

## **Environmental Health Consultee Comments for Planning**

Application Number: S62A/2023/0019

Location: Land to the north of Roseacres, between Parsonage Road and Smiths Green Lane, Takeley, Essex, CM22 6NZ (Land known as Bull Field, Warish Hall Farm, Takeley, Essex)

Full planning application for Access to/from Parsonage Road between Weston Group Business Centre and Innovation Centre buildings leading to: 96 dwellings on Bulls Field, south of Prior's Wood, including associated parking, landscaping, public open space, land for the expansion of Roseacres Primary School, pedestrian and cycle routes to Smiths Green Lane together with associated infrastructure

### **Lead Consultee**

Name: J Mann

Title: Senior Environmental Health Officer

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: 25 October 2023

### **Comments**

I refer to the submission of additional information by the applicant dated 29 September and 3 October 2023 for the above application. In particular, Consultation Response Document 28.09.23, Appendix A letter from SES and Appendix B Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). I have the following additional comments on the new submissions. The original comments dated 24 August remain applicable.

### **Noise**

I note that the school extension will be the subject of a separate application (Consultation Response Document section 2.10 and 2.11) and potential noise impacts from the extended school would be considered as part of that application. The applicant states that a 1.8m close boarded timber fence, and 1.8m brick wall is proposed along most of the boundary with the school and a small chain link access gate. The SES letter does not indicate what sound level reduction would be achieved by the proposed fences and wall.

A general rule is that a single barrier at eye level with a source and receiver will reduce the level by approximately 5dB. (ref ISO9613-2:1996)

I note that this is a full planning application and therefore the amenity of the residential properties and gardens along the boundary with the school will have to be considered carefully as part of the school extension application. It should be noted that considering the two applications separately in this way might lead to greater restrictions on the layout and location of noisy activities within the school extension application due to the fixed layout of the new housing in this application once permission is granted. This limits the opportunity for Good Acoustic Design to minimise impacts on future residents and lessen restrictions on the school.

I note the applicants comments that existing properties are closer to the existing commercial facilities and therefore they do not anticipate noise issues from these sources. However, they have not provided any additional details regarding these noise sources in the revised submissions and therefore the extent of any potential impacts on future residents is currently unknown.

The SES Appendix A refers to changes in the trigger points for the recommended 4 noise conditions in my original comments. However, I was unable to find details of the proposed changes in the Consultation Response Document which states;

“2.13. The EHO suggests 4no. conditions covering the following details, which the Applicant is happy to agree to be added to the decision notice should the Application be approved albeit that the Applicant does not feel that the 7 Acres development would cause any detrimental harm in terms of noise:

1. Internal noise protection scheme;
2. External noise protection scheme;
3. Noise impact from 7 Acres parcel; and
4. Noise impact from air source heat pumps “

### Contaminated Land

The SES Appendix A states,

“The EHO has requested further justification regarding why the linkage between the source and receptor is not potentially active. The reason for this is that during the site intrusive investigation works, no linkages were identified which is understandable based on the previous land use of the proposed development site. As such no contamination was found to exist and therefore no active linkage pathways were identified. It should however be noted that the Construction Environmental Management Plan does include a method for dealing with any unforeseen contamination should this be discovered during the construction process.”

The only land contamination investigation document submitted was the Stansted Environmental Services Desk Study and Preliminary Risk

Assessment dated 3 February 21. This document did not include any details of intrusive investigation works undertaken or soil sampling results. It may be that there is a phase 2 site investigation report that has not been formally submitted?

I would like to reiterate that further information is required with respect to land contamination risks and I would like to reiterate that the condition I previously recommended is attached to any permission granted.

The applicants Consultation Response Document (CRD) states

“2.15. The EHO then goes onto suggest a contamination related condition, to be added to the decision notice, should the Application be approved. The Applicant is happy in general with the proposed condition wording, with the exception of some minor amendments to the trigger for part C of the condition, details of which is provided in Section 4. “

As noted above I was unable to find details of the applicants proposed changes to condition wording so am unable to comment further on this point.

#### External Lighting

It is noted that the applicant has agreed to the suggested condition in CRD 2.16.

#### Air Quality

The applicants' comments regarding Building Regulations Part S is noted (CRD 2.18) and the proposed vehicle charging point condition is therefore no longer necessary.

#### Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

The revised CEMP is satisfactory and the proposed condition requiring a CEMP is not considered necessary subject to the applicant complying with the submitted CEMP in full.