

Morris, Rachael

From: Morris, Rachael
Sent: 11 June 2024 15:10
To: Morris, Rachael
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] RE: Chalcroft 3 Paddock application - Noise #

From: Wedgbury, Stuart <>
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 11:46 AM
To: Morris, Rachael <Rachael.Morris@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Chalcroft 3 Paddock application - Noise #

Morning Rachel

My comments are as follows:

1. My comments regarding the consideration of contextual matters were that the arguments were not made out in my view; I did not intend substitute an alternative assessment. I did not understand the relevance of the closure of Burnetts Lane to through traffic (that is affecting average roadside noise many years prior to the expected opening of the industrial site) to this assessment. I still don't. I accept that I may have confused matters by commenting that a reduced residual sound level might make tonal and impulsive industrial noise more intrusive rather than less.
2. The purpose of the noise assessment is to predict the likely impact, to inform the decision making. My comments upon the consultant's work largely relate to the likelihood of impact and the severity of that impact, to give a view on the potential risks posed by the development. The policy objectives should be to mitigate noise to minimise the impact as far as possible and to avoid significant adverse impacts upon amenity. Layout is also cited as a fundamental measure for mitigating impact both in the NPPF Guidance and I think the Local Plan.

As I do not consider that the contextual assessment is made out, naturally a noise rating equating to the expected background sound absent the development is a reasonable aim; corresponding to a low risk of impact. That is not to say, that if this aim is not practicable in a desirable development that it would necessarily be a reason to refuse an application considering noise in isolation. My point was rather that I don't consider that the consultant has made out that a rating +5dB over background should be the aim. According to the Standard a rating of +10dB above background (subject to context) would relate to a likely significant adverse impact. National planning advice advises that significant adverse impacts should be avoided. I expect whether this scenario is ever realised here will depend upon the degree to which impulsive and tonal noise is perceptible and intrusive at the residential premises.

The acoustic barrier considered with the layout proposed, is predicted to reduce sound from the industrial site by 1-2 dBA only. This is by any standards a very poor performance for an acoustic barrier. Why it is so poor is not clear. If the aim is to minimise the impact to a minimum, the question is could better noise reduction be achieved by better layouts and barrier configurations. This has not been explored.

3. I am not best placed to comment upon this. My natural thought that arises from this commentary is to what extent the outcomes described as expected could be controlled by condition. As previously stated, in my experience, residents are more likely to complain about tonal noise from reversing beepers and impulsive noise linked primarily to activity occurring within open yards.

4. This is mainly a matter for you to consider. I still wonder why alternative layouts have not come forward and been tested acoustically. The reference to other planning considerations is suggestive that alternative layouts (at least along the lines suggested by Neil and I) are not possible. That may be the case and if so, this will limit the scope for reductions in noise emission from the site at the reserved matters stage. You will need to consider this.

Happy to discuss your suggested approach over Teams if that is helpful.

Regards

Stuart Wedgbury

Stuart Wedgbury
Environmental Health Specialist
Planning & Environment - Pollution

From: Morris, Rachael <Rachael.Morris@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2024 1:24 PM
To: Wedgbury, Stuart <>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] RE: Chalcroft 3 Paddock application - Noise #

Hi Stuart,

Please see the below response from the agent on this. Please can you let me know your thoughts on this. I think we might need to address all this through suitably worded conditions as at this stage when we are unsure of building positions, it is hard to ask for things to be changed outside of the general parameters etc.

Many thanks,
Rachael

Rachael Morris
Senior Planning Officer
Planning & Environment - Planning/Development Management
Ext.: 8463

From: NOEL Craig <>
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2024 12:12 PM
To: Morris, Rachael <Rachael.Morris@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Cc: Joshua Mills | Phlorum <>; Rob Peirce <>; O'DONOGHUE Julie <Julie.O'Donoghue@struttandparker.com>; MCCARTHY Helen <>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Chalcroft 3 Paddock application - Noise #

Afternoon Rachel

I have read the comments below carefully and have discussed with our clients' noise consultants (copied). In response, I would make the following points:

1. I note that Stuart Wedgbury says that he is not familiar with the circumstances that led to the closure of Burnetts Lane and that he assumes that it has already occurred, and thinks that this is more likely to exacerbate the noise problem as a result. Those circumstances however are a key consideration.

