Please find below the response from the noise technician.

Please let me know if you need me to get any more information. If needs be we can commit in writing to perform a secondary analysis after the duly made checks are done to include R2 and even R3 if deemed necessary, but I would look to avoid this due to time constraints if at all possible.

Thanks,

Regarding the input files I cannot understand the question. In Annex 9 of the report there is a detailed list of the inputs given to the predicting model, including noise sources, geometry and so on. There is NO “input files”, The predicting model is built using a .dwg as a base, and introducing the noise sources that are fully described in the report and more specifically in Annex9.

Coming to the other request, receiver R2 was actually taken into account

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Receiver** | **Day** | **Night** |
|  |  | **dBA** | **dBA** |
| IPkt003 | R2 - Harold Str. | 45.6 | 43.1 |
| IPkt004 | R1 - Denison Rd. | 44.1 | 43.3 |

If the requested info is about the fact that only R1 was rated according to BS4142 It is because of the position of R2, that was considered as less impacted because of its location.

More, the rating requires the measurement of the background noise, and this measurement was taken only at R1. Yet, these two receivers are very close to each other, and it was considered redundant a rating of both. Finally, R1 is facing directly SEDAMYL plant, while R2 is on the back.

These are the reasons.

Hi

Hope you are well. I have taken over from Enrico for environment here in Selby.

In 2019 you produced for us the attached file. We have submitted this to the environment agency for the permit application, and they have asked for the input files/data used for the report.

They also raised a question about the fact that R2 Harold Street is not considered directly, is there a justification I can give them for this?