

MEMO

From Jonathan Rigg

To Howard Wroot
howard@howardjwroot.com

Dr Sarah Nicholson, Environmental Health, North Lincolnshire Council
Sarah.nicholson@northlincs.gov.uk

Scott Jackson, Planning Manager, North Lincolnshire Council
Scott.jackson@northlincs.gov.uk

Subject Consented Outline Planning Permission for Residential Development
7 Lakes Industrial Estate, Crowle Wharf, Ealand, Scunthorpe, DN17 4JS

LPA Ref PA/2013/1256

PINS Ref APP/Y2003/A/14/2221377

Further to the consultation response from Sarah Nicholson, Environmental Health (Commercial) I have taken the opportunity to visit the application site on the early morning of Friday 17th June 2016 following which I consulted with management at Canley Food Packers. May I respond to the issues raised in the consultation response as follows:

Noise From Industrial Premises in the Locality

During the original survey (April 2015) the ambient noise climate at the application site was due to road traffic noise from the A161 to the east. Commercial / industrial noise was not audible.

Canley Food Packers is located (at its closest) circa 250 metres to the west of the western boundary of the application site (note: there is a residential caravan park located between).

Junction 2 Business Park (predominantly offices) and Double Rivers Industrial Estate (predominantly storage and distribution) is located (at its closest) circa 325 metres to the south of the southern boundary of the application site. Both the residential caravan park and existing residential dwellings are located in closer proximity to these uses than the application site.

Similarly during my early morning visit (with lower background noise levels i.e. less masking noise) at no stage was commercial / industrial noise audible.

Between 0600 and 0700 hours there was a single articulated HGV (at circa 0640 hours) into Canley Food Packers (the access road runs along the northern boundary of the application site and bisects the residential caravan park i.e. HGVs drive between the eastern and western parts of the park).

I also took the opportunity to liaise with site management at Canley Food Packers who commented that the site operating hours were 0600 to 2200 Monday to Friday, 0600 to 1400 hours Saturday. In terms of HGVs, site management confirmed that there would typically be a single HGV into the site during the early morning, typically around 0630 hours (and that deliveries and dispatches are staggered throughout the day due to the size of the service yard). This is wholly consistent with my own observations.

To summarise, the ambient noise climate at the application site was road traffic noise. The baseline noise survey is sufficient in terms of establishing the ambient noise climate at the application site.

Wind Turbine Noise

There is a wind turbine installed at the business park / industrial estate to the south. There are other existing residential dwellings and the residential caravan park far closer to the turbine than the application site. It is logical to presume that the planning application for the turbine would have considered the turbine noise emission levels and the proximity of residential dwellings and (based on the fact that planning permission was granted) concluded that there was no unacceptable impact.

Nonetheless, for absolute clarification, I have established that the planning reference for the wind turbine was PA/2010/0407. The wind turbine is a WES 80 (80 kW). The sound power level of the WES 80 (80 kW) is 93.7 dB(A) at a 10 metres per second wind speed at 10 metres height.

In accordance with the IOA Good Practice Guide, the wind turbine noise level is calculated at circa 32 dB LA90 at 310 metres (which is the approximate distance between the turbine and the nearest proposed residential dwelling). This is well below the simplified '35 dB' rule in ETSU-R-97 i.e. no noise impact, background monitoring not required.

Railway Noise

Between 0600 and 0700 hours I visually observed 3 freight trains and 2 passenger trains on the railway line (some distance) to the south. I did not hear the trains; no horns were sound. This is wholly consistent with the observations from local residents (and from residents at the residential caravan park I also spoke to). In my experience, it is uncommon for trains to sound horns at night (horns are generally only sound by non-stopping services through stations in the day and to warn trackside workers).

Ambient Noise Levels / Protection of Gardens

In the context of the locality, there are existing residential dwellings closer to the A161.

In terms of building envelope, British Standard 8233:2014, Table 4 Indoor Ambient Noise Levels for Dwellings, Note 5 states *'If relying on closed windows to meet the guide values, there needs to be an appropriate alternative ventilation that does not compromise the facade insulation or the resulting noise level. If applicable, any room should have adequate ventilation (e.g. trickle ventilators should be open) during assessment.'*

For reference, WHO guidelines also comments *'residential buildings near main roads ... or near railway lines, may be provided with sound-proofed windows'*.

A double glazed window with standard vents provides circa 27 dB reduction in road traffic noise. Based on the relatively low ambient noise levels, such a reduction will provide very good amenity.

In terms of garden amenity, British Standard 8233:2014 comments *'For traditional external areas that are used for amenity space, such as gardens and patios, it is desirable that the external noise level does not exceed 50 dB $L_{Aeq(0700-2300)}$ with an upper guideline value of 55 dB $L_{Aeq(0700-2300)}$ which would be acceptable in noisier environments. However, it is also recognized that these guideline values are not achievable in all circumstances where development might be desirable. In higher noise areas, a compromise between elevated noise levels and other factors, such as the convenience of living in these locations or making efficient use of land resources to ensure development needs can be met, might be warranted. In such a situation, development should be designed to achieve the lowest practicable levels in these external amenity spaces, but should not be prohibited.'*

For reference, the UK Department of Environment (DETR) have recognised that in considering future policy on environmental noise, the idea of standards with a close link to health effects should be explored together with a consideration of the implications. It is within this framework that DETR placed a contract with the National Physical Laboratory (NPL), in collaboration with the Institute of Sound and Vibration Research (ISVR), to review noise standards used for assessing the health impact of environmental noise. The research commented:

- *It can be concluded that the guidelines do provide useful guidance as to the lower threshold levels below which residual noise impacts can probably be considered as negligible*
- *Exceedances of the WHO guideline values do not necessarily imply significant noise impact and indeed, it may be that significant impacts do not occur until much higher degrees of noise exposure are reached'.*

In the context of the locality, there are existing residential dwellings closer to the A161.

Notwithstanding this, the provision of a 1.8 metre solid timber fence (or brick wall or combination) around gardens is an appropriate mitigation measure.

I trust this resolves the queries raised in the consultation response.

Best regards

Jonathan Rigg
ENS Ltd