As you will know, the closure of Burnetts Lane was an integral part of the delivery of the new Bubb Lane link road, which itself was a precursor to allowing development on sites WE1 and WE2, as required in those policies. The road closure is not something that has come about independently of the Local Plan allocations for commercial development (which include B8 use), but is intrinsically linked with it. Indeed part of the main rationale for the new link road and associated road closure was that it facilitated development at these employment sites, which were previously subject to a policy embargo. The present position (link road in, road closed, paddock undeveloped) is an interim one only.

The fact that these sites have been allocated following full Local Plan consultation and scrutiny must mean that the sites (including the Paddock) are considered suitable in principle for the forms of development for which they are allocated (including B8 use).

2. Any new development can be expected to impact the local environment in some way. The planning system functions to balance those interests against the benefits arising from development (such as employment, the local economic multiplier etc.). The BS4142 assessment must consider the context, and as discussed in para 5.17 of the noise report *'The context is provided by the predicted traffic noise levels for the year of opening, 2028 at the existing properties. The predicted traffic noise levels without the development in 2028 are predicted to be up to LAeq,16 hr 59 dB in the daytime and LAeq,16 hr 40 dB at night. This indicates that noise from activities at the development is predicted to be up to 14 dB lower in the daytime and 11 dB lower at night than the traffic noise even without the development at Burnetts Lane. Furthermore, the noise levels at Burnetts Lane have reduced significantly with the road closure and the residents were previously exposed to noise levels of LAeq,16 hr 63 dB in the daytime and LAeq,16 hr 53 dB at night, which are higher than those predicted for the year of opening, 2028.'* When considering this context, it is not considered to be reasonable to adopt a 0 dB BS4142 target as a starting point as Mr Wedgbury does and in Phlorum's previous correspondence regarding noise with EBC (in the email chain below) a target of +0 dB(A) had not been suggested. The Local Plan process has established the principle, requiring as he says that developments mitigate adverse effects, which this application seeks to do through supporting the installation of noise barriers.
3. The specific concern with B8 uses because of noise associated with HGV movements and/or forklift truck movements (notably reversing alarms). However I think it is important to have regard to the scale of units that might be delivered on this site, the likely nature of uses that might fall within Class B8, and whether they are likely to give rise to those sorts of noise sources.

The Paddock area is unlikely to attract occupiers looking for logistics premises (the "distribution" part of B8). Present day logistics building tend to be highly automated and require economies of scale and therefore large buildings (and in particular, tall buildings). The height parameter plans here which have been submitted with the application would preclude such a logistics development as would the scale of any individual building that is able to comply with the other parameter drawings, including the movement drawing. A single large B8 building of the type which might be expected to generate regular noise of the type complained of) could not be developed in a manner which complied with the parameter plans that would be conditioned as part of the permission.

The paddock site would be much more suitable for the sort of mixed light industrial and storage user that would not generate HGV movements nor necessarily operate forklifts, particularly in the open. While there might be some storage only uses, small-scale storage use rarely involves large and regular movements associated with distribution, but nevertheless fall within the same use class. Part of the rationale behind the Paddock development is to offer accommodation in smaller units, as distinct from the much larger buildings already established on the Business Park, to attract a different and wider range of tenants. The size of the site and the nature of the parameters proposed mitigate against the type of disturbance from B8 uses that Mr Wedgbury is concerned with.

4. The illustrative layout presented responds to a number of different planning issues. It would be wrong in our view to allow a single issue to be determinant of the form of development. However, as a matter of principle, the need for attenuation is accepted and it is also acknowledged that the form and type of that mitigation will need to be developed to adequately address noise concerns at Reserved Matters stage, when

the effectiveness of the noise mitigation can be more reliably addressed (because the location and form of the buildings will be known).

