

PLANNING REF : 260613
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Handpost House
: Barge Lane, Swallowfield, Berkshire
: RG7 1HZ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Tim Allen
DATE SUBMITTED : 02/06/2026

COMMENTS:

Please find attached a report from Evolve Acoustic ltd.

Evolved Acoustics Limited

2 St Andrews Place

Southover Road

Lewes

East Sussex

BN7 1UP

Company Number:

14503285

TO:

Tim Allen

Handpost House

Barge Lane

Swallowfield

RG7 1HZ

Review of Noise Impact Assessment - Wyvols Court Farm - Unit 13

Dear Tim,

I have reviewed the Noise Impact Assessment (Ref.

CRM.5011.002.NO.R.001 - Enzygo) in line with our agreed scope.

Overall, the methodology used is broadly appropriate and is similar to how most consultants would approach this type of

assessment based on experience.

However, the assessment's conclusions appear at odds with your subjective experience of the noise at your property as described further below. My review highlights a number of areas of potential uncertainty around the predicted noise levels.

Assessment Outcome vs Resident's Experience:

The Rating Level of the workshop was predicted to fall 9 dB below

the background sound level in the garden and 2 dB below

the background sound level externally at first-floor window level.

This would suggest that the noise from the premises is virtually inaudible in the garden of Handpost House. I understand that this is not the case, based on your reported subjective experience, with sound from saws and other items of equipment frequently audible above the background sound. This suggests the potential that the Rating Level may have been underestimated.

Methodology:

Bank Holiday

As the issue of the bank holiday has been raised, I will address this first.

The noise data relating to the premises itself, and the calculation of its sound levels at Handpost House, are based on the attended survey undertaken on the Friday. Provided this was a representative and typical working day, with the premises operating normally, this approach is reasonable.

The background sound survey was undertaken over the bank holiday weekend. The purpose of the background sound survey is not to establish noise levels from the premises itself, but to establish the underlying background sound levels without the

source significantly influencing the results. The consultant has based the background sound analysis on Sunday, so the levels measured on the bank holiday Monday do not appear to have been relied upon.

On that basis, I do not consider the fact that the survey was undertaken over a bank holiday weekend to be a significant cause for concern.

Selection of Background Sound Level

The background sound monitoring was undertaken in the front garden of Handpost House. As the assessment has been undertaken at the rear of the dwelling, it may have been preferable to monitor background sound levels at the rear. However, I am doubtful that this would have made a significant difference to the overall assessment outcome.

The consultant has derived a background sound level of 40 dB LA90,15min. Based on my own analysis, the level on Sunday during the 08:00-18:00 period was more commonly below 40 dBA. I would probably have selected 39 dB LA90,15min as the more representative background sound level.

For information, the background sound levels were lower on Monday, averaging approximately 36 dB LA90,15min. However, as discussed above, this may be due to the bank holiday, with lower traffic flows and reduced general activity.

Noise-Sensitive Receptor Location

In answer to your question, the black and white circles/spheres are the calculation points in the noise model. These are the precise positions at which the noise levels from the assessed source are calculated. In this case, one calculation point has been included on the rear facade at first-floor level, and one has been included in the garden.

You should satisfy yourself that these locations adequately reflect the noise-sensitive parts of your property. For example, if there are windows on the side elevation of the building, rather than only on the rear elevation, these may also need to be considered.

From what I can see, the selected calculation points appear reasonable.

Calculation of Noise Level from the Premises

The assumed internal noise level is not explicitly labelled as an adopted design level, but it is derived from the internal extended measurement SM02 in Table 3-5, which recorded 72.3 dB LAeq,T. Section 5.3.1 then indicates that this internal extended measurement was used, together with the predicted facade/roof sound reduction performance, to calculate breakout noise from the unit.

As BS 4142 is based on a 1-hour reference time interval during the daytime, it may have been preferable to consider the worst-case 1-hour period. By my calculation, this would be 73.9 dBA, which is 1.6 dB higher than the level adopted in the assessment.

The reliance on SM02 to derive the assumed internal noise level has the potential to introduce uncertainty into the assessment. Table 3-5 indicates that some individual items of

equipment were measured at levels of up to 87 dBA at 1 m. Whilst these near-field levels are not directly comparable with a reverberant internal measurement, they do indicate that certain items of equipment are materially louder than others.

