

Formal Objection of Proposed Development SMDC/2022/0343 Totmonslow Farm, Draycot Road

In response to the email received from Arne Swithenbank on 22/12/22 regarding the new and/or revised/updated submissions from the applicant. Please find below my concerns and objections to the proposed development.

Landscape and Visual Matters

This has only been completed for public areas, not neighbouring properties. It is also a concern that the report has identified screening in the summer months (which significantly reduces in the winter months), looking at the gardens existing vegetation, which we all know, as home owners, we have the choice to remove and therefore no screening would be in place. We do not believe that our own vegetation is a sufficient mitigation to the visual impact.

An example of this is the visual detailed below. If taken today (09/01/23) all houses are visible due to the lack of vegetation in the winter months (approx. 5 months of the year).



The report also states the following: *“The visual effect of the PV arrays positioned close to these two boundaries can only be judged on Site and this is a private view so was not taken in my field survey”*. However, a detailed visual impact has not been completed for the three neighbouring properties in question, which photographic imagining/projections to factually evidence the visual impact the development will have on each property.

Also, the landscape comments seem only to be from Stuart Ryder, and we were expecting the applicant to respond on this formally.

Applicants Noise Assessment NPD

The noise impact assessment has been produced (16/11), but only has Highfields Farm listed in this report, not The Old Barn or Horseshoe Barn, who are, in fact, the closest to the development and most impacted. This has been an ongoing issue since the initial consultation, as the applicant still continues to exclude the two barns in the documentation.

It is of great concern that only 'proposed' investors have been assessed, as we understand that these may not be utilised if the development goes ahead. We understand that SMDC does not have sufficient Enforcement Officers, and therefore, the governance of the plans versus the actual development may be different.

The report states that the development has two 6400kVA transformers and one 3200kVA transformer. It goes on to say that the 6400kVA transformer will produce a 83dB LpA at 1m. It is of great concern that at 85dB permanent hearing loss can occur (see table below)

PAINFUL & DANGEROUS		
Use hearing protection or avoid	140	• Fireworks • Gun shots • Custom car stereos (at full volume)
	130	• Jackhammers • Ambulances
UNCOMFORTABLE		
Dangerous over 30 seconds	120	• Jet planes (during take off)
VERY LOUD		
Dangerous over 30 minutes	110	• Concerts (any genre of music) • Car horns • Sporting events
	100	• Snowmobiles • MP3 players (at full volume)
	90	• Lawnmowers • Power tools • Blenders • Hair dryers
Over 85 dB for extended periods can cause permanent hearing loss.		
LOUD		
	80	• Alarm clocks
	70	• Traffic • Vacuums
MODERATE		
	60	• Normal conversation • Dishwashers
	50	• Moderate rainfall

It is therefore concerning that the reports states the following *“Regarding outdoor living areas, BS 8233 states that “it is desirable that the external noise level does not exceed 50dB LAeq,T, with an upper guideline value of 55dB LAeq, which would be acceptable in noisier environments”*. With the knowledge that the two transformers will create circa 83dB LpA, what is the mitigating factors to this noise impact. In contradiction, the email from the agent dated 11th Oct also states that the lowest level of noise impact is 69dBA up to 75dBA. We are somewhat confused and would like to understand how this development can be considered when it falls outside of acceptable external noise levels.

We also do not believe that a 24-hour period is sufficient time to complete a robust noise impact assessment. *“Continuous baseline ambient/background noise monitoring was undertaken in sequential 15-minute samples at two locations over a continuous 24-hr period commencing at 1400hrs on Thursday, 3 November 2022”*.

There does not seem to be any acceptance that the development will 'add to' the noise of the A50 and not be 'drowned out' by said road. The A50 should not be used as noise mitigation against the development *“the residual noise environment is dominated by steady road traffic noise from the A50”*. It has to be questioned what we would hear from the development if that A50, at any point, were to be resurfaced, which would reduce noise levels. We chose to live by the A50 and accepted the noise created by this; we have never reported or complained of noise levels. However, we do not wish to live on top of a development that increases the noise to our properties.

The report also states that *“Based on the results of the baseline noise survey and the predicted worst-case noise levels from the development, a set of ‘initial estimate’ assessments of the potential noise impact of the development, as per BS 4142 guidelines, has been undertaken”*. As we live next to this development, we cannot accept an 'initial estimate' to be sufficient evidence of long-term noise impact, nor do we believe SMDC find this robust evidence for decision-making.