

Land at Maple Lodge Close, Maple Cross

Summary Proof of Evidence (Noise)

Report 19/0333/Summary P.o.E1.0

Author: Matthew Heyes

Land at Maple Lodge Close, Maple Cross

Proof of Evidence (Noise)

DRAFT Report 19/0333/P.o.E1.0

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: APP/P1940/W/21/3289305

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFERENCE: S/2013/0890

Summary Proof of Evidence

Appeal by BCL (Maple Cross) LLP & Impact Property Development Ltd

Appeal against non-determination by Three Rivers District Council
of planning permission for development at
Land to the North of Maple Cross Lodge, Maple Cross
Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SE

This report and associated surveys have been prepared and undertaken for the private and confidential use of our client only. If any third party whatsoever comes into possession of this report, they rely on it at their own risk and RSK Acoustics Limited accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any such third party.



Proof of Evidence (Noise)

Qualifications and Experience

My name is Matthew Heyes and I am an Associate Director at RSK Acoustics (formally Cole Jarman), a dedicated acoustics consultancy practice. I have a Bachelor of Science degree with honours in Acoustics. I am a Member of the Institute of Acoustics.

I have worked full time in the field of acoustics consultancy since 2006 with a year in industry placement at Atkins Global. I have then been employed by RSK Acoustics since finishing my degree in 2008.

I have undertaken and continue to undertake work for both private and public sector clients on a wide range of development schemes. This includes a significant amount of planning work for distribution warehouses all around the country for various clients. In addition to this I undertake work within the residential, commercial, industrial, transportation, retail, hotel, health, education and performing arts project sectors. My experience and expertise include both environmental and building acoustics.

The criteria that I propose within my proof has been accepted for numerous similar development sites within various planning authority sites. A small example of sites where this has been agreed as suitable with the Local Planning Authority are provided below:

- Symmetry Park, Kettering (LPA – Kettering)
- Symmetry Park, Aston Clinton (LPA – Buckinghamshire)
- G-Park, Doncaster (LPA – Doncaster)

I confirm that the evidence which I present for this appeal has been prepared in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.



Proof of Evidence (Noise)

Summary

In my proof I set out the basis on which noise from the site, affecting existing dwellings, should be assessed in accordance with current planning policy and guidance. I adopt the assessment standards used within the CJ Report which the council have agreed is appropriate as noise was not considered as a reason to refuse planning permission.

I have undertaken update noise modelling for the development site which has ensured that accurate distance and acoustic screening losses have been used within my assessment. The model has also taken account of the topography of the development site and surrounding areas. The model takes full account of all of the potential noise sources on the site and the movement of HGVs both on the site and on the access road. The noise sources within the model have been measured by RSK Acoustics on a significant number of similar sites over many years and so are considered to be robust examples of all potential on site activities.

I have provided suitable values for LOAEL, both in terms of absolute levels and as a difference compared to the existing background noise levels. These values take full account of the guidance provided within BS 4142.

The noise levels generated by the site have been compared to the absolute thresholds for LOAEL as it was not possible to undertake accurate noise measurements on site during the COVID Pandemic. I consider the absolute noise thresholds to be the lowest potential value for LOAEL and so this is considered to be a worst case assessment.

The results of my results have shown that the noise impact is below my proposed LOAEL threshold and so complies with guidance within the NPPF, NPPG and Policy DM9 of the Local Council's Development Management Policies.

■ End of Section

