

Subject: RE: APP/23/00127 Wartsila 4 Marples Way



Good Afternoon Leanne,

Please find below our response to the comments on the noise assessment from our noise consultant. I trust this addresses the concerns raised by your EHO colleagues. I look forward to your response confirming the information provided to date suffices.

*The initial BS4142:2014 +A1:2019 assessment indicates that the noise generated by the dust filtration unit is likely to have a **low adverse impact** at receptors to the north of the site.*

The assessment has been made for daytime hours (defined in accordance with the relevant standard) as it is understood that the unit only operates in this period. The ambient noise environment is largely dominated by the A27 dual carriageway, and this is clearly audible in the residential areas north of the site.

The rating level used in the assessment has been based on the audibility of the filtration unit in residential areas. It is accepted that the unit is a substantial piece of kit and in isolation generates a high level of noise, however, this unit was considered to be barely audible on the north side in Abrams Way and an existing compressor unit located on the north boundary was the more likely source. However, a penalty of +2 dB was added for this location based on the unit's potential audibility if the compressor unit did not operate. For the location to the north-west in Abrams Way, the filtration unit was just audible but a more conservative higher tonal penalty of +4 dB was added to calculate the rating value which the noise consultant considered to be sufficient based on audibility.

With regards to impulsive/intermittent noise based on the observations and discussions with site staff it appears that this unit runs on a continuous basis during the normal working day, and for the survey, arrangements had to be made to get the unit switched off for background measurements. Close to the unit there is a low level rhythmic 'thump thump' noise but this largely disappears when more than 5m from the unit when the motor/fan unit is more audible. Based on this, it was considered that a penalty for this was not warranted. A review of the one-third octave band data on the day also indicated no specific low frequency components that dominated in the local environment except that generated by traffic noise.

*So, even allowing for a higher tonal penalty at each of the two affected locations (+6 dB) the rating level for both receptors is considered to be just below the existing daytime background noise levels and therefore still considered to have a **low adverse impact**.*

It is considered that there are number of existing controls in place to minimise noise disturbance, this includes no overnight running, the unit has been located behind existing buildings in order to minimise line of sight to properties in Abrams Way, and ductwork has been insulated, even if this is for thermal reasons this should provide a degree of noise attenuation.

As discussed in the main report, the main recommendation is to continue the good practice being used on the site to minimise noise disturbances from the operation of this unit. However, further measures could be taken to satisfy the requirements of the EHO, which would include enclosing the main motor unit and ensuring any exhaust/intake vent openings are located towards the southern boundary away from Abrams Way.

Kind regards,

Beth

Elisabeth Pywell MRTPI

Associate Director

CBRE | Planning and Development