

Osmond, Gary

From: Pires, Andre
Sent: 14 April 2025 16:03
To: Osmond, Gary
Subject: DC/25/99219 - 20-24 UPPER MARKET STREET, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9FD Condition 2 (glazing & MVHR)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good afternoon Gary,

Thanks for consulting the Pollution Team regarding the application DC/25/99219 for the discharge of condition 2 of the prior approval PN/24/98468 for the change of use from Offices/Services (Class E) to 22 Dwellings (Use Class C3) under Class MA at 20-24 UPPER MARKET STREET, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9FD.

Condition 2 requests full details of the glazing and the MVHR specifications to be used for each elevation of the building.

I reviewed the original noise report from Clarke Saunders reference AS13600.240719.NIA dated July 2024. This report states the use of a MVHR system and recommends the improving the performance of the present glazing or the installation of secondary glazing.

The planning statement dated 08/04/25 proposes the installation of secondary glazing and a passive ventilation system using through wall ventilation on each habitable room (Rytens Super Acoustic Controllable LookRyt® AirCore®) rather than the previously proposed MVHR system.

Clarke Saunders Review the above and considerable acceptable regarding noise in a covering letter dated 9 April 2025.

The justification for Passive Ventilation Over MVHR in Conversions are given to be higher running cost and difficulty installing duct routing in converting buildings.

We have serious concerns about the replacement of a MVHR system to a passive system. It's understood that continuous mechanical ventilation system for bathrooms and kitchens (System 3 ventilation) is proposed. This system requires duct routing (different diameter I imagine than a MVHR) but duct routing will already exist on the site.

Our main concern is overheating and the need of opening the windows in the summer months. Opening the windows for purge ventilation will then eliminate the noise benefits from the secondary glazing and the passive ventilation.

I fully understand a MVHR system does not provide cooling but mitigates overheating in a superior way comparing to a passive system as proposed. I also fully understand Document O of Building Regulations does not apply to conversions.

A specialist ventilation report showing that the proposed Passive Ventilation system achieves the ventilation criteria from Document F of Building Regulations will be required to be reviewed and accepted by the Local Planning Authority.

Additionally, the installation of the proposed passive ventilation option will have a visual impact on the building façade as you will require one or two of these through wall vents per habitable room.



At this point in time with the information provided we are not able to discharge condition 2.

On another matter I would highly recommended to review your dust mitigation measures as a considerable amount of dust is being created while loading the skip loaders as it can be seen by the layer of dust in the front of the building and main road.

Thank you

Andre

Andre Pires

Pollution Control Manager

Planning & Environment - Pollution

Ext.: 8436

Mobile: 07795985497