

Altman, Rebecca

Subject: FW: Conditions application ref. DC/23/95704 - Condition 5 of planning permission F/21/91726

From: Wedgbury, Stuart <Stuart.Wedgbury@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 9:56 AM
To: Altman, Rebecca <rebecca.altman@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Conditions application ref. DC/23/95704 - Condition 5 of planning permission F/21/91726

Morning Rebecca

My advice as follows:

- Acoustic barrier extent – Plan SD-2169-00-P (2) shows a decent footprint for a barrier. I doubt you could achieve a much better acoustic performance unless the height was increased substantially. Given your various acoustic and non-acoustic considerations, the proposal seems reasonable in the circumstances.
- Barrier construction – No new information provided. But to re-iterate the Jacoustics Plus barrier will be sufficient; if this is what is proposed.
- Windows – The brochure submitted is generic and does not relate to a single product. The document does not provide acoustic performance information for comparison with the acoustic consultants specifications. The proposal is therefore unsatisfactory.
- Ventilation – I note the strategy is to provide a Type 4 MVHR system. The design is a matter for Building Regulations and I make no comment upon this. However, in respect of the LPA interest of preventing excessive external noise from entering the Building, I would recommend that you seek an unequivocal confirmation that:
 - no passive vents will be installed in the building on the front and side elevations
 - no openings in the front or side elevations of the external building fabric will be required to accommodate the MVHR system.

That being the case we do not need any acoustic information regarding the sound insulation performance of these openings. As a general comment, once you are ready to discharge this part of the condition on this basis, I would reference that the discharge is subject to the ventilation arrangements described to the LPA being accepted as compliant with Building Regulations by the relevant regulator. If not, this matter would need to be reconsidered.

Regards

Stuart Wedgbury

Stuart Wedgbury
Environmental Health Specialist
Planning & Environment - Pollution
