

Feedback on noise impact assessment by Senior Pollution Control Officer

Thanks for sending the noise report across.

The report by Parker Jones Acoustics contains the results of a noise survey carried out at the front and rear of the property.

This confirms the high levels of road traffic noise at the front of the property, and identified noise impact from jet washing at the adjacent garage no other noise sources on the garage site are identified.

Recommendations for the acoustic performance of glazing and ventilators is included, Table 5.2, which if implemented should ensure that the internal noise standards of the Local Plan would be met *with windows closed*. On the front, Bournemouth Road facade, internal noise levels with windows open would exceed the internal noise standards by a wide margin and therefore mechanical ventilation is required, the noise level for the ventilation system would need to be such that internal noise standards are met whilst it is in operation.

Noise levels in the garden are not specifically assessed, however based on the noise survey results at the rear of the property, first floor level, we might expect levels at or around 55dBA, which would be acceptable.

The report identifies noise from jet washing activities at the garage which are carried out directly adjacent to the garden area, see Fig 2.1, the report's author highlights that the 5 minute average noise level measured for this activity was up to 65dBA, which they consider would be 60dBA in the garden due to the existing boundary fence. No other 'noisy' activities are reported as occurring at the garage.

Reviewing the monitoring data for the Saturday at the rear of the property figure 4.2, it can be seen that there are regular periods of elevated noise from approximately 0800 to 1500, and for the preceding day, Friday these peaks appear to end at around 1700. The report does not comment on whether these are due to the car washing activities alone, however they would appear to indicate regular activity at the garage across the day, which will be the dominant noise in the garden. There is clearly potential for new residents to be disturbed by the noise and have reason to complain.

With respect to noise the impacts of road traffic on the development can be mitigated by appropriate acoustic glazing and ventilation, with mechanical ventilation to address the issue of high internal noise levels if windows were to be opened at the front.

Regarding the noise from the adjacent garage should the balance of arguments in planning terms deem the development appropriate, then we would recommend that the boundary with the garage should have a fence which is at least 2.5m high and of close boarded design with a minimum surface density of 10kg/m², so as to reduce the impact of noise in the garden.

When making comments previously we highlighted that impacts other than noise should be considered, information in this respect has not been supplied. The jet wash activity is a case in point as overspray of water cannot be ruled out given the close proximity to the boundary where this activity is carried out, and consequently the potential for complaints from future occupiers / residents. Whilst the barrier referred to above would assist in reducing the impact of this, the agent of change principle indicates that the developer should seek to engage with the garage to see what

steps can be taken to mitigate the noise and potential overspray, either by addressing it at source, or by relocating.

Given the commercial nature of the garage, it is not unreasonable to assume that security or other lighting will be utilised on site, and given the close proximity to the development, that this may impact on the proposed residential use. No consideration of the impact of this on the development proposals has been provided.