

[REDACTED]

From: Nicola Moore on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 21 August 2019 10:52
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Lu/321/17/PL - 22 Beach Road, Littlehampton. Application for Discharge of Planning Condition 4

[REDACTED]

Nicky Moore | Technical Support Assistant, Planning Department, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: First floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

[REDACTED]

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk  Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Carol Reynolds
Sent: 21 August 2019 08:15
To: Planning.Responses <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Anita Gardner <[REDACTED]>; Juan Baeza <[REDACTED]>; Tracey Headley-Smith <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: Lu/321/17/PL - 22 Beach Road, Littlehampton. Application for Discharge of Planning Condition 4

Environmental Health: With reference to that document provided by Acoustic Associates, Project Number J2707, Issue One, BS 8233:2014 Assessment. This assessment would only appear to consider road noise and noise from the mechanical ventilation system to Pizza Hut. Emphasis is placed upon the fact that the food business will operate between 12:00 and 23:00 hours, with switch off of the ventilation system at 23:00 hours. The fact that the condenser unit to the walk-in chiller is positioned almost, if not immediately beneath habitable rooms to Flat One does not appear to have been included, despite the fact that this is likely to run and to cut on and off throughout any night. The report also seems to exclude consideration of the way in which rear rooms of Flat 3 may be impacted by noise from the nearby flue outlet. We would also question the assumption that mitigation would not be required in a case where one existing dwelling is converted into multiple residential unit, page 15, paragraph 6.

Flat 1: The report makes certain assumptions in respect of sound absorbtion once the premises is furnished. However, it also clearly states that a laminate floor will be provided meaning that sound absorbtion from soft furnishings is likely to be minimal. Average day time measurements (Figs 6 & 7, page 10) show a 'best case' scenario, indicating that with windows open (rather than closed as during the assessment period) a level of 39 to 44 dB could be expected meaning that windows would need to be kept closed if they were to comply with BS8233 guidance. Although, night time levels would appear to be acceptable, as stated intermittent condenser noise must be factored in to this calculation.

Flat 2: The assessment notes (page 6) that the site 'was already a residential dwelling' and therefore a 5dB relaxation can be allowed to guidance figures in BS8233. However, it is also to be noted that this was previously a much bigger residential unit where it would have been possible to use alternative rooms should noise from the road be unacceptable; also that those bedrooms facing the road in Flats 2 and 3 are the main, double bedrooms. I therefore see no reason why this relaxation should be applied. The fact that the assessment was carried with the windows closed means 10-15dB may be added to represent the actual noise level so that these rooms do not accord with the requirements of BS8233.

In respect of noise at the rear bedroom to flat 2, then the fact that this window was 'cracked open' seems to indicate that this does not properly reflect the situation of an 'open window.'

Overall, mitigation methods should be prescribed to enable guidance for noise levels in bedrooms and living/dining rooms as described in BS 8233 to be achieved. The applicant must also have regard to suitable and sufficient ventilation of these rooms. Due to the above, then I cannot agree to discharge of planning condition on the basis of this report.