5. In response therefore to the summary advice:

- i. We do not believe it is necessary to preclude B8 uses from buildings within the developable area as noted on the parameters plans, for the reasons give above. While it is suggested that there might be a zone in which such uses should not be permitted, we believe that that would be inconsistent with the allocation in the Local Plan. The present noise environment at Burnetts Lane can best be described as an interim position. The road closure and link road construction was intended to facilitate the development of this site and it is wrong to regard this interim position as the baseline or norm – the closure of the road was intended in planning terms to go hand in hand with the delivery of employment development on the site.
- ii. We have no issues with the imposition of conditions as stated.

Kind regards,

Craig

From: Morris, Rachael <Rachael.Morris@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 11:16 AM
To: Rob Peirce <>; NOEL Craig <>
Cc: Joshua Mills | Phlorum <>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Chalcroft 3 Paddock application - Noise

EXTERNAL SENDER - EMETTEUR EXTERNE

Be cautious before opening attachments or clicking on any links. If in doubt, use '**Report Email/ReportPhishing**' button or contact your **CSIRT**.

Soyez vigilants avant d'ouvrir les pièces jointes ou de cliquer sur les liens. En cas de doute, signalez le message via le bouton '**Report Email/ReportPhishing**' ou contactez votre **CSIRT**.

Hi Rob and Craig,

Neil Scott has now left the council and as such our noise consultant, Stuart Wedgbury, has had a look at this case afresh. He provides the following comments:

1. I broadly accept the conclusions regarding increases in traffic noise levels at the residential facades provided that the traffic data used in the acoustic report is accepted as reasonable by the LPAs Highways expert. I cannot advise on this. So far as I can see, the report does not include the traffic data used in this assessment. I have no further comments on this aspect.
2. I broadly do not accept the assessment of the impact of industrial noise for various reasons. I will briefly set the main concern with this work below:
 - a. The assessment of noise generated from new industrial activity is partial in that it considers only HGV movements and unloading/loading activity. Explicitly excluded is noise from within the industrial units. Implicitly excluded is noise from other activities (than deliveries) within the yard areas and noise from any fixed plant (para 5.2 of the report). Including noise from such activities would likely increase the noise rating. Responding to the comments in correspondence regarding fixed plant noise; the point that this element is unknown is well made! Whilst it may be possible in principle to later control by condition the noise emission of individual items of fixed plant as they are installed; noise emission from the cumulative plant ultimately installed would still add to the overall industrial noise emission from the site; unless the standard is set so low for individual plant as to be assured that cumulatively this element would not change the specific sound level (so far derived from HGV and delivery noise only). The uncertainty of assessing overall impact is the point.

