

27 August 2013

By email: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

### SUMMARY OF CLARKE SAUNDER ASSOCIATES LETTER

As discussed over the phone on the Friday the 23<sup>rd</sup> of August 13, I feel that it would be useful to present a summary of my previous letter dated 21 August 13, titled Review of Clarke Saunders Associates Letter.

In summary, CSA's letter focuses on three points:

#### **MACH Acoustics**

- CSA claims that MACH Acoustics has made errors within our calculations and subsequently under predicted noise levels at the residences. This view is made on a misinterpretation of MACH Acoustics report.
- Skating will take place up to the hours of 00:30.

#### **Hoare Lea**

- CSA claim that Hoare Lea's data for skate park noise is incorrect and therefore under predicts noise levels. However MACH Acoustics and Hoare Lea's data is in agreement, whilst CSA's data appears to be high.

#### **MACH Acoustics**

CSA's core argument in assessing MACH Acoustics report, is that a 5m distance correction [14 dB increase in noise level] is required to be added to MACH Acoustics measured data. The result of this additional 14 dB means that noise levels at the receptors increase dramatically over that predicted by MACH Acoustics, indicating that noise "*complaints are likely*".

However CSA have misread MACH Acoustics report. Noise levels measured by MACH Acoustics were measured at 1 meter from the side of the park and then corrected 5m back to the centre of the park. CSA have done exactly the same. Their data represents noise levels at 40m from the park, these have then been corrected to the centre of the park. If this error had not been made, the contradiction below would not have been made. Additionally, the conclusion that noise "*complaints are likely*" could not have been put forwards.

*'It should be noted that the noise levels measured by Mach Acoustics are quite a lot higher than measurements undertaken by us [CSA] at several sites.'*

CSA are also critical of MACH using a cut off time of 10pm. This time is taken to be summer time sunset. No part of the park is or is proposed to be fenced off, therefore a variety of activities can take place at anytime, including well beyond CSA's proposed 00:30. Noise can also be generated significantly closer to residences than the proposed skate park. We therefore see this as a CSA technicality.

## Hoare Lea

In the review of Hoare Lea's report, CSA focuses on Hoare Lea's measured noise levels being lower than CSA's levels. MACH Acoustics does not believe that Hoare Lea have used incorrect levels.

*Both the above levels would be lower than expected by CSA and considerably less than those measured by Mach Acoustics;*

If the 5m distance error had not be made by CSA, they would have seen that both Hoare Lea's and MACH Acoustics data are very similar to each other, well within measurement difference.

MACH Acoustics presented 2 sets of data, Hoare Lea have provide a third. These three sets of data are all very similar to each others, however CSA's data is considerably higher. As indicated by CSA's letter, their measurements were taken at 40m from the park, at this distance the chances of a second noise source effecting levels is considerable. This is possibly the reason why CSA's levels are higher than Hoare Lea and MACH Acoustics' data.

## Conclusion

Hoare Lea and MACH Acoustics have provided very similar conclusions with respect to noise from the skate park, through two separate and independent assessments. Wiltshire Council are also understood to have undertaken two separate internal assessments, with again similar conclusions. CSA's conclusion is very different to these four assessments and uses wording such as 'strewn with errors', 'large assumption', 'entirely incorrect', 'many issues' to make an apparent and emotive case against the park.

In MACH Acoustics view, if the error of adding 14 dB to MACH Acoustics data had not been made, CSA would have struggled to be critical of both MACH Acoustics and Hoare Lea's assessments.

Yours Sincerely,

  
**MACH ACOUSTICS**