

17 May 2018

Ref: 13274-180517-L1

Clement Acoustics Ltd
202 Uxbridge Road
London
W12 7JP

Tel: +44(0)203 475 2280
Fax: +44(0)203 475 2281
info@clementacoustics.co.uk

www.clementacoustics.co.uk

Dear Alex,

13274: Half Cup, 100-102 Judd Street, London

In response to the issues raised by Mr Whittingham and the Jessel House Residents Association and Bloomsbury Residents Action Group we would make the following points:

Microphone placement

We note the error in our original report which incorrectly stated that the microphone was mounted on a tripod.

Due to the cold weather on the day of the survey, it was not appropriate (or necessary) for our engineer to stand next to the microphone for the duration of the measurement. Placing a tripod on the pavement would have caused an obstruction. It is not uncommon to utilise structures (including trees) to mount microphones for noise surveys. In this instance it was considered the best option in terms of gathering representative data (Judd Street forms a street canyon which would be expected to present similar average noise levels down its length), while ensuring the safety of our equipment and not obstructing the pavement.

Instead of mounting the noise meter on a tripod our engineer therefore attached the microphone to the tree outside the premises and waited inside for the duration of the measurement, in sight of the monitoring station in order to ensure the safety of our equipment and to observe the prevailing noise sources and weather conditions. We would not expect any difference in data measured by a tree-mounted microphone to one on a tripod and therefore this detail has no bearing on the validity of our assessment.



It was not our intention to be misleading. A different colleague to the individual who carried out the site work wrote the report and unfortunately this information was not correctly passed on. This detail was not picked up in our quality checking stage for which we apologise. A revised report has been provided with this error corrected which we trust may be considered without prejudice.

Time of Survey

The purpose of the survey is to establish the minimum background noise level (at any time) representative of the nearest receiver. It was considered that a mid-week late morning would be the quietest period the premises in question would be operating over, avoiding both rush hours and anticipated spikes in shopping activity in the afternoons. Based on previous surveys in similar central London locations, weekend daytimes would be expected to be noisier due to increased shopping activity. It was our understanding that our client had discussed our proposed methodology with the planning officer and it had been approved. There was no stated requirement at this time for weekend period monitoring and we are surprised that this is now being asked for.

Weather Conditions

The weather conditions were considered to be suitable for noise monitoring according to the requirements of BS 7445:1991: *'Description and measurement of environmental noise, Part 2- Acquisition of data pertinent to land use'*. There were no excessive winds in Judd Street during the survey (as observed by our engineer throughout the survey and stated in our report). The maximum windspeeds as measured at Heathrow Airport that day (at times unspecified) have no bearing on the conditions in Judd Street.

It was not snowing significantly at the time of the measurement. Snow on the ground (approximately 1 inch) was not deemed to be a prohibitive factor in undertaking the noise survey on the day. The photographs provided show the road surface was free of snow. It is asserted that the snow may have caused some local businesses to close. This being the case

we would expect the local noise levels to be lower as a consequence, thereby making our assessment more robust. If the noise survey is to be repeated in fine weather it is possible that a higher LA90 may be measured, so potentially relaxing our original noise criteria.

Fan Case Noise

Our report details mitigation (including detailed spectral insertion losses for the proposed attenuator) to meet noise criteria 10dB below the minimum measured background level at residential windows as per the requirement of the local authority. If our recommendations are followed we would not expect noise from the duct to be audible at the receiver. Case breakout noise from an internally installed fan would be expected to be contained by the building envelope and there is no condition in this or any similar application we have seen requiring sound insulation testing of the internal separating floors to demonstrate this.

We appreciate that there may be other arguments for refusal (upon which it is not in our remit to comment). In terms of noise impact however we are confident in the validity and recommendations within our report, which if followed would be expected to fully mitigate any noise impact upon the residents from the proposed plant.

We remain available should any of the above points require further clarification.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Markwick".

Matt Markwick MSc AMIOA

Acoustic Consultant