

Altman, Rebecca

Subject: FW: Updated Info from Noise consultant: PN/23/96620 111 WINCHESTER ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD - change of use of the rear first floor from Class E (commercial) to 6 flats (Use Class C3)

Attachments: Fwd: PN/23/96620 111 WINCHESTER ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD - change of use of the rear first floor from Class E (commercial) to 6 flats (Use Class C3)

From: Scott, Neil <Neil.Scott@eastleigh.gov.uk>

Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 6:14 PM

To: Altman, Rebecca <rebecca.altman@eastleigh.gov.uk>

Subject: Updated Info from Noise consultant: PN/23/96620 111 WINCHESTER ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD - change of use of the rear first floor from Class E (commercial) to 6 flats (Use Class C3)

Rebecca

We have received the attached email from the noise consultants acting on behalf of the applicant, in response to our previous comments.

The consultant advises that with respect to the assessment of noise impact from:

- deliveries / collections - they monitored for a single day which was in their view a 'typical' day, and that noise levels measured were similar to those measured previously (PN/23/95595). Details have not been provided as to the number, type and duration of deliveries or waste collections so we are unable to verify this, also the monitoring position used for the earlier noise assessment would have been screened from delivery / collection noise. We would request that details of deliveries and collections from the store are provided so as to establish if the day in question was representative, we would also highlight that the assessment should consider a 'reasonable worst case' in assessing the noise impact.
- The exhaust flue serving No. 113 – that this was inaudible at the time of their visit. Given that windows of noise sensitive rooms are to be located in close proximity to this flue we would recommend that this is assessed to demonstrate that internal noise standards of the Local Plan can be met within the nearest noise sensitive rooms. This assessment should consider noise when windows are open.
- Plant / machinery at No. 103 – that no plant or machinery noise was evident at the time of their visit. We do not dispute this but would highlight that they should consider the activities that may be reasonably carried out there.
- From within the delivery bay beneath the proposed flats – details of floor construction performance of 68Rw are included. This is satisfactory.

Reference is made to plant serving No. 113 (not the kitchen exhaust) being relocated to a position shown on Fig 5.1.3 of their report, my concern is about how this will be implemented under the planning permission as it is not something in the consultant's gift, and the likely noise impact implications if it is not moved.

With respect to our comments on odour impact from No. 113 this is not considered. Given that the ventilation of rooms is not addressed we would highlight that air inlet vents should not be located in the vicinity of the kitchen exhaust.

Unfortunately the information provided has not fully addressed our concerns and our objection to the development remains.

Regards

Neil

Neil Scott

Senior Pollution Control Officer

Planning & Environment - Pollution