The only independent noise calculations that have been carried out to MCS standards on this replacement Air Source Heat pump (ASHP) Doc Ref; EV2422/VAR1, have shown the noise level at our nearest noise receptor to be 41db.

This is 6db higher than the maximum level imposed by Worthing planning and environmental health last year as part of retrospective application AWDM/1069/23.

All the other calculations in this application, including the "submitted noise assessment", have been carried out by the applicant and cannot be taken as independent calculations or as "fact".

These make the assumption that the acoustic fence performs as well as it was calculated, which it does not, and their findings are vastly different from the MCS noise calculations submitted.

The acoustic fence in this application has already been shown to not perform nearly as well as expected. We didn't notice any significant reduction in noise at our property after it was installed as part of the previous retrospective application AWDM/1069/23. The noise just travels straight over the top of the fence.

The independent report carried out by Evolved Acoustics as part of the previous retrospective application AWDM/1069/23 states that "it is not expected that the existing acoustic fence can be modified to achieve the required sound reductions without increasing its height considerably".

This report recommends alternative mitigation such as:-

a) Relocating the ASHP
b) Use of a bespoke acoustic enclosure.

Neither of the above have been considered.

The measured reduction in noise in our garden, with the acoustic fence in place was 12db compared to inside the enclosure, according to the independent report in the previous application. By this measure the replacement ASHP would still produce 46db in our garden (41db at our house), which is far higher than the ambient noise in this very quiet location.

The applicant's calculations base the noise reductions on the measured volume of the old ASHP versus the stated volume of the replacement ASHP. This is not a fair comparison. The stated volume of the old ASHP is 60db and the replacement ASHP is 58db.

This reduction of 2db compared to the old pump also corresponds with the measured volume of 43db at our house with the old ASHP (with the acoustic fence installed), and the current MCS noise calculations of 41db with the replacement ASHP.

With regard to the manufacturers required clearances for this ASHP, in it's current/proposed location there is insufficient space for these to be adhered to, however the unit is sited within that space. This will result in reduced efficiency, so the ASHP will have to run harder for longer.

It is also worth noting that MCS regulations do not differentiate between the use of an ASHP to heat a home, swimming pool, or outbuilding. The same regulations still apply. These regulations could have been adhered to, but the applicant again decided to select the unit and install it himself.

The noise issues highlighted in the previous retrospective application AWDM/1069/23 still have not been resolved. Replacing an ASHP stated at producing 60db with an ASHP stated at producing 58db is not going to have a significant reduction in noise at our property.

This unit should be relocated and professionally installed in order to address the noise issues that have been highlighted and independently verified in the previous retrospective application AWDM/1069/23.