

From: Wedgbury, Stuart <Stuart.Wedgbury@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2024 3:36 PM
To: Martin, Clare <Clare.Martin@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Cc: Panza, Yacklin <Yacklin.Panza@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 5 Leigh Road - PN/24/97334

Hi Clare.

I have had a look at the ISVR acoustic report 11732-R01 and will respond with reference to the three points made in my email of the 29/5/24 concerning the risk posed by commercial noise.

1. *Transmission of Commercial Noise from the ground floor use through the building structure:* The consultant recommends that the sound insulation for the separating floor/ceiling should be upgraded to meet the Building Regulations Part E standard. I agree that such works would be sufficient for low risk commercial uses such as expected to be the case with the current occupier. Other commercial occupiers might well cause a more significant impact upon amenity. The significance of this risk will depend upon the extant planning consent and the degree to which this may prevent changes in occupation to more impactful uses. I would recommend that you review this risk.
2. *Transmission of commercial noise from adjacent uses:* No mitigation measures are proposed. I accept that current occupiers are unlikely to present a significant risk to amenity. However, the comments above related to changes in occupation apply; albeit this presents a lower order of risk.
3. *Transmission of noise from externally located plant:* I note your email of the 30/7/24 requiring the removal of external amenity space from the proposal. In which case consideration is limited to the impact upon internal habitable rooms. The consultant assesses the risk to amenity as significantly adverse during the evening and at night. At night, the rating level predicted by the application of the BS4142 methodology predicts an extraordinary +18dB above background sound levels. Conditions during the daytime assessed as adverse, but not significantly adverse. This due to the noise emission from two air conditioning plant and the cooking extract system serving the Istanbul Grill. This plant is considered to produce slightly tonal noise and is the dominant environmental noise at the rear of the proposed premises. Other fixed plant is less significant, such that in combination it does not significantly worsen the assessment.

This presents a very poor quality acoustic environment for residential use. This is best addressed at source by identifying mitigation measures for the plant in question if practicable or if not, avoiding fenestration to habitable rooms on the rear façade of the proposed development.

The acoustic consultant proposes conventional double glazing with ventilation provided by acoustic trickle vents as a suitable mitigation strategy. Such measures considered by him to be sufficient to achieve different internal acoustic criteria set in BS8233. This approach presents a number of concerns:

- The criteria in BS8233 are intended to apply to steady external noise sources without character and to not apply to noise sources from neighbouring uses. They are not appropriate in this case. If achieved, it is likely that the acoustic environment within the rear bedroom would be dominated by plant noise even when such windows are closed. Better standards of sound insulation may reduce this risk somewhat. Conventionally, when accepted lower absolute standards than those in BS8233 are sought where the noise source is dominated by noise of a commercial or industrial character.
- The tonal element identified at 160Hz may be more dominant inside habitable rooms when the windows are closed. Method G2 BS8233 would allow this risk to be explored for particular double glazed units.
- A passive ventilation system may be insufficient to prevent overheating. If so, residents will be likely to want to open windows for extended periods for cooling. If so, the acoustic environment within the rooms will be very significantly blighted by plant noise. This risk has not been explored.
- The provision of mechanical ventilation systems to deliver cooling as an alternative to open windows has not been considered. Such a system may provide some masking sound to make the internal environment more acceptable.

Overall, I am not satisfied that the proposals regarding the control of plant noise are sufficient.

Regards

Stuart Wedgbury

Stuart Wedgbury
Environmental Health Specialist
Planning & Environment - Pollution
Ext.: 8353
Mobile: 07721572764