Subject: Re: CDN/24/0943- Land Between Simister Street And Jonas Street
Date: Thursday 19 December 2024 at 14:07:05 Greenwich Mean Time
From: Daniel Tomlinson
To: Katie Raw

Katie,

See below from the acoustician on the latest request from the EHO. He has tried calling to no avail. Can you forward on to the EHO, thanks.

This is a difficult query to give a straight answer to and, again, if the Officer would call it could be sorted out much more easily than exchanging emails.

The Officer is essentially asking us to do something which is wrong. It is a common misunderstanding that, because a source of noise has characteristic features, then penalties must be added. This is not correct - the characteristic features have to be present at the receiver position, not at the source. Even ignoring the numerous worst case assumptions throughout the modelling, the predicted levels are well below the lowest measured background levels. Keep in mind that the background level used in the assessment was the lowest 5 minute L_{A90} level. This is the level exceeded for 90% of the time, ie. the lowest 10% of the lowest 5 minute period – the lowest 30 seconds. And the predicted level at the most exposed position was 3 dB below that. I cannot see that a penalty is appropriate and that remains our opinion. If the Officer disagrees, than that is their right, and they can take a view on the effect of adding penalties. But it is not reasonable to ask us to alter an assessment to something we consider to be wrong.

The report states:-

'We can see that the levels at the proposed house facades and the nearest gardens show levels up to 34 dB L_{Aeq}. These are well below the typical daytime background levels, and in fact below even the lowest single 5 minute measurement of 37 dB L_{A90}. In our view, characteristic features are unlikely to be "readily distinctive against the residual sound", as BS 4142 puts it. But there is ample headroom for any corrections which others might feel appropriate.'

The last sentence in the above extract was included specifically to avoid this kind of query. The Officer has not said that they think there should be penalties, just that they wish to see appropriate penalties. In our view appropriate penalties are none at all and we can't just change that view because we are asked to. If the Officer disagrees, then they can consider the effect of a penalty themselves (perhaps +3 dB if they feel that characteristics in general are "readily distinctive against the residual acoustic sound" then the rating levels could be up to 37 dB L_{Ar} and the "initial estimate" would still rate as still rate as "low impact depending on the context").

So, with the above paragraph, I have in effect given the officer what was asked for, but I need to be clear that the penalty illustrated is not appropriate in our opinion.

Regards

Andrew Raymond
ADC Acoustics