

Day 5

Darren Humpherson

Proof 2.1.1. How have figures of noise levels from the White Horse been arrived at?

-Appendices, pg9

-Take provided vehicle flows, take % of HGVs, take average speed, distance from observation point from road, ground type, type of road surface, angle of view, take relative heights of road surface, take any barriers into account > put into noise model

-Theoretical model, based on empirical data

Is it right that you have factored in any screening effect along the carriageway?

-Trees and vegetation do not generally provide mitigation

Mitigation planting will not have an effect in reducing noise?

-No physical effect

-'Psychological effect'

Would 2001 assessment be audible, and recognisable as traffic noise?

-Yes, if taken in isolation, though if other factors were involved may not be recognisable.

Have similar assessments been taken for Wessex ridgeway?

-No, 'resource intensive'

Noise levels for Wessex ridgeway will increase?

-Agreed

-Character of the area would increase

-Would be recognisable as traffic noise

Footpaths and other public rights of way would also experience increases in noise level, and perception that the noise was from traffic

-Agreed

Important that noise would increase in cemetery?

-Agreed

How have you attempted to mitigate noise in cemetery?

-Nothing specific for cemetery

Could proposed mitigation on road surface be carried out in town centre?

-Yes

-However would not have an effect on noise, as only have effect above 45mph

Noise measurements mostly taken in residential areas, not in open areas?

-Agreed

Noise measurements taken in a period of 15 minutes?

-Agreed

Site 2 noise:

-Mostly from A350 rather than from town centre

Existing sound levels, first three locations have distant traffic noise, only occasionally at site 3. Traffic on existing A350 at site 4 and 5.

-Agreed

Data representative of rural environment

-Agreed

Wildly varying noise estimates between proof and other assessments WHA107: 198 less people annoyed by noise after 15 years. According to 2001 census, 4000 houses in WSB – do you argue that other than 300 houses, everyone in WSB will benefit

-Under study area, there were 6613 houses identified. 2 possible approaches - DMRB or TAG. DMRB environmental assessment, TAG environmental appraisal.

-Number cannot be compared

What is the reality in terms of people benefiting and disbenefitting?

-Noise model has identified every household, and calculated their noise levels under do minimum and do something

-Every property experiencing a change of more than 1DB recorded

-Speculate that 2001 assessment using different significance levels.

Explanation of 115 compared to 4,500 properties?

-Possibly different assessment area

Measure should be of significance, not based on arbitrary figure like 1DB. How will 1DB improve people's lives?

-Some residents will perceive significant change in character of town centre

People adaptable to background noise?

-Agreed

WHO assessment of 50DB is moderate annoyance, e.g. Tumble dryer

-Good analogy

-Not noticeable in busy urban area

E WSB urban edge, not busy urban area.

-Agreed

Definition of moderate and minor adverse effects?

- Contained in appendices
- Commonly accepted semantic scale

Minor – 3-4.9DB

Moderate 5-9.9DB

Noise clearly perceptible at county wildlife site?

- Agreed

Assessments of noise without scheme?

- Do minimum is do nothing

No comparable study for FW route

- Agreed