

From: Richard Hume
Sent: 06 November 2018 10:34
To: DCAdmin
Cc: John Ritchie
Subject: 2018/93136 - Discharge condition 4 (noise) on 2018/91253 for two dwellings at land adj, 710, Bradford Road, Birkenshaw, BD11 2AE

Hi John

2018/93136 - Discharge conditions 4 (noise), 6-9 (intrusive site investigation) and 11 (materials) on previous permission 2018/91253 for erection of two dwellings at land adj, 710, Bradford Road, Birkenshaw, BD11 2AE

In our previous response dated 31 Oct 2018 we recommend that condition 4 was not discharged for a number of reasons. In response an email from Paul Horsley dated 5 Nov 2018 has been received.

Mr Horsley correctly advises that a North orientation is included on the plan, which I had missed.

He also advises that from the orientation of the site "the location of mitigation is obvious". Whilst I would agree that the location of mitigation measures is obvious the report does advise, at the bottom of page 17, that "*further mitigation would be necessary to provide rapid ventilation for the occupants other than opening a window along the northern elevation of the premises*". The Northern elevation has just a single window opening for a non-habitable room and is not the elevation where open windows will give rise to unacceptable indoor sound levels. To accept a report with such an error would mean that we may be subsequently unable to require provision of the additional ventilation in the rooms where it is necessary. I would again recommend that the rooms requiring the additional ventilation provision should be clearly marked on a plan and so avoid any doubt as to where this ventilation is required.

Mr Horsley clarifies that it is just the ceilings to 2nd floor level that require double boarding.

Mr Horsley advises that the final choice of additional ventilation provision for the development is outside his remit and his report made recommendations on some of the options available. I accept his position regarding this but condition 4 does require full details of all the necessary noise mitigation measures, including ventilation. The applicant would therefore need to provide details of the additional ventilation measures recommended in the report.

Recommendations

I again recommend that condition 4 should not be discharged because:-

- of the error on page 17 of the report which inaccurately advises which rooms require additional ventilation and also
- Details of the ventilation measures, that form part of the noise mitigation measures, are still required from the applicant.

Regards

Richard

RICHARD HUME

Environmental Health Officer, Pollution & Noise Control

Kirklees Council (Environmental Health), Flint Street, Fartown, Huddersfield, HD1 6LG

tel: 01484 221000 - Automated switchboard ask for Richard Hume or key 70909

This email and any attachments are confidential. If you have received it in error - notify the sender immediately, delete it from your system, and do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way. Kirklees Council monitors all emails sent or received.

From: John Ritchie
Sent: 05 November 2018 11:42
To: Richard Hume <Richard.Hume@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: 2018/93136 - 710 Bradford Road, Birkenshaw

Hi richard – following your consultation response of 30 October 2018 the agent has sent the attached response.

Can I have your comments??

John

John Ritchie
Development Management
Investment and Regeneration Service
Kirklees Planning, PO BOX B93, Civic Centre III, Huddersfield, HD1 2JR

✉ john.ritchie@kirklees.gov.uk
🌐 www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning



The information contained in this e-mail, and any files transmitted with it, is confidential to the intended recipient(s). The dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message or its contents is prohibited unless authorised by the sender. If you receive this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete the message from your system.