

Osmond, Gary

From: Pires, Andre
Sent: 03 September 2026 16:48
To: Osmond, Gary
Subject: RE: [F/26/100809] The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews, Kenilworth Gardens, Southampton, SO30 3RE - noise response

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good afternoon Gary,

Thank you for your email

I reviewed Clarke Saunders updated acoustic assessment dated 22 June 2026 reference AS14071,260508,R1 that aims to respond to my initial comments included in the below email chain.

The report proposes extending the existing 4.2-metre-high brick wall around the eastern part of the site, thereby providing a physical separation between the development site and the existing yard.

The report also presents the findings of a noise survey, including attended noise measurements undertaken during the operation of Pitter Commercials Limited and activities associated with the washing station.

The report presents the results of a BS 4142 assessment relating to noise arising from the operation of the yard. The assessment predicts a rating level of up to 3 dB above the background sound level during the early morning hours, increasing to 5 dB above background when the vehicle washing area is in operation.

According to the report, the vehicle washing area operates approximately three times per day, with each washing period lasting around 30 minutes.

These predicted noise levels take into account the proposed extension of the existing 4.2-metre-high brick wall, as shown in Figure AS14071/SP1 on page 24 of the report.

Additionally, the report recommends the use of a mechanical ventilation system with cooling capabilities to all dwellings.

The report states that noise associated with the neighbouring car park serving the Utilita Bowl venue would be discernible throughout the site. It provides calculations and supporting commentary to demonstrate that the potential impact from this source would be acceptable.

The report also considers event-related noise associated with the Utilita Bowl, including noise arising from both sporting and music events, and concludes that the associated risk of noise disturbance would be acceptable.

I accept the assessment and the rationale presented in relation to music and event noise. However, I have the following comments:

- The first point relates to the proposed 4.2-metre-high brick wall. I accept that the wall is likely to provide significant noise mitigation and would reduce the noise impact

associated with the yard, including the vehicle washing area. However, the proposed wall would surround a number of garden areas and, at 4.2 metres in height, would be comparable to the height of first-floor bedroom windows.

While the wall may provide an effective means of mitigating noise, its height and extent could have a significant impact on residential amenity, including access to sunlight and daylight, outlook, visual impact and the overall character of the garden areas. I appreciate that these matters fall outside my specific area of expertise; however, they are important considerations when assessing the suitability of the proposed mitigation. In my view, these wider amenity considerations should be given at least equal, and potentially greater, weight than the noise benefits provided by the proposed wall.

- The most significant concern relates to the operation, location and unrestricted use of the vehicle washing area. The information provided indicates that the washing area is currently used approximately three times per day, for around 30 minutes on each occasion. However, there does not appear to be any restriction on the duration, frequency or hours of operation of this activity, nor on the number of vehicles that could be washed.

Consequently, although the noise assessment is based on the current stated pattern of use, Pitter Commercials Limited could potentially increase the frequency or duration of washing activities in the future, including operating the washing area during more sensitive periods such as late evening or night-time hours.

This is particularly important in the context of the Agent of Change principle. Once the proposed residential development is occupied, if noise complaints subsequently arise from the operation of the vehicle washing area, the absence of appropriate restrictions at this stage could limit the ability of the Local Planning Authority to require changes to the established operation of Pitter Commercials Limited.

- Regarding the car park associated with the Utilita Bowl, the consultant clearly acknowledges that noise from the car park would be discernible throughout the proposed development and concludes that the level of impact would be comparable to that experienced by existing properties surrounding the site. While this may be technically correct, I do not consider that this provides an ideal starting point when assessing the suitability of the proposed development, particularly given the existing relationship between the car park and the proposed residential properties.

Additionally, the report's statement that the car park is primarily used during daytime periods does not fully reflect its pattern of use. The car park is also utilised following late-night events at the Utilita Bowl, when significant numbers of vehicles may leave the site at the conclusion of sporting or music events. Consequently, noise associated with vehicle movements, door slamming, engine noise and general activity within the car park can occur during more sensitive evening and night-time periods.

I do not consider this to be the most critical issue with the proposal; however, it is an important consideration when assessing the potential for future disturbance, particularly given that the proposed dwellings would be introduced into an environment where this existing activity is already established.

From a technical noise perspective, the report presents a group of mitigation solutions that demonstrates that the relevant noise criteria can be achieved. However, this appears to come at a significant cost to the general residential amenity, particularly given the scale and height of the proposed acoustic wall.

Furthermore, the assessment is based on the current pattern of operation, which could change in the future. As there do not appear to be restrictions securing the current frequency, duration or hours of operation, there is a risk that the actual noise impact could increase once the development is occupied, without an effective mechanism to control or enforce the existing level of activity.

