[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Fiona Fitzgerald
Sent: 15 June 2017 10:57
To: Claire Potts
Subject: RE: CM/1/17/OUT

Dear Claire,

Using the same numbering system:

1. No further comments, thank you for the acoustic barrier information/proposals. Environmental Health have no concerns with different fence/bund combinations providing the proposals are achievable which it appears they are.
2. Please could a map showing the external noise contour levels at ground level with the bund/fence mitigation taken into account be provided? This would also show the noise levels at pedestrian access points.
3. No further comments.
4. Would the applicant suggest wording for the condition which we would then comment on? I think we are all on the same page on this one, just the actual wording of the condition to be finalised.
5. Noted.

Regards

Fiona

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL CM/1/17/OUT

From: Claire Potts
Sent: 07 June 2017 12:57
To: Planning.Responses
Cc: Fiona Fitzgerald
Subject: FW: CM/1/17/OUT

Please could the attached plans be uploaded on to the file. The masterplan is substitute and the acoustic barrier additional.

Fiona -see attached and below in response to your queries. Please could you consider and respond.

Kind regards

Claire

Claire Potts BSc MSc MRTPI | Strategic Development Team Leader, Strategic Development, Arun District Council | First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37698 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737698 E-mail: claire.potts@arun.gov.uk
Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Chris Wojtulewski [redacted]
Sent: 02 June 2017 16:07
To: Claire Potts
Cc: Fiona Fitzgerald
Subject: CM/1/17/OUT

Dear Claire

Following our meeting on 16th May and our discussion earlier today, we have now had an opportunity to consider the comments from Fiona Fitzgerald that were tabled and can respond as follows using the numbering used in Fiona's email to you;

1. Please see the attached drawings (01 Masterplan (Rev E) – Amended to show the bund/fence and 03 Acoustic Barrier – New drawing illustrating the bund & fence in plan and cross section illustrating the location of the acoustic fence and bund with respect to the retained trees and rear gardens of housing identified on the illustrative masterplan). As you can see, there are a couple of places where the distance between trees and houses is quite narrow and, having consulted with Southdowns Environmental, we are showing in these locations a 1m high bund and 2m barrier instead of the 2m high bund and 1m barrier identified by Southdowns Environmental in their report. Southdowns Environmental have confirmed that this is acceptable as the key aim is to have a 3m high acoustic barrier – the form that this takes can vary. As per the recommendations in the Arboricultural Survey Report, the closest edge of the bund needs to be at least 7.2m from the buttresses of the trees in W22 and 4.8m from those in W25 to the south as identified in Appendix A (Tree Constraints Plan) of the Arboricultural Survey Report and 8.4m from those in W27 to the south west. The drawings show that this can be achieved.
2. Southdowns Environmental have advised that there was a slight increase in predicted noise levels (between the model runs for the original report and those reported in the response note) as a result of moving the noise bund and fence alignment back so as not to damage the trees or their root systems. Figure A9 in the original report is a plot of the current LAeq,16hr noise levels as modelled using the CRTN methodology and as such does not contain the mitigation off the bund and garden fences. Figure A10 in the report is as Fiona suspects, the LAeq,16hr noise levels in Figure A10 also do not include the mitigation as both Figures A9 and A10 form part of the road traffic assessment to show the change in noise levels from traffic noise (rather than from mitigation measures). With the bund and fencing in place the noise reduction benefits to the existing properties would be even greater. Southdowns have responded to Fiona directly on this point already.

3. Noted.
4. We think the suggested condition probably fails 3 of the tests on conditions - enforceability, precision and reasonableness. It is a condition which is relying on what is in essence a sketch design solution in response to a sketch of an illustrative plan. Whilst what Fiona is seeking to achieve is not in dispute, the manner of doing so results in an unsatisfactory condition. We would suggest what is required is a condition which seeks the submission of a noise report in specified areas of the site (Areas for Noise Attenuation Measures which can be delineated on a plan) which report sets out the proposed method of attenuation to meet express internal and external noise parameters, and that these attenuation measures shall be agreed before development of dwellings in the Area for Noise Attenuation Measures commences, and such details as are agreed shall be implemented in full before occupation of the dwellings subject of the condition.
5. Subject to fine tuning the wording we have no difficulty with the two conditions proposed here.

Regards

Chris

Chris Wojtulewski BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI - Director
Parker Dann Chartered Town Planning Consultants
Suite S10, Waterside Centre, North Street, Lewes BN7 2PE
[redacted]
www.parkerdann.co.uk



ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL CM/1/17/OUT