CLARIFICATION STATEMENT RE SOUND REPORT CRESSWELL

These points of clarification were generated by comments from Jane Curley

COMMENT 17 MAY 2018 FROM ACOUSTIC TECHNOLOGIES

Non-openable windows - This is somewhat of a confusing statement but standard in acoustic reports. The phrase is meant only in terms of the provision of ventilation – so although for the calculations the windows are non-openable, in practice they are openable at the discretion of the occupant. A worked example would be that to provide a minimum amount of ventilation and meet acoustic guidelines the windows are closed, and trickle ventilation units are open. If the occupier chooses to open the windows this is to their discretion. This is a normal specification method for glazing/ventilation schemes as it provides the end user with the suitable level of ventilation and acoustic protection with the additional option to open windows should they choose.

Non-acoustic trickle vents - This is a term used to describe a standard vent that has not been tested for it acoustic performance. For the sake of calculation, we assume no acoustic attenuation/performance for these units and as such represents a 'worst case' trickle vent. In practice these units do provide some acoustic benefit, but it has not been laboratory proven for publishing. The additional sound reduction shown in the calculation occurs simply through the small area that a trickle ventilation unit represents.

In summary – it is acceptable and normal practice to allow windows to be opened by the occupier at their discretion. The term non-acoustic trickle vent is one given to those not specifically designed with sound attenuation in mind – essentially meaning any trickle ventilation unit will be acceptable.

COMMENT 30 MAY 2018 FROM ACOUSTIC TECHNOLOGIES

I don't see how trickle vents are a problem in rural areas compared to urban? Surely their function is to provide background ventilation and that does not change with type of area? Very strange. Have they proposed a suitable alternative? I am happy consider other solutions, but I would imagine that they will require/want ventilation solely via openable windows. The noise levels on site are not extreme – but the only way to control external levels is through the use of screening (e.g. close boarded timber fencing). To demonstrate this, I can create a noise map and model the effects.

During the time on site there was noted activity within the adjacent units (as stated in the report) so this contribution across the 16hr day-time period was included within the assessment/report. In addition, I had opportunity to speak to the neighbours during the survey (noted in the report) who confirm that they have no concerns about any noise generating activities carried out at the commercial units.

It is extremely odd that the EHO has not recognised that a site-specific survey has been carried out – unless the EHO is referring to the commercial units themselves as a 'site' in which case all noise radiating from that site has been assessed in our report, even though it is considered by nearby occupants as non-problematic.

It is very odd that there are objections to this given the number of residential properties in immediate adjacency to the site already.

I would suggest that you clarify that the noise assessment was completed at the site and includes noise contributions from all sources affecting the site as required by BS8233, if this scope is not in-depth enough request that they suggest the full scope of the required assessment as I had done prior to our assessment (and received no reply). In addition, it would be worth seeing what their alternative ventilation suggestion would be.