Dear Mr. Campbell,

Last week, one of my neighbours installed a generator in their garden in order to perform damp repairs. A few days later, at least three microphones were erected on roofs in Utopia Village.

This is presumably related to application 2023/4757/P.

If the intention is to establish "typical" background noise readings, the data should be disregarded for the following reasons -

1. The microphones are installed on the applicant's own property and not in the gardens of the nearest receptor properties. The reason baseline noise levels need to be measured in the neighbouring properties is because it is the amenity of the neighbours, and not the applicant, that is lawfully protected. Background noise readings, in compliance with BS4142, taken in the gardens of 8 Chalcot Road and 1 Egbert Street, the nearest receptor properties to the proposed "Plant Room A", have already been submitted. I re-send them with this email.

2. The microphones have been installed on roofs and not at ground level. Background noise levels will be different, and almost certainly higher, on roofs at first floor level than in gardens at lower ground floor level.

3. The presence of a generator in the neighbourhood can in no way be described as "typical". In fact, the machinery was so loud that I understand that several official noise complaints were made to the Council. I attach a sound recording with video taken yesterday, and a separate one from the day before, to show how severely the readings would have been affected.

Additionally, the generator noise, although coming from the south east corner of Chalcot Road (number 3), could be heard so loudly in the houses on the northern end of Egbert Street (numbers 9 and 11) that the residents of those houses thought that the noise was coming from directly behind their gardens.

This confirms the observations of several independent experts about the reflection of noise in such a built-up area and which the applicant has not considered at all in the calculations submitted with its application.

For example, Acoustical Control Engineers makes this point in reviewing the applicant's noise report [see paragraphs 6.7 (page 9) and 7.3 (page 11) of the attached report]. Acoustical concludes: "Insufficient allowance has been made in the calculations for the reflection of sound between the numerous buildings surrounding the plant and sensitive receptor areas".

The unusual presence of noise-generating machinery in the neighbourhood this week has confirmed that the applicant's failure to consider the propagation of sound in such a hemmed-in area is a significant failing of its proposal.

It was additionally noted by independent experts that the applicant's distance corrections were taken using non-standard point source attenuation and appeared to be overestimated [see Syntegra Consulting, paragraph 5.3.4, pages 13-14].

The applicant's readings from this survey, assuming the intention is to make them public, will be interesting to analyse in these contexts.

Yours sincerely,