

Technical Note



Edmund House
12-22 Newhall Street
Birmingham
B3 3AS
0121 389 1472

info@airandacoustics.co.uk
airandacoustics.co.uk

Weybridge Business Park

Job Number: 100492	Date: 19 January 2023	Client: Bridge Industrial
Prepared By: DS	Reviewed By: DS	Approved By: DS

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Air & Acoustic Consultants Limited (AAC) have been commissioned by Bridge Industrial to prepare this Technical Note (TN) to address further comments received from Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) regarding the noise assessment submitted in support of the application to develop Weybridge Business Park.
- 1.2. This second Technical Note is provided in response to further comments received from RBC regarding the initial Technical Note and addresses each point in the order that they were presented.

Runnymede EHO Comments

- 1.3. Noise receptor R06 has been identified in Table 5 of the applicant's noise impact assessment 'Addendum Note' dated 18/10/22 as having a +4.5 dBA difference (night-time) resulting from a BS4142:2014+A1:2019 assessment and is at the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level. At such level the noise falls to be further reduced through appropriately detailed/calculated/modelled mitigation measures. This appears to be an omission as exactly the same difference is identified in respect of R08 and mitigation is outlined in respect of that receptor. Further reasoning: BS4142:2014+A1:2019 outlines that a 'difference of around +5 dB is likely to be an indication of an adverse impact, depending on the context'. The standard also states that 'Rounding is to be done on the basis that a value of 0.5 is rounded up' Runnymede's policy EE2:Environmental Protection (which accords with NPPF on noise and NPSE) states that '...all proposals resulting or being subject to external impacts above Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level will be expected to implement measures to mitigate and reduce noise impacts to a minimum'. No further comments are made at this time until further mitigation is proposed in respect of receptor R06 (in the addendum as one receptor, R07, differs in location between original and addendum).

AAC Response

- 1.4. The rating level at the receptor R08 has been reduced as a result of the inclusion of a noise barrier which is to be installed on the boundary of this part of the site, which is just the north of Addlestone Road. The barrier is primarily placed to protect receptors R04 and R05 which have noise rating levels of 11 dB and 9.7 dB above the background sound level.
- 1.5. While the noise level at R08 is mitigated by the inclusion of this barrier, mitigation for R08 was not the reason for the barrier to be included and this benefit is incidental and does not identify a deliberate variation in the approach to mitigation between R06 and R08.
- 1.6. If there was another receptor in a similar location to R06 but closer to the site which was predicted to receive a noise rating level in excess of 5 dB above the background sound level, mitigation would need to be installed

which would also result in an additional benefit in the form of a noise reduction to the noise rating level at R06.

- 1.7. From the RBC comment, it is accepted that a sound level of 0.5 dB should be rounded up set out in the comment which quotes BS4142:2014+A1:2019 and it is also accepted that this rounding up which would make the rating level at R06 to be 5.0 dB above the background sound level (when calculated to 1 decimal place). To ensure that the rating level at R06 is lower than 5.0 dB above the background mitigation can be specified to reduce the noise rating level at R06 by 0.1 dB and this would result in a rating level of 4.4 dB above background, which would then be rounded down (to 1 decimal place) to 4 dB above the background and therefore be considered acceptable.
- 1.8. The mitigation require to reduce the noise level by 0.1 dB (to achieve 4.4 dB above background rounded down to 4dB) would be a small barrier around 0.5 m high along part of the eastern boundary of the southern part of the site.
- 1.9. The original assessment was based upon a reasonable worst-case in terms of the operational development scenarios, and it is considered unlikely that this worst case would be experience regularly and so for the majority of the time the operational noise levels would be lower than this.
- 1.10. The BS4142:2014+A1:2019 guidance discusses the consideration of the context of the noise and the environment in any assessment and while it is accepted that specifying the noise to 1 decimal place results in a level of 5dB above the background, in reality this issue comes down to a variance of 0.1 dB which in acoustic terms is negligible and AAC do not consider that the intent of the BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 guidance was for it to be interpreted and used in this way.

Runneymede EHO Comments

- 1.11. Treatment of temporary moorings. The pre-application advice commissioned by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) 'Environoise' recommended at 2.15 that the narrowboat moorings be assessed. The addendum from the applicant's noise consultant declined to do so for their reasons set out in said addendum at 4.3. I would suggest it is a matter for the LPA to determine whether to assess the noise impact to the amenity of users of these moorings on the River Wey Navigation (noting comments asserting below threshold of nuisance).

AAC Response

- 1.12. It is not clear whether this comment requires any additional information from AAC and we stand by our reasoning within section 4.3 of the original Technical Note.
- 1.13. It is our opinion is that we can only assess the impact based upon the current lawful position of the mooring. The current lawful position is that these mooring are only interned to be used for short periods and as such any potential exposure to noise is limited to these short periods.
- 1.14. Any potential receptor makes the decision if or not to use these mooring and has the options to move to another location if they are sensitive to short term noise impacts.
- 1.15. As the potential exposure is limited in terms of its duration and no individual receptor has a right or requirement to remain at the mooring, it is considered that the context of the exposure is relevant to the sensitivity of the receptor.
- 1.16. AAC consider that based upon these reasons and until a change is made to the lawful use of the mooring any potential user of the mooring should not considered as a noise sensitive receptor.

Runneymede EHO Comments

- 1.17. Fixed plant yet to be specified. The original noise impact assessment report and the addendum acknowledge fixed plant (to follow) is not specified. Where new baseline data is proposed for such an assessment, to avoid

potential upward creep of background noise levels from successive development, reference should be made to baseline data in the original report and/or apply a criterion of 10dBA below background.

AAC Response

- 1.18. While it is relatively standard for Local Authorities to impose conditions that require any assessment of any new fixed plant or equipment to be undertaken, the imposition of a standard limit within such a condition, such as to require 10 dBA below the background fails to provide a provision to consider the context of the noise or the existing environment which is, based upon the latest guidance in BS4142:2014+A1:2019, a fundamental consideration in an assessment.
- 1.19. While the principle of preventing background creep are common a condition that requires an appropriate assessment based in line with the most recent guidance (BS4142:2014+A1:2019) is sufficient to protect the amenity of local noise sensitive receptors.

Runnymede EHO Comments

- 1.20. Construction noise. The original report (5.1.3) proposes start and finish times for construction work that extend before and after Runnymede Borough Council's guideline hours for noisy works, namely noisy works only between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday, and 8am to 1pm on Saturday. There should be no noisy work on Sundays or Public Holidays.

AAC Response

- 1.21. As stated in the comments Runnymede Borough Council have provided guidelines for operational hours during the construction phase of development, however these are general guideline and not absolute limits.
- 1.22. The assessment is based upon the specific development within the specific location and the assessment has proposed what are considered reasonable hours for the construction phase of the development based upon the specific context in terms of the type of work to be undertaken and the specific local environment.
- 1.23. It would be assumed that any construction working hours would be secured with a condition and this can be negotiated should the Council consider that a more restrictive planning condition is appropriate for this specific development.