

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3407/P	Ian Dench and Virginia Garcia	14/11/2023 14:54:10	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to the development as the noise report has discrepancies which mean the noise of the ASHPs would exceed acceptable levels, contrary to the developer's claims.</p> <p>In section 5.1 the noise assessment claims that; 'The proposed roofplant comprises 2 ASHPs (Clade Acer 75KW Ultra Low Noise) each with a sound pressure level of 33dBA at 1m' This is incorrect, the 75KW version of the Clade Acer ASHP is a very large unit and has a sound pressure level of 56.2dbA at 1m (please see page 4 of Clade Acer's info sheet). This is 23.2dbA above the developers' assessed levels and 2 units will be higher than that. The acceptable noise levels at our windows will be exceeded by at least 18.2dbA by day and 20.2 dbA at night. (also in section 5.1 'The units are assessed as being operational in the day and night-time periods)</p> <p>There are also other discrepancies in the noise report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Calibration certification details for the instruments used seems to indicate they are outside of their calibration period. * The LT1 measurement location results may indicate higher than expected background noise level than you might expect at the Lancaster Stables roof top positions as these may be further shielded by the building envelope to provide a lower noise climate when compared to LT1 measurement position. * I would like to see documented evidence of the attenuators used on the MVHR's and AHU to obtain the insertion losses assumed. <p>The ASHPs are being placed onto the steel work that is attached right next to our party wall. During the SpringHealth gym years the vibrations of the ventilator were transmitted along these steels and were very disturbing to us, there are no measurements about the vibrations.</p> <p>Also the plans do not show the correct legal boundaries of the club. A gap is shown between the development and 10 and 12 Lancaster Stables on the ground floor and it is unclear where the boundary sits on the top floor.</p> <p>I believe that planning should be rejected until these issues are satisfactorily dealt with.</p>