漢字 michael sugiura
acoustics consultant

Michael Sugiura Limited
20 Merryweather Close
Wokingham RG40 4YH

+44 (0)118 973 1497

info@sugi.co.uk

www.sugi.co.uk

Mr David Fowler
Planning Case Officer
London Borough of Camden
Planning and Building Development
5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

13th August 2021

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Abbey Phase 2 - Notification of Section 73 Application - 2021/2813/P Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) under planning reference 2020/2486/P dated 27/11/20) Construction of a new health and community centre (Use Class D1)

Dear David

I am confirming below our comments and concerns as joint owners of Flat A and the Freeholders of 241 Goldhurst Terrace NW6 3EP on the Section 73 application which were uploaded on your planning portal.

Our representation stems from the reading and reviewing the content of the RBA Acoustics Technical Note 'Plant Noise Revision' dated 1 June 2021 (Ref. 9769.ATN04.PNA.2) and Acoustic Assessment (Planning/Stage 3) dated 27 May 2020 (Ref. 9769.RP01.AAR.4).

The points of concern and comments are summarised below:

1. The Acoustic Assessment report presents data presents data from unattended measurements recorded in March 2015 (positions 5 &6) and spot measurements in October 2019 (positions 1-4) recorded over a shortened daytime period of 3-hours (10.00-13.00 hrs).
2. The 'spot measurements at position 4, open green space, (minimum $L_{A90,15mins}$ 50dB/Average $L_{Aeq,15mins}$ 59(dB) Table 2 are not representative of the environmental sound levels at the Goldhurst Terrace properties and are therefore inaccurate. A photograph shows an incorrectly labelled position No.4 Park.
3. No BS 4142:2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound assessment has been done.
4. There is no basis to claim that the emission criteria are complaint with Policy A4 of the 2017 Local Plan.
5. Section 2 statement "in line with…" has NO VALUE; Therefore, the noise criteria in use are mere conjecture until supported.

6. Section 3 para 3.3 Tonality of the plant is said to be absent. Using a 1/1 octave analysis is equivalent to not looking for it. Tonality needs a 1/3 octave spectrum. This is not a sustainable argument and this is made more significant when combined with the absence of a BS 4142 assessment.
7. Section 4 Plant Noise Calculations are too simplistic. The calculation method for predicting noise levels from the proposed plant at the nearest residential windows are free-field corrections. An urban environment was free- field 20 years ago. Today, we have a much better understanding from modern design aids to account for the built environment (i.e. not free-field). This again is made more significant in the absence of a BS 4142 assessment.
8. An argument that night noise is somehow less significant because the building is not used at night has value only if the planning permission restricts night-time operation.
9. It is far from unusual that the Pre-determination of the original planning application the building requirements of air handling system (total pressure estimated, preliminary fan selection, budget & space allocations made) started out with an over optimistic view which was also the lowest cost. Air handling system total pressure increase is a circular argument.
10. Reselection of the air handling system (pressures calculated, increases the fan size required, bigger ductwork, higher velocity) has resulted in a new fan sound power level spectrum.
11. The proposed mitigation by fitting attenuators to the atmospheric terminations of both air handling units (AHUs) will result in the total pressure increasing again… increase fan size / operating speed / new fan sound power level.
12. This needs to be reported AFTER the attenuation is selected.

The re-selection/re-design as detailed in the Technical Note 'Plant Noise Revision' shows **how far away the first estimate was at the pre-determination planning application stage relating to potential significant adverse noise impact**.

Noise emission levels from the reselection of the proposed roof level plant, particularly low frequency tonal noise, is likely to give rise to significant adverse impact on the health and quality of life of residents external and internal amenity.

The environmental sound level data recorded in 2015 which is more than 6 years old and the 'spot measurements' in our opinion cannot be relied upon for criterion and plant noise design limits.

The RBA Acoustic Assessment and Technical report 'Plant Noise revision' for this S73 Application is incomplete and therefore cannot be relied on.

Furthermore, I have read the minutes of the CWG meeting of 4th August 2021 released by the Development Manager, Simran Randhawa, and item 2 again refers to the 6-years old 2015 data. Item 2 only addresses the single heat pump on ground floor and makes no mention on the selection of the roof mounted five additional heat pumps and the air handling units plant noise impact.

Finally, we would be willing to offer site access to a Goldhurst Terrace property for the purposes of acoustic surveying (if possible/needed).

I would inform you that I have obtained environmental noise data (in the absence of construction activity) during one weekend in July 2021 at our Goldhurst Terrace property.

In summary, the results of the July 2021 survey recorded Daytime period $L_{Aeq,16\ hr}$ 47 dB night time $L_{aeq,8hr}$ 41 dB and typical Background sound levels L_{A90} daytime 40dBA minimum 36 dB(A) typical L_{A90} Nightime 36 dB(A), minimum 33 dB(A). These levels are significantly lower than those recorded by RBA 2015 and 2019.

I would be grateful if you would bring this information to the attention of the Abbey Phase 2 Development Team, Wates Construction Ltd and RBA Acoustics as we do not agree with the revised changes for reasons detailed above and the conclusions in RBA Acoustics Technical note.

I trust this will be accorded attention worthy of qualified professionals.

Yours sincerely

Michael Sugiura

Director

Cc Dan Pope Chief Planning Officer