

Sent: 22 January 2016 19:02
To: Thompson David
Cc: Swan Richard
Subject: RE: Bourn Airfield

Hi David

I have had a look at Mr Collman's letter dated 15th January 2016 concerning the above application (S/0499/15/FL) and have the following observations/comments.

With regard to points in paragraph 4, relating to data pertaining to this specific application and not previous data based on a larger site I can confirm that if this application were to proceed it would be my intention to incorporate the tougher restrictions suggested in my email to you dated 11th November 2015 by way of conditions.

I agree BS4142: 2014 is the most appropriate standard to use.

I agree with Mr Collman's observations made in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7

I agree with paragraph 8 regarding measured background levels not being representative at the measurement point MP2 due to the operation of the grain drier skewing the data. This issue was raised in my email to you dated 27th October 2015 in which I raised an objection to the proposal on a number of grounds. An addendum report has since been submitted covering those areas discussed at our meeting with the developers and acoustic consultant at SCDC offices on 2nd November 2015.

I agree with Mr Collman's observations in the first part of paragraph 9. However, the addition of a +6dB penalty for impulsivity is the method used in BS 4142 that takes into account the character of the noise compared to that in the acoustic environment. BS4142 is fundamentally an objective assessment of data (mostly), whereas the comments in Mr Collman's letter in paragraph 9 are more suited to a subjective assessment such as that used in statutory nuisance deliberations. I agree maximum noise levels are important but are not required in the BS 4142 assessment methodology, which compares a "rating level" expressed as an time weighted Leq against background.

In paragraph 10 I accept Mr Collmans comments in respect of the components of noise forming background and rating levels and their context. This again was something I commented on in my email of 27th October 2015. However, the lack of detail given in calculations was due in my opinion to the predictions being made using 3D sound modelling software (SoundPLAN 7.3) to predict sound propagation rather than "longhand" calculations using measured a data.

Paragraph 11 questions the claims made on "robustly" controlling the variability of the sound source.. The report does however qualify this by stating it only used the worst case measured and BS 5228 source data.

Regarding the comments made in paragraph 12 it was expected the same source data would be used but sound modelling software was used to predict levels at other locations, particularly towards the Highfields and Caldecote direction that were not previously considered.

Unfortunately, the prediction of noise levels is not precise and can be affected by a number of variables. The information submitted in the noise reports may appear simplistic to an expert requiring a greater depth of understanding compared to a lay-person. But the submission of a large quantity of data in such reports can make them unwieldy and difficult to follow. Provided the reports accurately summarise the findings that should be sufficient, with the proviso that the raw data could be made available if necessary.

In conclusion, I am in agreement with most of the points raised in Mr Collman's letter. But they are mainly about the content of the first noise report submitted. I was also of the opinion we should object to this application at that stage. However, following our meeting on the 2nd November 2015 and the submission of the Addendum Report in relation to a much reduced level of activity on site I withdrew that objection.

I hope the above is of assistance.

Many thanks

Nick