Therefore, while the proposed mitigation may demonstrate technical compliance with the noise criteria, there remain concerns regarding its long-term robustness and the wider impact on residential amenity.

The consultant considers that the existing 4.2-metre-high brick wall provides an effective mitigation measure, based in part on the observation that properties benefiting from the existing wall have not generated noise complaints, whereas properties located further from the yard, and therefore not afforded the same screening, have generated complaints associated with the operation of the yard.

While this provides some indication that the existing wall may be contributing to the mitigation of noise, I do not consider that the absence of complaints can, in isolation, be relied upon as evidence that the wall provides an adequate or definitive mitigation solution. Individual responses to noise can vary significantly, with some residents being more sensitive to particular noise sources or more likely to report disturbances than others.

Therefore, the relationship between the presence of the existing wall and the absence of complaints should be treated with some caution. The lack of complaints does not necessarily demonstrate that noise levels are acceptable or that the wall alone is responsible for the difference in reported disturbance. In my view, greater weight should be given to the objective noise assessment and the predicted impacts of the proposed development, rather than relying primarily on the historical absence of complaints.

For these reasons, I continue to consider the proposed development to present a relatively high risk in terms of future noise impacts and potential noise nuisance. While the current assessment demonstrates that the proposed mitigation can achieve the relevant noise criteria based on the existing pattern of operation, there appears to be limited control over how, when and for how long Pitter Commercials Limited can operate the vehicle washing area or any other areas and activities.

Consequently, should noise complaints arise following occupation of the development, it may be difficult for the Local Planning Authority to require changes to the existing operation, including restrictions on its hours, duration or location, where no such controls currently exist. This presents a significant long-term risk, particularly in the context of the Agent of Change principle.

Thank you

Andre

Andre Pires

Pollution Control Manager

Planning & Environment - Pollution

Ext.: 8812

Mobile: 07795985497

From: Pires, Andre <Andre.Pires@eastleigh.gov.uk>

Sent: 05 February 2026 13:52

To: Osmond, Gary <Gary.Osmond@eastleigh.gov.uk>

Cc: Panza, Yacklin <Yacklin.Panza@eastleigh.gov.uk>

Subject: [F/26/100809] The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews, Kenilworth Gardens, Southampton, SO30 3RE

Good afternoon Gary,

Thanks for consulting the Pollution Team on the planning application reference F/26/100809 for the construction of 8No. detached dwellings with associated amenity space, parking and landscaping at The Orchard, 5 Westgate Mews, Kenilworth Gardens, Southampton, SO30 3RE.

We have reviewed the following documents:

- DWM Architects (31/10/2025). Site and location plan. Drawing No. PL02
- Forge Environmental Management Ltd (May 2025). 5 Westgate Mews, Kenilworth Gardens, West End, Hampshire, SO30 3RE. Desk Study Report. Reference ORC460.S/DS/001
- Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, Impact Acoustics Ltd reference IMP7860-2 December 2025

Please see our comments below:

Contaminated land

The provided report comprises a desk-based review of the site conditions, including historical map review, geology, hydrogeology, hydrology, radon, unexploded ordnance, historical landfills and the findings of infiltration testing exercise undertaken on 26/03/2024. Please see key points noted below:

- The report indicates that the proposed development comprises a total of No. 4 dwellings, but the proposed site plan shows a total of No. 8 dwellings. This is a minor mistake and won't affect the findings of the report as the information presented from the Groundsure report included the entire site boundary.
- The bedrock geology of the site comprises Marsh Farm Formation (sandy clays), classed as Secondary A Aquifer.
- The borehole logs from the infiltration testing indicates that ground conditions comprise topsoil over sands with different cohesive material proportions from Marsh Farm Formation.
- The site is located in an area <1% homes are above the action level for radon (report mistakenly said >1%). Therefore, no protection measures are required for radon.
- The historical map review suggests that the site has not been developed previously and formed part of garden to 5 Westgate Mews; however, the consultant indicate that made ground could not be discounted as potential source of contamination on site.
- The historical maps review also identified some features within 250m from site boundary such as unspecified depot, tanks, electricity substations and garage. These features were not considered potential sources of contamination in the Conceptual Site Model as no viable pathway was identified. I partially agree with this statement; however, the depot is located immediately next to the northeast boundary, and it could have introduced some contamination to the site.
- The preliminary risk assessment indicates that the risk from made ground on site to future occupiers, buildings and controlled waters is low.
- The consultant recommends that a watching brief for unexpected contamination should be in place during earthworks.

