

Altman, Rebecca

Subject: FW: Response to noise comments: DC/23/95704 - Hill Haven, Winchester Road, Fair Oak. Condition 5- Noise. of F/21/91726

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

Sent: Monday, April 8, 2024 10:23 AM

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

Subject: Response to noise comments: DC/23/95704 - Hill Haven, Winchester Road, Fair Oak. Condition 5- Noise. of F/21/91726

Rebecca

We have reviewed the response from Mr Vine of Noisecheck and Airtight in response to our comments of 2.03.2024, in respect of the noise assessment submitted and mitigation proposed.

With respect to the main points raised Mr Vine has advised:

- That he is satisfied with the robustness of the survey
- That a good solid fence would bring the external garden levels in Plot 2 in line with the good standard of BS8233
- We should discount reference to:
 - plenum windows and that calculations based on 'normal' windows would achieve satisfactory internal noise levels with windows open.
 - the balcony as it is unlikely to be installed and should not be counted in terms of its contribution toward noise mitigation
 - References to use of MVHR as these were made in error
- Noise calculations include correction for road traffic, Ctr.

In terms of the 'acceptability' or otherwise of internal noise levels when windows are open Mr Vine refers to table 3.3 of the AVO Overheating Guide produced by the Association of Noise Consultants, ANC. And that his calculations show that with windows open internal noise levels both during the day and the night would be such '*...that the resident behaviour should not be affected by the external noise levels...*'. To support his he advises that internal levels in the living room would be 47 dBA, and for the bedroom would be 41 dBA, and L_{Amax} 59dBA, assuming a 'normal' open window, and that '*These are all within the guidance listed in table 3.3 of the ANC guide.*'.

We are happy to accept the approach given in the ANC guide, but must highlight that in respect of the table quoted that it describes the impacts on occupiers where internal noise levels exceed; 35, 30, and 45 (for living rooms, bedrooms and L_{Amax}, respectively), and which is the case here, as an '*Increasing likelihood of impact on reliable*

speech communication during the day or sleep disturbance at night’. Further, where noise levels increase further, it states, *‘At higher noise levels, more significant behavioural change is expected and may only be considered suitable if occurring for limited periods’.*

Comparing the calculated internal levels with the criteria above it can be seen that they are exceeded by a significant margin; daytime $47 - 35 = 12$, night time $41 - 30 = 11$, and L_{Amax} $59 - 45 = 14$. Indeed, the AVO guide advises that night time average internal levels of 42 should be avoided on the basis, *‘...sleep disturbance resulting in difficulty in getting to sleep, premature awakening and difficulty in getting back to sleep....’*. The night time level of 41 with windows open is very close to this threshold and we do not consider on this basis that the occupants would not be adversely affected by external noise as has been suggested.

PPG Noise advises that noise should be mitigated and reduced to a minimum where, *‘Noise can be heard and causes small changes in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response, e.g. turning up volume of television; speaking more loudly; where there is no alternative ventilation, having to close windows for some of the time because of the noise. Potential for some reported sleep disturbance. Affects the acoustic character of the area such that there is a small actual or perceived change in the quality of life.’*

As no mitigation other than standard double glazed windows are proposed in respect of internal noise levels we do not consider that the developer has demonstrated how they have mitigated and reduced to a minimum the adverse noise impacts on the future occupants.

Overall then our conclusion is that the applicant needs to demonstrate that internal noise levels have been mitigated and reduced to a minimum when windows are open. For clarity we do not accept the internal noise levels quoted above as being acceptable, and we do not agree with Mr Vines statement at the AVO guide says that they would not lead to adverse impact, in fact in our reading of the guide is that it very clearly articulating that at the internal noise levels predicted in the report that behavioural change in response to the noise is likely and that an adverse impact will occur. These are circumstances in which the Planning Policy guidance on noise identifies that an Observed Adverse Effect is occurring and that the appropriate action is to mitigate and reduce to a minimum such effects.

The noise report / mitigation scheme should be updated to include reference to how satisfactory internal levels can be achieved, this appears most likely by the use of mechanical ventilation. Where this is the case then internal noise standards should be met when the mechanical ventilation is operating

The other matters discussed and identified as previously mentioned in error, or not be featuring in the design above should also be corrected (MVHR / Plenum windows, the balcony that is not being installed), the proposed barrier to address the matter of the garden of plot 2 should be included, and revised calculations presented confirming the internal and external noise levels that will be achieved. The site-specific noise mitigation details should also be provided, including the barrier for Plot 2 garden.

Regards

Neil

Neil Scott

Senior Pollution Control Officer

Planning & Environment - Pollution