HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Development Control
FROM:	Environmental Health and Licensing
REFERENCE:	DISC/23/0270
LOCATION:	Grainingfold, Horsham Road, Five Oaks, West Sussex, RH14 9AT
DESCRIPTION:	Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 1a (b and c if necessary), and 2 to approved application DC/23/1873 (Prior Notification for Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 2No dwellinghouses (C3 Use class)).
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION: Comments relating to below information: Albury S.I. Ltd Phase 2 Report on a Site Investigation, dated February 2024 Acoustic South letter dated 02.02.24	

MAIN COMMENTS:

Condition 1

We have reviewed the Albury S.I. Ltd Phase 2 Report on a Site Investigation, dated February 2024, and we have the following comments to make.

1. We note that samples were collected from the made ground at locations BH1 and BH4 and no elevated levels of contaminants were detected at these locations which is welcomed.
2. From reviewing the log for BH3 we note that 0.5m of made ground was detected and samples were collected from a variety of depths – we note however none of the samples from this location appear to have been scheduled for chemical analysis. Given that this trial pit was located in an area of the site likely to become soft landscaped/garden area we would welcome some chemical testing of made ground soils at this location. We note that the nature of the made ground changes between 0.20m and 0.50m, following the principles of BS10175 the samples should therefore be collected from both of these made ground stratas.
3. We note that elevated levels of poly-aromatic hydrocarbons have been detected at 0.10m at location BH6 with the report recommending further testing in this part of the site to delineate the lateral extent of the contamination in this part of the site – we support this recommendation.

Given the above we are unable to recommend the discharge of condition 1 at this time.

Condition 2

We have reviewed the Acoustic South letter dated 02.02.24 and we have the following comments to make.

1. The additional comments in section 1 are noted and with regards to the overheating risk we note that The Simplified Method as set out in Approved Document O is referenced. It is our interpretation of ADO that the Simplified Method can however only be used where it can be demonstrated that the dwelling has cross-ventilation i.e. it has opening on opposite facades. From reviewing the internal layout it is apparent however that the bedrooms will not have opening on opposite facades and will therefore not allow cross ventilation.
2. The letter report also only considers noise levels at night, as ADO only specifies noise levels for closed windows at night, and does not address what noise levels would necessitate windows being close during the day. With this in mind, we have revisited the noise survey and we note that daytime noise levels in the northern part of the site will be in the region of 60-65dB. With this in mind, allowing for 13dB reduction in these levels for an open window, noise levels in living rooms facing the A264 have the potential to be in the region of 47-52dB and so well above the 35dB level quoted in BS 8233:2014. With windows open noise levels in the living room on the southern façade of the development are also likely to be significantly high.
3. Having operable windows and/or patio doors serving living rooms, in particular the living room facing the A264, is therefore likely to significantly prejudice internal noise levels in living rooms. It is however not clear what the overheating risk to living rooms is and, if rooms are at risk, what ventilation is proposed.
4. Due to road traffic noise levels we also note that with the exception of bedroom 1 to plot 2 none of the bedroom windows can be opened to prevent overheating and ensure that an acceptable level of thermal comfort is maintained.
5. If there is a medium or high risk of overheating in habitable rooms, the applicant may need to conduct an overheating assessment in line with CIBSE's TM59 modelling.

6. We are happy for further overheating assessment to be undertaken as detailed above, however given the scale of the development a way forward may be for all habitable rooms in both plots to be served by mechanical ventilation.
7. Finally, we also note that mitigation in the form of acoustic fencing is proposed along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site which is welcomed. We are however unsure if a 2m high acoustic fence along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site is acceptable to the LPA from a visual perspective. As any proposed fencing along the northern and eastern boundaries would also sit outside of the red boundary line of this application it is also not clear to Environmental Health if the installation of this fencing can be secured through this discharge of condition application.

Given the above unfortunately we are not in a position where we can recommend the discharge of condition 2 at this time.

We would welcome dialogue with the applicants consultants on the above matters.

NAME:	Kevin Beer
DEPARTMENT:	Environmental Health and Licensing
DATE:	20/06/24