

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: David Herniman (Allan B Matthews) [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 October 2018 18:00

To: Nick Howard

Cc: Anita Gardner; 'David Harman'

Subject: RE: Fontwell ref.WA/71/18/DOC.

Dear Nick,

In respond to your queries in the same sequential order as follows:-

1. The PUHZ 125 and MUZ/SF25VE are air conditioning cassettes and the other two units are inverters and condensers relating to the shop chillers.
2. The lowest background noise is expected to happen at the early hours. After 6.00 traffic and work related noise start to increase.
3. The nearest residents at risk from noise pollution is Tamarisk, London Road. Park Cottage to the north of the site is not considered to be at risk (see item no.6)
4. The attached revised report excludes any noise reduction for vegetation in the calculations.
5. The measurement of 42m in the report was an error and this has been corrected in the attached revised report to 33m which has been taken from a OS plan. The 8m dimension is from the boundary of Park Cottage which is not considered to be at risk.
6. Sound pressure levels produced by this unit are considered to be negligible by our noise consultant.
7. The acoustic fence will overlap and abut the brick retaining wall and be extended along the top of the wall as illustrated in the attached revised report. There will be no gaps in the fence or between the fence and wall.
8. As long as the barrier obstructs the direct line of sight between the equipment and the noise sensitive receptors (which it does by far) then noise will be reduced. We are confident that the fence will provide adequate attenuation.

In order to provide sufficient air flow around the units the layout has been slightly amended and to assist in omitting the allowance for vegetation, it is proposed to increase the height of fence from 2.50 to 3.00m and this forms part of the revised report which supersedes that previously submitted.

I trust that you now have sufficient information to discharge the condition.

Regards,

David

David Herniman for
Allan B. Matthews R.I.B.A
Chartered Architect
37 Fore Street
Bovey Tracey
Devon TQ13 9AD



This e-mail, its attachments and any other items transmitted with it are confidential and intended only for the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, copy or show to any other person the contents of this message. You should immediately reply to the sender and delete the message from your computer system.

VIRUSES - Allan B. Matthews Chartered Architect cannot guarantee that this e-mail and attachments are free of viruses and you must ensure that you carry out your own virus checks Allan B. Matthews Chartered Architect accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

From: Nick Howard [mailto:Nick.Howard@arun.gov.uk]
Sent: 04 October 2018 14:36
To: 'David Herniman (Allan B Matthews)'
Subject: RE: Fontwell ref.WA/71/18/DOC.

Dear David,

Further to our telephone conversation I attach a copy of the comments below which I had forwarded to Anita Gardener in planning.

Kind Regards
Nick Howard
SEHO

'Dear Anita,

EH has viewed the noise report and updated drawings regarding the above application received to EH on the 13th September 2018 and EH has made the following comments below.

Fontwell noise report comments:

1. Please could the applicant confirm exactly what the equipment referred to on page 3 is. E.g. 2 x PUHZ125 - we do not have any knowledge of specifically what these pieces of equipment are.

2. Page 6, Table 2.1 details that noise measurements were taken from 14.30 to 06.25 the following morning. Please explain why no noise recordings were taken covering the morning period, and whether the applicant would expect the background noise levels to be different to the afternoon levels.
3. Page 9. Please could the applicant advise the address of the nearest residential property as this was not clear from the report.
4. Please advise of the reference used for the sentence "It should be highlighted that around 4dB noise reduction due to dense vegetation has been accounted for in the calculations".
5. Page 9 Table 3.2 references closest receiver at 42m. Please could the applicant confirm how this measurement was arrived at. Our measurements of the distance between the facade of the closest residential property and the boundary of the premises is 8m.
6. Given that the premises to the north of the site (in our opinion the closest property to the site) will have one unit significantly closer than the other 8 units (which will be behind the structure of the building, thereby providing a barrier type effect), could the applicant please confirm whether or not the assessment is likely to give a representative rating level?
7. Please could the applicant provide the specific location of the acoustic fence. We note that this is shown in Figure 4.2 on page 11 but it is not clear how this ties in with retaining wall in this location.
8. With regard to the acoustic barrier, the residential properties to the north and west of the site are located higher than properties to the south. We have concerns therefore that the barrier would not prove as effective as the applicant may have intended.

Kind Regards
Nick Howard
SEHO'

From: David Herniman (Allan B Matthews) [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 October 2018 15:38
To: Nick Howard
Cc: Anita Gardner; 'BURRELL Peter'; 'MCKINLEY Niall'; 'David Harman'
Subject: Fontwell ref.WA/71/18/DOC.

Dear Nick,

Reference our telephone conversation I've now read condition no.3 again and it states that the required noise level is to be achieved by the plant being enclosed and/or attenuated, therefore I believe that the proposed acoustic fence is in compliance with this wording as it is a form of attenuation. Surely the critical factor here is compliance with that part of the wording relating to the noise emissions and not how that is achieved. In my experience the provision of a acoustic fence is a accepted means of achieving this. At this late stage the provision of plant enclosures isn't a practical solution.

Subject to the planning officers approval I'd like to install the fence, allow the site to start operating and then take further noise readings to prove that the fence is providing the required attenuation. It's my intention to speak to Anita Gardner tomorrow regarding this matter.

Regards,

David

David Herniman for
Allan B. Matthews R.I.B.A
Chartered Architect
37 Fore Street
Bovey Tracey
Devon TQ13 9AD
[REDACTED]



This e-mail, its attachments and any other items transmitted with it are confidential and intended only for the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, copy or show to any other person the contents of this message. You should immediately reply to the sender and delete the message from your computer system.

VIRUSES - Allan B. Matthews Chartered Architect cannot guarantee that this e-mail and attachments are free of viruses and you must ensure that you carry out your own virus checks Allan B. Matthews Chartered Architect accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>
DX 57406 Littlehampton
You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