- b. The specific sound level calculated from the industrial sources that have been included in the assessment will be heavily dependant upon the assumptions made regarding for example; the length of time each delivery takes place; the number of concurrent deliveries that occur at different units within the 60 minute and 15 minute reference time periods for day and night respectively and the type of delivery activity that occurs (for example use of diesel/petrol versus electric forklifts) in operation. The report does set out activity noise levels for expected HGV manoeuvres and unloading activity in Para 5.2, but the source of this data is not explained or justified. Further, the assumptions regarding intensity of activity are not set out in the report. The Standard requires that where a modelling methodology is adopted that the method of calculation is reported in detail (Para 7.3.6 of the Standard).
- c. The rating level for the industrial sound (the specific sound referenced above adjusted for the character of the sound) has received a +3dBA adjustment due the consultant's view that the unloading/loading activities may produce impulsive noise that '*is just perceptible*' at the residential properties (para 5.13 of the report). However, the Standard allows for much more severe penalties dependant upon the circumstances found. For example, a +6dBA adjustment would be appropriate if impulsive noise is clearly perceptible at the residential properties. Further a penalty of up to +6dBA may be appropriate where the noise source has a tonal nature; for example, as may be the case with tonal reversing beepers on HGVs or on forklift trucks. In real world cases where B8 activity occurs adjacent to residential uses complaints often focus upon impulsive noise from yard activities (including but not limited to unloading and loading activity) and the annoying features of reversing beepers. What circumstances will apply here once the units are occupied is unknown.
- d. I do not consider that the contextual assessment the consultant has applied convincing.
 - i. The Standard does suggest the character and level of the residual sound (environmental noise excluding the new industrial noise sources) compared to the specific sound (the new industrial noise) may in principle be a contextual consideration (see Para 11(2) of the Standard). However, the key as expressed in the Standard is to assess the degree to which the industrial sound is likely distinguishable and incongruous compared to other noise in the environment. The consultant only considers 16 hour average traffic noise levels predicted in 2028 compared to the industrial noise (para 5.17 of the Report) that is assessed over much shorter time interval appropriate for a BS4142 assessment. It also appears the data here is obtained from the traffic noise assessment in the report; if correct, these values would apply at residential road frontages, whereas the acoustic conditions at the rear of properties in Burnetts Lane for example, will be different and likely lower due to increased distance from the traffic sources and the barrier effects of existing houses. It is at the rear in this case, that the effects of the industrial activity will be more significant. Further, considering only the limited industrial noise sources considered in the report, whilst there may be similarities between the character of say HGV movements in transit and traffic noise present from other sources; there is unlikely to be any similarity between the character of noise from unloading and loading activities likely to include impulsive and tonal noise.
 - ii. I am not familiar with the circumstances relating to the closure of Burnetts Lane to through traffic. I take it that this is a change that has already occurred and resulted in a reduction in transport noise levels. There is no precedent in the Standard for making allowance for this as a contextual consideration at a future development date. If anything in my view; perversely, reduced traffic noise levels would make it more likely that new industrial noise would be more apparent and incongruous rather than less.
- e. The mitigation proposed is of marginal benefit; delivering a insertion loss (reduction) of 1-2dBA. A reasonable acoustic barrier would be expected to deliver a reduction of 10-15dBA. It is not set out why the proposed barriers in this case are relatively ineffective. This will I suspect, be a function probably of the distance from the assumed sources of noise and the barrier. Alternative layouts (for example, where the industrial units are terraced and run parallel to the housing grain with yards on the side opposite to the housing) or barrier configurations might result in a more substantial reduction in noise levels. There seems to be some suggestion in the correspondence that alternative layouts may conflict with other planning considerations. However, in respect of the design of noise mitigation considered in isolation, no attempt I can see has been made to consider alternative layouts to improve acoustic shielding. The more recent plan I have seen on the file

(absent the acoustic barriers) DD639L01 Revision D doesn't seem materially much better especially in respect of the relationship to Burnetts Lane.

- f. The consultant states that achieving a +5dBA rating above background noise would be a reasonable target for the development (para 7.4). I disagree. According to the Standard, such an outcome would represent a likely risk of adverse impact (subject to contextual considerations). The Local Plan (para 5.49) requires that developers mitigate and minimise adverse effects where possible. If no contextual considerations apply (I am not persuaded that they do) a +0dBA rating above background should be the aim if one is to approach this by criterion. This may of course not be practicable to achieve in this case. However, where the planning view is that the development is desirable and this standard is not practically achievable, you can accept a higher risk to amenity so long as this is not a significantly adverse impact.

Overall, I consider that the report sets out **an** assessment of the possible severity of impacts that might result from unloading and loading activities and HGV movements **in isolation**. The real world position is likely in my view, to be that a range of possible severity of impacts may arise, dependent upon the type of future occupation and associated activities as yet unknown. Some risks may be controllable by performance conditions; some (especially activity in open yards) may not.

In general terms, my advice would be:

- Unspecified B8 use in close relationship to residential uses should generally be avoided. In this scheme it may be that alternative layouts or alternative acoustic barrier configurations may reduce the risks to amenity somewhat. Zoning the site to locate B8 uses in specific buildings further from residential uses; with E(g)(ii) and E(g)(iii) uses closer to the residential boundary may also reduce risks to amenity. There is no evidence these options have been considered from an acoustic perspective.
- I have no principled concern regarding the proposal to place E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii) and E(a) uses on this site. I think that consent for such uses should be subject to conditions to:
 - Require approval for the installation of any fixed plant or equipment.
 - Limit the permitted hours for activity (for example deliveries) external to the buildings.
 - Protect amenity during the development phase.

Please review these comments and get back to me.

Thank you.

Kind regards,
Rachael

Rachael Morris
Senior Planning Officer

Planning & Environment - Planning/Development Management
023 8068 8463



Eastleigh Borough Council | Eastleigh House | Upper Market Street | Eastleigh | SO50 9YN