

Morris, Rachael

From: Wedgbury, Stuart
Sent: 30 April 2024 16:20
To: Morris, Rachael
Subject: F/24/97188 -UNIT H, GEORGE CURL WAY, EASTLEIGH, SO18 2RX

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Rachel

F/24/97188 -UNIT H, GEORGE CURL WAY, EASTLEIGH, SO18 2RX: Creation of headquarters for Hampshire Isle of Wight Air Ambulance (HIOWAA) and other healthcare services to include offices; the creation of a helipad; change of use and minor alterations to existing building to form a mixed use comprising B2, B8, E(e) and E(g); and other associated works.

Thank you for consulting Environmental Health regarding the above application. I will comment upon the risks posed to amenity from noise emission. Comment under separate correspondence will be made regarding air quality and land contamination.

I note from the planning statement that in respect of the existing facility, 982 incidents were responded to by helicopter in 2022 of which 30% occurred between 19:00 hours and 02:00 hours (labelled as night). If typical of what is to be expected; equivalent to on average 2.7 flights per day (take off and landings) of which 0.8 occur after 19:00 hours. It is not stated how many flights typically occur during periods more typically considered as nighttime (23:00 hours to 07:00 hours) when most residents will be sleeping.

I have reviewed the Omnia Noise Impact Assessment C11045 dated February 2024 Ref: C11045/NIA/1.2. This considers only the impact of noise from helicopter take off and landings upon amenity at existing residential uses. Two locations are chosen for assessment (a site to the East in Allington Lane and to the North in Campbell Road). Consideration is not given to noise from overflights because these flight paths are not defined. The assessment predicts that the impact from take off and landing events would be negligible at the two residential locations chosen. In terms of mitigation, the consultants advise that flight paths should avoid overflying residential properties 'where possible' and that a complaints procedure should be implemented.

I have a number of observations to make:

1. The expected noise emission from the helicopter are based upon measurements made on the current operating site. It is not stated what specific helicopter is/was in use and what would be in use on the proposed site although I assume it will be the same aircraft. It is possible however, that the helicopter may change during the life of any consent and that such a change may alter the noise impact. As such, I would recommend that the aircraft assessed in this report is specified. I would also recommend that any consent is conditional upon either the continued use of the aircraft or subject to approval should the applicant wish to change helicopter.
2. The assessment does not consider the impact of the proposed use on neighbouring commercial units. During the pre-application discussions EH specifically referenced the need to consider the impact upon these uses (see Q/23/96487 email 4/12/23 from Neil Scott). Whilst such uses are usually by their nature less sensitive than residential uses, still they are located very close to the helipad. It is predicted that landings and takeoff maneuvers would generate 100dBA at 15 meters. Such extremely high noise levels may well impact upon some types of commercial activity albeit for relatively short periods of time. It is not understood how impactful this may be upon commercial activities in this location.
3. The assessment with regard to the impact of helicopter take off and landings at distant residential receptors is generally accepted. The impact of such maneuvers at distance, is unlikely to be significant.

4. With regard to the risk of noise impact upon residential uses due to helicopter overflights we have no information. Strictly the assessment should have assessed the likely noise levels caused by a hypothetical direct overflight. This would give some sense of scale to the likely impact that may occur; even if flight paths are not yet determined. Further, the application should have responded to the acoustic consultant's comments that the flightpaths should avoid residential uses as far as possible. It is not understood to what extent this is a practical proposition, or indeed the process by which flight paths will be determined.
5. No comment is made in respect of maintenance activities for the helicopter referenced also in the pre-application comments. It would be helpful to know whether other significantly noisy activities associated with the use may also occur on the site. For example, might the helicopter need to operate on the ground for extended periods during such activities? Concern here can be limited to the potential impact upon commercial uses.

Regards

Stuart Wedgbury

Stuart Wedgbury

Environmental Health Specialist

Planning & Environment - Pollution

Ext.: 8353

Mobile: 07721572764