

To:	Lucy Robinson	From:	Dan Saunders
Company:	Henry Adams	Pages:	1
cc:	Peter Cleveland; Matt Twinberrow	Date:	04 September 2026
		Ref:	AS14674.260903.TN1.0
Project:	Interbridges Site, New Brighton Road, Emsworth		
Subject:	Response to Environmental Health Consultation (ref. APP/24/01010)		

We understand that following submission of our Noise Impact Assessment dated 24th July 2026 (ref. AS14674.260630.R1) to accompany the full planning application at the above site, the Environmental Health team at Havant Borough Council have returned comments requesting further information in relation to our report.

We have, therefore, provided some additional detail beyond the assessment presented in the planning report below, and undertaken a further sensitivity check focused specifically on tonal reversing alarms.

As a deliberately conservative test, we have applied the full BS 4142 corrections of +6 dB for clearly perceptible tonality and +3 dB for readily distinctive intermittency to the cumulative specific sound levels in Table 8.3 of the report. This produces the following results:

- Malvern Mews: $L_{A,r,Tr}$ 45dB against a representative Background Sound Level of L_{A90} 45dB;
- Sultan Road: $L_{A,r,Tr}$ 49dB against a representative Background Sound Level of L_{A90} 50dB;
- Northlands Park: $L_{A,r,Tr}$ 41dB against a representative Background Sound Level of L_{A90} 53dB.

The resulting rating levels, therefore, remain at or below the representative background sound levels at every receptor, even under this intentionally pessimistic scenario.

This sensitivity test assumes that the maximum tonal and intermittent corrections apply to the cumulative sound from all vehicle movements, loading and unloading, and forklift activity. In practice, only the reversing-alarm component would exhibit this character; the other contributing activities wouldn't all be tonal or intermittent at the receptors. The test therefore materially overstates the likely character correction but provides a useful additional margin of confidence.

We have also considered the reversing alarm separately on a frequency-specific basis. After allowing for distance propagation and screening from the railway embankment, the predicted reversing-alarm contribution at 2 kHz is well below the representative 2 kHz environmental sound level measured at the site. The existing soundscape is dominated by A27 road traffic and contains sustained mid-frequency sound, providing useful masking in the frequency range within which a conventional tonal reversing alarm would be most noticeable. The vehicle calculations include receptor-specific distance and screening corrections for forklift reversing alarms.

There is also relevant operational context. Because of the 3.5 m bridge-height restrictions on either side of the entrance, the largest vehicle expected to access the site is a 7.5-tonne panel van. The overall fleet is likely to include smaller LGVs, many of which may not be equipped with reversing alarms. It is, therefore, unlikely that every assessed vehicle movement would generate tonal reversing-alarm noise.

There will inevitably be variability in the duration and location of manoeuvres, the screening available, and the number of occurrences during any particular hour. Taking account of the additional worst-case sensitivity test, the frequency-specific comparison and the likely vehicle mix, the +2 dB tonal correction adopted in the assessment can be seen to be proportionate and suitably cautious.

More importantly, even if the full +6 dB tonal and +3 dB intermittency corrections were applied to the entire cumulative sound level, the assessment outcome would remain unchanged: the Rating Level would not exceed the representative Background Sound Level at any receptor, indicating a low impact in BS 4142 terms.

In conclusion, the assessment withstands a deliberately conservative sensitivity test, providing further confidence that tonal reversing alarms are unlikely to adversely affect residential amenity or result in a material risk of noise complaints.