The report states that SM02 was located internally in a position representative of the reverberant field exposed to noise from all equipment. However, limited information is provided regarding the location of SM02 relative to the louder items of equipment, the extent to which those items were operating during the 3-hour measurement period, or whether the measurement captured a reasonably worst-case operating scenario. On this basis, the adopted internal level of 72.3 dBA may be reasonable, but its representativeness is not fully demonstrated.

The noise model has been calibrated to the external measurement undertaken at position SM01. This introduces some uncertainty, as this is a single calibration position located close to the building. It may have been more reliable to reference

multiple calibration positions at greater distances from the building, if this was viable having regard to residual sound levels. Feature Corrections

Section 5.5.2 of the report states:

"Some of the equipment does contain tonal content, most significantly the routers, which is clearly audible inside the unit. At

the receptor, the tonal content is masked by nearby road related noise and is further 'muffled' by the sound reduction from the unit's facade."

In the calculation of the Rating Level, a +2 dB feature correction is applied for "just perceptible" tonality.

I understand that, based on your subjective experience, tonal sounds such as high-pitched whining from saws and other equipment are frequently audible from within the curtilage of Handpost House. On this basis arguably a +4 dB or +6 dB feature correction, corresponding to perceptible or clearly perceptible tonality respectively, would apply using the subjective method of BS 4142:2014+A1:2019.

BS 4142 also allows penalties to be applied for impulsivity, i.e. transient or impact-type sounds. I would expect there to be the potential for some heavy impact sounds during loading and unloading activities. If these form a minor part of the overall noise emitted from the premises then the decision not to apply an impulsivity correction is reasonable. However, the impulsivity correction would apply if transient sounds are frequently audible from Handpost House. It is acknowledged, however, that feature corrections should not be over-loaded and, on balance, the tonality appears more significant than the impulsivity in this case.

Summary:

In summary:

The assessment methodology appears broadly robust. However, the assessment's conclusions appear at odds with your subjective experience. The assessment predicts a rating level 9 dB below the background sound level in the garden of Handpost House; almost suggesting inaudibility. The main sources of potential uncertainty in the assessment are:

- whether the noise level adopted for the premises itself represents a reasonably worst-case operating scenario. As

the owner potentially had influence or control over the noise output from the premises during the survey, we cannot know with certainty how representative the measured levels are;

- whether the internal noise level adopted for the premises in the model adequately represents the loudest pieces of equipment in use;
- the technique used to calibrate the noise model;
- whether the penalty applied for tonality is sufficient; and - whether an impulsivity feature correction would also be justified.

- The fact that the survey was undertaken over a bank holiday weekend does not appear to be a major concern, based on the way the consultant has derived the background sound level from the survey data.

- If a background sound survey were undertaken on a different date, there is a possibility we would measure different levels however my review suggests that the background survey data is not a major source of uncertainty in the assessment.

The uncertainties identified above may alter the Rating Level versus background sound level differential enough to change the outcome of the assessment. The assessment suggests a Low Impact is likely, which is not consistent with your reported subjective experience whereby tonal sounds from equipment are frequently audible and subjectively intrusive.

Yours sincerely

Tim Hegan

BSc(Hons) MIOA

Director

Evolved Acoustics Lim

In Summary

1. The report says the background noise is higher than the router and saw used in the factory. Clearly incorrect, if it made no noise then planning would not be required. All the residents hear it every day. 2. The microphone was only 1m away from the factory door, which does not give an area sound.

3. They say you cannot hear any difference in noise, when all the residents can hear the low grind of one machine, and the high pitch noise of the other .

4. Because of that noise difference the data should be 4-6Dbs higher than has been used.

5. The deliberate choosing of a bank holiday weekend to record noise , when they knew the factory was shut.

The previous planning was rightly concerned about residential building next door when granting B1 planning status.

If planning was granted B2 industrial manufacturing, then that would set a precedent for the other two building to follow. Then residents would have not one industrial factory , but up to 3 factories.

I believe that there are many companies that would rent this space that fit B1 planning restrictions, and that by rejecting this planning application would not stop industry in the building but change it to a compatible one.

The landlord by renting out to a non compliant business , and having decent law abiding residents next door, should NOT get planning permission because he has got away with it for an extended time. I really hope the law is upheld.