In summary, I generally agree with the findings of the report and, although I would have considered the depot located to the northeast of the site as an off-site source of contamination, I consider a watching brief during ground works would be appropriate to

identify any potential contamination as a result of this feature. Therefore, I recommend that the application is approved subject to the following condition:

Watching brief

In the event that any evidence of potential contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified in the approved Phase 2 report, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must then be undertaken in accordance with a methodology previously approved by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of the measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the immediately above condition.

Reason: To ensure that the development is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources.

Additionally, for protection of neighbouring dwellings, we advise the applicant to prepare and submit a Construction and Environmental Management Plan for approval prior to commencement of works, as per condition below:

CEMP

No construction or site preparation works involving excavation shall start until a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Preparation and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved CEMP which shall include:

- a) the location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material and plant storage areas used during construction;
- b) the arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works, loading/ unloading of plant & materials and restoration of any damage to the highway [including vehicle crossovers and grass verges].
- c) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- d) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt generated by construction;
- e) a scheme for controlling noise and vibration from construction activities (to include piling);
- f) provision for storage, collection, and disposal of waste from the development during construction period, including reuse and disposal of excavated soils;
- g) measures to prevent mud and dust on the highway during demolition and construction;
- h) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- i) temporary lighting;
- j) protection of pedestrian routes during construction;
- k) temporary surface water drainage provisions; and
- l) hours of working

Reason: To limit the impact the development has on the amenity of the locality.

Noise

The site is adjacent to a commercial yard (Pitter Commercials Limited operating Monday to Friday 6am – 9pm. Saturday 6am – 2pm) to the east and northeast, to the Utilita Bowl and in close proximity to the M27. There are already existing houses directly adjacent to Pitter Commercials Limited but not to the open-air yard (only 2 and where there is a 5m height fence/wall in place).

I reviewed the Noise Report from Impact acoustics reference IMP7860-2 dated December 2025 and have to say is not an easy report to follow.

Noise survey was carried out between 10th – 14th July 2025 in 2 locations I found this acceptable and the report recommends standard glazing and MVHR system for all dwellings. The site is relatively low risk regarding traffic noise.

The façade of the properties facing south and closer to the Utilita Bowl are above the overheating ADO criteria (as per point 10.2.2 of the noise report) and will require an overheating solution to be found in a possible later stage.

Noise measures were undertaken at Pitter Commercials Limited operations (including vehicle wash, Vehicle Maintenance Bays) and an assessment following British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 was carried out resulting in an impact of +11dB, this following the criteria is considered a Significant Adverse Impact. The noise report states "These calculations have been carried out the roller shutter doors open. Further reductions could be achieved if these were to remain closed throughout the day" – This is true, but the business is already operating on site and with no conditions requiring the shutter doors to be closed this comment/solution is meaningless and impossible to put in place.

This area of the business closest to the proposed dwellings it's an open heavy vehicle yard used for maintenance , this will include operations using tools, potential air compressors and slow vehicles movements most likely early hours (6 to 7 am) and the noise assessment does not include any of the following points.

The solution proposed is to extend the existing 5.0m high brick wall along the southern boundary of Pitter Commercial. This may be a technical solution but having a garden with a 5m high brick wall its unreasonable and will not provide the external amenity that a garden should. Additionally, this solution will still provide a +5dB impact for early hours in the morning.

The 5m wall stops halfway to the south. I understand the distance increases from the MOT area and the washing area but the open yard area in the south can still be used for any of the above operations as well as slow moving vehicles specially in the early hours. To mitigate the noise the wall should be extended all the way around the yard increasing the unacceptability of this solution.



The site and location plan. Drawing No. PL02 shows a 4.2M WALL not a 5m as proposed in the noise report. Does it require a 4.2 or 5m height wall ?

The report also includes the assessment of noise arising from the operation of the Utilita Bowl using noise data gathered from example sport matches at the venue. I find the noise levels of this music assessment low comparing to other noise levels registered at the same location on different applications. Adding to this the music assessment at point 15.3 shows Overall LAeq 16 HOUR dB. Music noise should not be assessed in 16h periods.

Overall, I find this assessment hard to read, includes a large amount of unnecessary information and does not provide enough guarantees regarding the potential noise impact of Pitter Commercials Limited and the Utilita Bowl venue. For these reasons I object to this development in noise grounds.

Air Quality

Due to the size of the development (less than 10 dwellings) we have no concerns regarding Air quality.

Thank you

Andre

Andre Pires**Pollution Control Manager**

Planning & Environment - Pollution

Ext.: 8812**Mobile: 07795985497**