access and loading area we are unable to establish if the choice of survey location and assessment assumptions are appropriate. For example, we do not know where the loading area will be, access doors or if a fork lift or similar is proposed. We would also have expected the assessment to have some noise character or feature correction given the nature of vehicle loading and unloading operations.

One other point we have is that it is not clear if the use is to be located on the same foundation slab or shares building fabric with the residential use, two plans are shown which differ in this regard. If they are to share foundations and walls etc. we would expect the noise assessment to consider structure borne noise / vibration.

We also note the comments about B1 use not being capable of giving rise to noise nuisance, experience has shown unfortunately that is not be the case, particularly where the building fabric is connected. Similarly, we require confirmation of the intensity of use proposed and operations associated with the use. As the assessments author suggests it most likely that it would be deliveries, and loading / unloading operations that are the source of noise annoyance in most circumstances.

Regarding land contamination we note the inclusion of a previous report submitted in support of a different application on this building for conversion to residential and note its recommendations. Given the different nature of this proposal would request that an addendum is provided making recommendations with reference to the proposal here. We do not though object on the grounds of land contamination.

At this time however, we are unable to support the application on the basis of uncertainty over the layout of the proposal and how it will operate.

Regards

Neil

Neil Scott

Senior Pollution Control Officer

Service Delivery - Specialist Services - Environment