
From: public.access@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk
Sent: 12 March 2024 16:24
To: Planning Application Comments
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 23/00330/OUT

Consultee comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

A consultee has commented on a Planning Application. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12/03/2024 4:24 PM from Mr Giles Rawdon (giles.rawdon@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk) on behalf of HBBC ES Pollution 2.

Application Summary

Reference:	23/00330/OUT
Address:	Earl Shilton Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) Mill Lane Earl Shilton Leicestershire
Proposal:	Outline application to include up to 500 dwellings, a primary school / education use (Class F1), retail (Class E), community hub (Class E/F1/F2), hot food takeaway (Sui Generis), accesses from Mill Lane and Astley Road and infrastructure including; public open space, SUDS, landscaping, the provision of associated infrastructure and ancillary works. Outline - all matters reserved except for access (EIA development).
Case Officer:	Alex Jelley

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

I have the following comments on the Environmental Statement Addendum:

Noise

I have concerns relating to Off Site Traffic Noise:

Comments: Can the applicant confirm that the description of Do Minimum within the Noise Section of the Environmental Statement Addendum is the same as that within the Air quality section- i.e.: "2026 Do Minimum (DM) Scenario (Assessed opening year that includes committed developments within the area but excludes the Proposed Development)"

Are the predicted noise levels in tables 3-9 to 3-11 façade or free field?

Have the assumptions made in section 4.3.20 been accepted by LCC transport?
Have these been catered for in the noise model?

Section 3.5.6 states that there has been an investigation into the input data and that Astley Road and Alexander Lane traffic inputs have potentially been over estimated giving rise to a worst case scenario. This should be justified and, if LCC agree on this, more accurate data used to provide predicted noise levels.

Section 3.57/3.58

On Mill Lane the section discusses a high impact on a medium sensitivity receptor giving a moderate adverse outcome. This is then said to be not significant due to being 6dB below the SOAEL. The predicted noise level is still 4dB above the LOAEL and is due to the development (there is an 11dB difference between do minimum and do something).

As per the summary table 3.1 within the Environmental Statement Addendum the NPPG provides effect levels in relation to adverse impacts on health and quality of life. The action for exceedance of the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) – level above which adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected, is to mitigate and reduce to a minimum. This is discussed in section 3.2.8:

“In relation to the effect levels summarised in Table 3-1, NPSE8 sets out three aims:

Avoid developments or activities which are demonstrated to have significant observed adverse effects i.e. Greater than the soael;

Mitigate and minimise developments or activities where the effect lies between the loael and the soael; and

Contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life through the effective management and control of environmental noise”.

On Astley Road the SOAEL is predicted to be exceeded and high resolution modelling has been carried out to determine individual properties where the SOAEL is exceeded. 10 Properties are predicted to exceed the SOAEL and mitigation is advised. As per my comments above other properties in the area will lie between the LOAEL and SOAEL where action should be to mitigate and minimise and this should be considered where the development is giving rise to those noise levels.

The above comments are also relevant to the remaining paragraphs in sections 3.5.and 3.6.

Section 3.5.9

States that “the easternmost façade does not appear to have any critical teaching spaces” This should be clarified with the school.

The section also states that the predicted noise levels include peak AM and PM traffic figures and that this would be outside school teaching hours. To justify this statement traffic figures for teaching hours should be used to predict the impact of traffic noise during the relevant times so that an appropriate assessment can be made.

Section 3.5.11

As above Traffic figures relevant to the schools opening times could be used to assess traffic noise.

Section 3.5.12

Mitigation is suggested in the form of an acoustic barrier. Predictions should be provided to show post mitigation noise levels. This may also benefit classroom noise.

Industrial Noise

I would recommend a condition is applied to provide that development sound levels do not exceed the background sound levels at the worst affected receptors.

AQ

Have the assumptions made in section 4.3.20 been accepted by LCC transport?

Land

There is a potential for land to have been contaminated from past use. Ground

investigation should be undertaken to confirm the presence of pollutants including pesticides and herbicides. This could be conditioned.

Lighting

Lighting is an important element and will need to be considered. Guidance from the Institution of Lighting Professionals should be referenced and the assessment carried out for an appropriate Environmental Zone. I cannot find an assessment in the documents provided.

Odour

I have no further comments regarding odour from the Waste Water Treatment Site based upon the current design.

Construction Phase

I would recommend that a Construction Environmental Management Plan is conditioned for this site due to the scale of development, likely timescale and proximity of sensitive receptors.

Kind regards