

Good afternoon Katie

Thanks for consulting the Pollution Team on the planning F/26/101924 for the Retrospective change of use of land for Use Class B8 (storage) and extension to area of hardstanding at Land to the Rear of 30 The Crescent SO50 9BR. We have reviewed the following documents:

- RS Studio. (July 2026). Plans as existing and proposed. Reference 1797-P-01
- RS Studio (25/09/2026). Design and access statement. KO Plant Groundworks Limited. Land Change of Use to B8 (Storage and Distribution)
- Venta Acoustics VA6550.260925. Noise Impact Assessment 25 September 2026

Please see our comments below:

Contaminated land

Available aerial imagery suggest the site has been undeveloped until around 2021/2022, when vegetation was removed and seemed to be used as an extension of the existing yard. The proposed development is understood to comprise B8 storage for the construction industry, vehicle, materials and installation of gravel hardstanding. The geology of the site comprises River Terrace Deposits over Wittering Formation, classed as Secondary A aquifer. Although the risk of contaminated land is considered to be low due to the nature of the activity, it is recommended that a pollution prevention plan is in place during operation, which includes measures to prevent, control and mitigate any potential risks of contamination (i.e. spill response procedures, storage controls, etc) – Maybe a note to the applicant?

Noise

It's my understanding after reading the Design and access statement that the proposed site and operating will be running concurrently to the existing scaffolding site and business. The statement also includes the proposed operating hours - 7:00-17:00, Monday-Sunday.

The site is between the railway and The Crescent (residential street) with a distance of approx. 15m to the closest residential property and a smaller distance to its back garden. The site will have a considerable high background noise level due to the close proximity to the A335 and the railway.

I reviewed Venta Acoustics report reference VA6550.260925. I accept the duration of the survey that includes one weekend and I can confirm the location of the survey is representative. Table 4.2 presents the typical LA90,5min for 07:00 – 18:00 hours as one value.

The BS4142 assessment in table 5.3 and table 5.4 used residual sound level LAeq of 55 dB as the calculations background noise level, presenting an impact of +7dB for general yard activities and +15dB above background for plant movements. This is classified as an adverse impact and hard to accept. I find the penalties used for impulsivity and intermittency valid.

Furthermore, I believe that at 7am the background noise level may be lower than the one used resulting potentially in an even higher impact.

The main justification appears to rely on the explanation of the existing use and the statement on page 8 that the noise impact would be greater if a scaffolding yard were to operate within the site. I do not consider this to be the most appropriate basis for the assessment. The scaffolding yard is currently located on the adjacent land and will remain in operation alongside the proposed development. Therefore, the assessment should not rely on a comparison with a hypothetical scaffolding yard operating within the site, as this does not reflect the actual circumstances.

In my view, the noise assessment should take into consideration the cumulative impact of the proposed activities together with the existing scaffolding yard, particularly where both uses will operate concurrently and may affect the same nearby residential receptors. The assessment should therefore demonstrate that the combined noise impact of the existing and proposed uses has been adequately considered.

The additional plant and vehicular movements using the access road will also increase and it should not be acceptable over the proposed operating hours or at least be assessed and mitigation provided.

The noise report includes a good and correct approach but a detailed table including hours/background noise level for early morning specially will be require as well as a cumulative assessment from both sites operating simultaneously.

Would also be reasonable to propose physical mitigation solutions, rather than the Noise Management Plan alone, or propose more restricted operating hours.

This level of impact should not be acceptable.

Thank you

Andre

Pollution Team

Andre Pires

Pollution Control Manager

Planning & Environment - Pollution