

Planning Application 20/01226/FUL

Written Submission for the Planning Committee 14/10/20

I would like to clarify a point made in the environmental health email Sent: 01/10/2020 13:01:30 From Tony McEvoy To: Lydia Mather. In conversation with Tony McEvoy I have advised that there has been some improvement as a result of Carbosynth switching off one of the refrigerated containers and trying some temporary mitigation measures. However, the noise nuisance has not gone away. It is not a loud noise but a low humming sound that is very intrusive.

The committee should also be aware that the noise has been heard by Tony McEvoy during a visit on Friday 2 October. Early afternoon I sent him a video clip illustrating noise from the site heard in my garden. The weather was poor and I was surprised that I could hear the noise because it has been most often heard on warm calm days and nights. In response to this video Tony visited and later that afternoon I had a call from him to say that he had heard the noise from the lane immediately behind my property. He felt it was coming from the AHU on Units 4,5,6 which are not within the scope of this application. The AHU on Units 10,11,12 is basically the same plant as on Units 4,5,6 and a significant contribution to the overall noise has now started to come from the direction of Units 10,11,12. The noise survey did not establish how much noise this AHU could make under significant load, Units 10,11,12 did not appear to be fully operational at that time. I have tried hard to identify the conditions when the noise is worse to provide constructive help but I have no information about loading variability resulting from Carbosynth's activities and how these have been ramping up at Units 10,11,12. I don't believe Carbosynth know when their plant is noisy because it runs automatically. The primary respite has been wind and other background noises, the quiet days and nights which we get in our rural setting have been most affected.

It seems to me that the solution is to minimise the plant that is required on the site, both in terms of limiting its on time and removing it if the function can be off site.

I understand Carbosynth are considering mitigation measures including a timer to switch off the AHUs evenings and weekend. I would point out that a timer would still leave a noise nuisance during the working week so mitigation should be the key objective. Please could the committee consider placing a condition on approval of 20/01126/FUL: that measures are installed and demonstrably shown to mitigate noise nuisance by a reasonable date. Such a condition would reinforce something that should have happened already, Condition 8 placed on this site back 2017 was supposed to ensure mitigation was part of any further planning applications.