

# Public Document Pack

## AMENDMENT SHEET

### DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 13TH APRIL, 2022

The following amendment sheet was circulated at the Development Management Committee meeting. It sets out any proposed amendments and updates to reports since the agenda was published.

This page is intentionally left blank

**AMENDMENT SHEET FOR**  
**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**  
**13<sup>th</sup> April 2022**

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Page 2

Minute 60(i) add ‘..subject to completion of a planning obligation by 26<sup>th</sup> March 2022.’

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Page 9 and 10

**SECTION A – Future Items for Committee**

Future items should be numbered as follows:

- 1 – Land at Former Lafarge Site**
- 2 – Block 3 Queensmead**
- 3 – Aldershot Bus Station**
- 4 – Farnborough Civic Quarter**

Add to items 4a and 4b to table on page 10:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Description and address</b>
<b>4a</b>	22/00068/REM	<p>PART APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS: for the erection of 9 dwellings (Phase1), including internal access roads, public open space, parking, lighting and associated infrastructure, pursuant to Condition 3 (1-24) of Hybrid Outline Planning Permission 17/00914/OUTPP dated 15th May 2020</p> <p><b>Land At Blandford House and Malta Barracks Development Site, Shoe Lane, Aldershot, Hampshire</b></p> <p>Further submissions to address consultation responses have been received and re-consultation is currently being carried out.</p>
<b>4b</b>	22/00138/REMPP	<p>PART APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS: for the erection of 76 dwellings (Phase 2), including internal access roads, public open space, parking, lighting and associated infrastructure, following demolition of existing buildings and hardstanding, pursuant to Condition 3 (1-24) of Hybrid Outline Planning Permission 17/00914/OUTPP dated 15th May 2020.</p>

		<p><b>Land At Blandford House And Malta Barracks Development Site, Shoe Lane, Aldershot, Hampshire</b></p> <p>Further submissions to address consultation responses have been received and re-consultation is currently being carried out.</p>
--	--	--

**Updates to Report :**

**Item 5: Page 13 - 30**

Application No. 21/00980/FULPP

Proposal Erection of a bungalow with access from Minster Close

Address 63 Cambridge Road East, Farmborough Hampshire, GU14 6QX

Amended recommendation: **DEFER** consideration of this application

Following publication of the agenda, the applicant has indicated the intention to submit revised plans seeking to address matters raised by respondents to notification. It is recommended that consideration is deferred to facilitate review and consultation of revised submissions.

**Item 5: Page 31 - 38**

Application No. 21/00947/FULPP

Proposal Alterations to front elevation and change of use of first and second floors from offices to nightclub

Address 101 Victoria Road Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1JE

On 8<sup>th</sup> of April the applicants' agent submitted a Noise Assessment (DAA GROUP. Noise Impact Assessment. 101 Victoria Road, Aldershot, Hampshire, GU11 1JE, 15<sup>th</sup> January 2022. Issue 1).

The Council's Environmental Health officer has reviewed the documentation and has provided the following comments;

"The report is dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 2022 so I'm a little disappointed that we are only getting this now.

The report does not address noise from the proposed external smoking area and roof terrace. Environmental Health objection stills stands on this aspect of the application.

Environmental Health also object to the proposed closing time on a Saturday/Sunday morning of 6am. Noise on the street late early in morning from customers accessing and egressing the premises, particularly if there is access to the rear car park will likely significantly adversely impact on local amenity. Such opening times will also draw customers from other venues in the area who close much earlier than the hours presented here.

The submitted Noise Impact Assessment proposes a breakout noise criteria that does not adequately account for low frequency noise. Bass noise, in the region of 63 and 125 Hz , is notoriously difficult to contain from entertainment venues and the impulsive, non-steady character of low frequency music noise can be particularly disturbing to residents exposed to it. Environmental Health would not consider it acceptable for noise from activities at the application site to be audible within existing residential premises. Whilst the concept of inaudibility is quite subjective, there are more appropriate noise criteria that should be employed to ensure the overall LAeq and the 63 Hz and 125 Hz octave band noise levels (Leq) are controlled sufficiently to render noise in adjoining residential premises virtually inaudible.

The Consultants have recommended treatments for glazing, doors, party walls and ceiling roof. Whether this is sufficient to protect adjoining residents from airborne noise will be down to the workmanship of the installation. As mentioned, low frequency noise has not been adequately considered so bass noise could still be audible, and there is little consideration for structure borne transmission of noise. The floor of the night club seems to have been overlooked, so the impact of customers dancing, plus amplified music, could result in both structure-borne noise and vibration being transmitted across party walls, particularly if the properties are structurally connected. The cost of such noise mitigation is likely to be significant and the applicant needs to have fully accounted for such works within submitted plans. The Noise Management Plan in Paragraph 8 of the Report advises a sound limiter will be installed to mitigate breakout noise. The standard of workmanship when installing noise mitigation measures is key as any flaws/gaps will seriously undermine the integrity of the intended insulation. The consequence of the insulation failing to properly prevent breakout of noise/vibration may be that any sound limiter will need to be set at such a low level to make the levels of noise within the venue unacceptable to customers, thereby making the business potentially unviable.

Doors and windows will need to be kept closed to prevent the break out of noise from the premises and an alternative means of ventilation and air-conditioning will be required. Details of three new condenser units are provided, to be located it appears on the roof of the premises (although this is unclear from the submitted documents). The report recommends that these be enclosed within an acoustic enclosure that can achieve at least a 12dB sound reduction. This element is considered acceptable if the location is on the roof as seemingly indicated and space permits such an enclosure.

Overall, there is still significant uncertainty as to whether noise from the use of the premises as a night club can be adequately controlled, and Environmental Health would not be comfortable recommending approval even with conditions, based on what has been submitted. Environmental Health still object to use of the proposed external smoking area and roof terrace and the proposed opening hours.”

The committee report was prepared prior to receipt and assessment of the report. However, fundamental concerns remain. The report does not satisfactorily address concerns regarding structure-borne noise/ vibration from the floor plate and noise breakout from the smoking area. It is also not clear how successful floating walls and ceilings would be with the layout of the venue as suggested – especially given the need for entrance/ exit doors, stairwells and ventilation. The report is silent regarding management of noise from patrons entering and leaving the venue during the night/early morning. The report therefore does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposals would not result in harm to residential amenities.

Amend recommended reason for refusal as follows:

“The proposed night club, given its hours of operation, provision of an outdoor terrace/ smoking area, potential for acoustic volume and vibrations, and its proximity to residential occupiers, would be likely to give rise to noise pollution that would result in adverse harm to the amenities of adjacent residential occupiers. **No satisfactory evidence has been** provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in such harm. As a result, the development would be contrary to Policy DE10 of the Local Plan.”