From: Michael Lavender <Michael.Lavender@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 December 2010 11:34
To: Peter Barnett
Subject: RE: 10-12-02 B6410 me-e- Next Shoreham, Acoustic comments -pb-s

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Peter,

The lack of transparency in the modelling process is a worry because the applicant has not provided any figures or assumptions used in the model. In an open process it is reasonable to expect this information to be available to everybody from the start in order that the assumptions can be tested. In addition and for reasons already given, I am of the opinion that the background levels used for the rating process are high. However, I recognise that the noise from the engines modelled in scenarios one and two will be removed from the equation as they will be turned off and vehicles can be prohibited from passing a certain point. Therefore the main noise source during a 1 ½ hour delivery will be from the cages, pump trucks and people talking as goods are moved around the yard. It is not clear whether this scenario was modelled, but the current use of the delivery yard is a garden centre and you would already expect noise from people talking and goods to be stacked on to shelving, albeit at a reasonable time. On reflection, I would advise that BS4142, with all its floors, is probably not appropriate for quantifying the effect of relocating the service yard and the assessment arguments are distracting from the real issue.

What I am trying to ensure is that there is no increase in disturbance to the neighbours that are immediately adjacent to the relocated delivery area. This is difficult to quantify as the amenity of the gardens as well as the internal environment should be protected. For example if the occupiers of the homes decide to have a barbecue on a Saturday afternoon then they will not want to be disturbed by vehicles and goods cages rattling on the other side of the fence. Therefore if it is imperative for the applicant to have permission granted at this stage, I would ask that the following conditions be attached to any permission:

No motorised vehicles being used in connection with a delivery or dispatch shall be allowed beyond a point, (to be agreed)

A speed bump shall be placed at the agreed point to indicate the start of the prohibited area.

Appropriate signage shall be erected notifying drivers to turn off their engine during loading unloading operations.

Pump trucks used to convey stock shall have pneumatic wheels.

The existing fence panels shall be removed and replaced with close boarded panel fencing.

Deliveries, shall only take place between 7am and 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 12pm on a Saturday with no deliveries on Sundays or bank holidays. (There are only 7 deliveries expected a week so these hours leave plenty of time for them to be scheduled in)

If these conditions can be agreed then I can confirm that I will have no objections to the application as it stands.

Kind Regards

Michael Lavender

From: Peter Barnett [mailto:Peter.Barnett@adur.gov.uk]
Sent: 03 December 2010 08:59
To: Michael Lavender

Subject: FW: 10-12-02 B6410 me-e- Next Shoreham, Acoustic comments -pb-s
Importance: High

Michael - any comments?

Peter Barnett – **Principal Planning Officer** | Planning Regeneration and Wellbeing, Adur District Council
Location: Civic Centre, Ham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6PR
Internal: 63233 | External: 01273 263233 | E-mail: peter.barnett@adur.gov.uk

Please think before you print this and save paper

From: Mark Evans [mailto:mark.evans@rpsgroup.com]
Sent: 02 December 2010 14:51
To: Peter Barnett
Cc: Tamsin Cottle
Subject: 10-12-02 B6410 me-e- Next Shoreham, Acoustic comments -pb-s
Importance: High

Dear Peter,

Next Shoreham, Acoustic comments

We have reviewed the comments from Michael Lavender and, whilst unable to make contact with him at present, would note the following clarifications for your consideration.

We confirm that weather conditions during the noise survey were dry, with wind predominantly north-easterly. We concur that the predominant source was distant road traffic noise to the south-west, considered to be from the A27.

During the survey, no other significant noise sources were considered to affect the noise levels, although a number of high altitude aircraft were noted.

The attended noise survey was undertaken at the site between 18:00 and 20:00 hours, which was considered to be the quietest time during the daytime period when deliveries are proposed. In general, evenings are generally considered to be more noise-sensitive periods.

Survey results show that the background noise level actually reduced from 18:00 to around 19:00 hours, with values increasing thereafter. The lowest measured value (at approximately 19:05 hours) was therefore used in the assessment, as a worst-case scenario.

A brief visit to site was made on the evening of Sunday 21st November (at approximately 21:00 hours) during calm weather conditions and, although no noise monitoring equipment was used, subjective impressions were again that road traffic from the distant A27 was the dominant noise source.

Our noise assessment, using 3D computer software, has been based on noise from both HGV delivery vehicles and smaller goods vehicles within the yard area. These are considered to be the worst case noise sources. As requested, we are happy to provide additional information to Mr Lavender with regards the noise levels, locations and other conditions modelled.

Current proposals are for the existing fence to the service yard to be retained, therefore the effect of this has been included for within our assessment. To maintain the acoustic integrity of the barrier the fence would be made good where necessary, with no gaps either within or beneath it. We note that the proposed mitigation measures could be developed further, with additional input from Mr Lavender.

We understand that the Applicant is currently seeking planning approval in principle, and that they have suggested that a suitable Condition be incorporated. We understand that this proposal states that the service yard will not be re-

configured until a noise mitigation scheme is agreed. This should provide the required assurance, whilst still allowing Planning Approval to be granted at this stage.

We trust that this provides additional useful information, and look forward to discussing the finer details with Mr Lavender soon.

With best regards,
Mark

Mark Evans BEng (Hons) MIOA MIHEEM
Associate - RPS Planning & Development
Highfield House, 5 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park,
Birmingham, B32 1AF.
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0) 121 213 5500
Fax: +44 (0) 121 213 5502
Mobile: +44 (0) 7919 327 616
Email: mark.evans@rpsgroup.com
www: www.rpsgroup.com

This e-mail message and any attached file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only.

Internet communications are not secure and RPS is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, any alteration or corruption in transmission or for any loss or damage caused by a virus or by any other means.

RPS Planning and Development Limited, company number: 02947164 (England). Registered office: Centurion Court, 85 Milton Park Abingdon Oxfordshire OX14 4RY.

RPS Group Plc web link: http://www.rpsgroup.com