

From: Gareth Liley <g.liley@npt.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 July 2020 09:46
To: Rhodri Griffiths <r.griffiths2@npt.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: P2020/0423 - Former Skewen Snooker Club

Further to my comments, it may also be worth clarifying whether rail movement during the monitoring was representative of typical movements, and if so, how was it established what was monitored was typical?

Its worth asking, as rail movements may have changed in view of what was going on at the time and in the build up to additional controls being put in place. In relation to the pandemic.

The survey was undertaken in early February, before any measures were put into place in relation to the pandemic, therefore rail movement at the time of surveying was considered normal and typical. The most onerous noise mitigation measures are determined by individual events of passing trains anyhow.

From: Gareth Liley
Sent: 02 July 2020 16:40
To: Rhodri Griffiths <r.griffiths2@npt.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: P2020/0423 - Former Skewen Snooker Club

Hi Rhodri,

Acoustic report

The document appears to refer to relevant standards and guidance, however the monitoring methodology applied appears slightly unusual to me. The photograph below shows that the measurement was taken by placing the microphone through a vent, at 4.5 m, and positioned close to the reflective surface. There is also mention of corrections being applied to establish free field values, and the modelling based at a 4.5.m height.

I think it would be worthwhile obtaining an explanatory note as to why this methodology of monitoring was deemed appropriate and what corrections were applied, and the reasoning why modelling is solely at a height of 4.5 m.



The microphone was raised through the vent for security reasons, and it was not possible to securely extend it further. We consider the monitoring location, which had a full range of view overlooking the noise source, to be appropriate. A 3 dB façade correction was applied to the measured levels to account for a doubling in levels due to reflections from the building.

The noise maps shown in the report are at 4.5m, though building evaluation markers are shown for the worst case level per façade, which is generally at first floor height (4.5 metres) due to the topography of the surrounding area and height of the railway line. Apologies that the report didn't clarify this.

Noise ingress calculations were made based on the worst case levels (of the levels predicted at both ground and first floor height) and the minimum mitigation requirements rationalised for bedrooms and living rooms.

The report identifies the need for mitigation measures to be implemented in order to achieve satisfactory internal noise levels as stated in BS8233. It will be essential that the developer implements the mitigation measures stated within the report, or similar mitigation which achieves the same or better attenuation. I suggest that validation reports are required prior to occupation of the units.

I note that the report refers to WHO Guidance in terms of internal noise levels, but I am surprised to see it has excluded guidance relating to external noise guidelines. I feel this is something that needs to be considered.

The proposed site plan does not show any private external amenity areas – as such we do not consider an external noise assessment to be necessary. Nevertheless, predicted levels across areas of grass on the proposed plans do not exceed 55 dB(A) at a height of 1.5 metres, and therefore are within WHO criteria and below the BS8233 upper guideline for noise in external amenity spaces.

I trust the above is of assistance.

Thanks

Gareth