

MEMO

TO	Zoe Curran, Boyer Planning	FROM	Toby Lewis
DATE	21 November 2023	CONFIDENTIALITY	Public
SUBJECT	F/22/93194 Ageas Bowl Application - Noise comments from Senior Pollution Control Officer		

The following is a response to the comments received from Neil Scott, Senior Pollution Control Officer, dated 17 November 2023. Some of Mr Scott's comments suggest that he may not have spotted our technical note which forms the second part of Appendix E of our report. Many of his queries are addressed in that note.

Notwithstanding that, I have made comments below in response to the points that Mr Scott raises. I am content that the proposed development comprises a good acoustic design which mitigates any risks of future noise impacts or restrictions to businesses (as per the Agent of Change principle).

- 1) **Noise survey coverage and quantification of baseline sound levels.** The ambient noise survey referred to by Mr Scott was used to verify the noise modelling, rather than to seek to quantify baseline sound levels across the development site.

The primary means of qualifying the baseline was via the three-dimensional noise modelling of road traffic noise arising from the M27, which curves around the development site to the north, east and south. The predictions were based on road traffic data, provided by the transport consultant, and a 1 m resolution digital terrain model sourced from Ordnance Survey. All the buildings currently on the site were included in the baseline model, with the predictions incorporating two orders of reflection of acoustic energy.

- 2) **Pitters Commercials and the David Lloyd Carpark.** The EH comments received in March 2023 (Appendix E) acknowledged that an Agent of Change assessment for the David Lloyd Carpark and Pitters Commercials had been provided, based on contact with Pitters Commercials and appropriate calculations. Our assessment approach for these sources (of using feature corrections in combination with absolute sound level predictions) was accepted at that time and I am uncertain why it has now been challenged at this late stage.

To clarify some of the specific points now raised by Mr Scott:

- (a) As mentioned above – our assessment approach utilised elements of BS 4142 (feature corrections) combined with predictions of absolute sound levels (as per the ProPG/BS 8233) to provide a single integrated assessment. This approach follows guidance in BS 4142 which states, at sub clause 8.5:

'Where a new noise-sensitive receptor is introduced and there is extant industrial and/or commercial sound, it should be recognized that the industrial and/or commercial sound forms a component of the acoustic environment. In such circumstances other guidance and criteria in addition to or alternative to this standard can also inform the appropriateness of both introducing a new noise-sensitive receptor and the extent of required noise mitigation'.

- (b) The feature correction penalty adopted for Pitters Commercial was +6 dB. To clarify; this value was selected based on discussions with Pitters Commercial and WSP experience of monitoring similar premises. It is relatively precautionary given that it aligns with 'highly perceptible' tonality or 'clearly perceptible' impulsivity.
 - (c) The operating hours for Pitters Commercial used in the modelling and assessment are 06:00 – 20:00.
 - (d) Notwithstanding our position that the hybrid assessment approach adopted within our report is appropriate; a BS 4142 assessment for Pitters Commercial has been provided in the technical note presented in Appendix E of our report.
 - (e) The assumed turn-over of vehicles in the David Lloyd Carpark was for 100% of the parking spaces during the day and 50% of the parking spaces during the night-time, with a sound level associated with a slammed car door attributed to each and every event. The point sources adopted in the model can be seen as red crosses in the model plots presented at Appendix I of our report.
- 3) **The Ageas Bowl.** Mr Scott suggests that there is no information to show how representative the 'one hundred' event was of typical use of the Bowl. Indeed the 'one hundred' events are not typical but represent the busiest and noisiest sporting events held at the venue and, as such are representative of a worst-case sporting event suitable to underpin a precautionary assessment. It is recognised that the noise character of these events is varied and for that reason a feature correction of +4 dB has been incorporated into the associated noise predictions.

As described in Section 2 of our Technical Note (Appendix E of our report), entertainment noise from the Ageas Bowl only occurs occasionally and in accordance with the premises licence. Based on our discussions with Ian McGuinness (Senior Licensing Officer at Southampton and Eastleigh Licensing Partnership) the proposed development would not lead to any tightening of the current licensing restrictions at the Ageas Bowl.

It is accepted that there will be noise emissions from activities ancillary to the operation of Ageas Bowl but the sound levels from these are likely to have included in the surveys and significant impacts from such activities is considered unlikely (given the proximity of established receptors). Nonetheless, the development is designed in such a way that the closest proposed blocks will provide screening to the remainder of the development and the exposed facades have improved glazing and ventilation. Under these circumstances, the development layout is a good acoustic design which will minimise any potential noise impacts and negate any unacceptable risk of noise complaints.

I am, naturally, happy to discuss this directly with Mr Scott if that would be helpful.