

Central
Bedfordshire
Council
Priory House
Monks Walk
Chicksands,
Shefford SG17 5TQ



**TO EACH MEMBER OF THE
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

13 January 2015

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - Wednesday 14 January 2015

Further to the Agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the additional Late Sheet information for item 6:-

Late Sheet

3 - 4

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact Democratic Services on Tel: 0300 300 4040.

Yours sincerely

Helen Bell,
Committee Services Officer
email: helen.bell@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix F for Item 6

Comments have been received from LFAcoustics, working on behalf of the Council, in response to the submitted report from AAD, on behalf of objectors to the scheme, attached as Appendix D to the Late Sheet.

"My main comments are:

4.4 – the measurement time period was considered suitable for this type of activity. Note that daytime noise levels are normally assessed over a period of 1 hour and thus the shortened assessment periods of 5 minutes considered provide a reasonable approach to evaluating potential effects, as suggested by AAD later in the report as being appropriate (Para 6.14).

4.6 – The analysis of the measured noise levels at Mead House were based upon both an evaluation of the noise level data and *more importantly* the audio recordings made. The variations which are highlighted in red were not attributable to changes in the number of bikes as these were only just audible, as indicated in our report and masked as vehicles travelled along the road, as you observed. The variations in noise levels measured during the exercise were attributable to variations in road traffic and regular aircraft flying overhead and not the bikes. The analysis undertaken by AAD in Section 4.6 is therefore not correct, as on no occasion did the measurements indicate that the bikes contributed significantly to the measured noise levels.

Section 5 – the aim of increasing the bunding height was both to reinstate what was around the track previously and fill in any gaps to ensure that the bikes were screened at all times, which is not the case at present.

Para 7.4 – this is misleading, at no point did the use of the bikes contribute significantly to the measured noise levels at Mead House. Any increase in noise levels was less than 3dB(A) and the 4 dB(A) stated is based upon not understanding the analysis of the data fully.

Para 7.5 - There were **no** periods where the use of the bikes gave rise to noise levels at Mead House above 55 dB LAeq,T. The increases noted in the data were attributable to additional vehicle movements on the road or aircraft flying overhead.

Para 7.6 – the recommendation for the mitigation was to reinstate the mitigation which had been provided previously, before the track levels were raised to improve the track conditions.

Para 7.9 – a limit of 46 dB LAeq, 5 minute is considered unreasonable given that the ambient levels, as measured can be 10 dB(A) above this and the fact that the track is already operational under an extant permission without any controls. The controls recommended seek to provide a reduction in potential disturbance from the track.

In summary, the AAD review does not appear to have given any real consideration to the fact that the track can operate at present unrestricted for 6 months per year over the summer. The proposals seek to change the operating period to the winter months, which are likely to be less sensitive, as people do not tend to use their gardens as much. Furthermore, the proposed controls, will seek to reduce any potential disturbance.”