

Louise Morton
Quadrant Town Planning
The Office,
14 Harcourt Close,
Henley on Thames,
OXON
RG9 1UZ

5th May 2015
Ref: 2014/0677/L3

Dear Louise

Westminster Kingsway College – Planning Amendments and Application

You are intending to make a Section 73 application to amend the original scheme so that a roller shutter door is installed between one of the workshops and the open service yard. The question has arisen as to the noise effects of this change.

You are also intending to make a new planning application to amend the proposed external areas used by students. You have asked about the noise effects of the enlargement of the amenity space and the introduction of the smoking shelter.

I discuss these separately below:

1) Roller Shutter Door

The roller shutter would be about 2m x 2m. The type used would include thermal insulation in a double skin construction. This type of construction has a sound dampening effect. This would avoid, when being opened and closed, the clattering associated with traditional single skin designs. Notwithstanding this the use of the roller shutter would be intermittent and college hours only. The college would ensure that the roller shutter would not be left open for extended periods at times that there were power tools being used within the workshop.

Therefore taking account of this the noise effects of the roller shutter provision can be expected to be insignificant, so noise should not be a reason for refusing consent.

2) Enlargement of the Amenity Space

It is proposed that the paved area of external amenity space be increased by 20-25 % and the question has arisen as to the noise impact of that upon the adjacent residences on Westking Place

The proposed extended area is at the Sidmouth Street end of the amenity area.

The extended area is a similar distance from the residents as the existing area, therefore any effects relate only to the area enlargement.



If the numbers of students using the space is unchanged, then we would expect noise levels to be unchanged too as people would be just slightly more dispersed.

However it could be argued that the extra space would encourage more students to use the space. If that were the case one could reasonably assume that the density of users would be similar to currently, and therefore the effect would be to increase the occupancy by 20-25%.

On a simple number basis an increase in numbers of 20-25% would equate to a noise level increase of 1dBA only. Normally an increase of 3dBA would be considered just perceptible. Therefore this increase in area of the amenity space can be expected to have an imperceptible change in the noise levels at the residences.

Therefore noise should not be a reason for refusing consent for this proposal.

2) Smoking Shelter

A small smoking shelter is proposed to be constructed within the current cycle bay area adjacent to Westking Place.

In itself numbers of people within the shelter will not be significant in the context of the numbers using the adjoining amenity space. However as a place of shelter it will be used more than the open areas and so it would be appropriate to consider mitigation as practicable, this being consistent with guidance in paragraph 123 of the NPPF that one should *"mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development"*

We have discussed with Gibberd and agreed that the mitigation will take the following form:

- a) Along the Westking place boundary of the cycle parking area and the refuse enclosure a solid timber fence shall be constructed 2m high and;
- b) On this same boundary where the smoking shelter will be the timber fence will extend up to the underside of the solid roof to the smoking shelter.

These measures will provide some screening to the residences from both the smoking shelter and amenity space.

Therefore noise should not be a reason for refusing this proposal.

Yours sincerely

Neil Jarman