

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990**  
**Section 78 Appeal**

**Ref: APP / E1885 / W / 22 / 3310099**

## Contents

|          |   |          |
|----------|---|----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction and Scope of the Evidence</b> .....     | <b>3</b> |
| <b>2</b> | <b>The Appellants' Cases</b> .....                      | <b>3</b> |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Noise Assessments</b> .....                          | <b>4</b> |
|          | <i>Previous Noise Assessment, Original Scheme</i> ..... | 4        |
|          | <i>Updated Noise Assessment, Revised Scheme</i> .....   | 5        |
|          | <i>Updated Baseline Noise Levels</i> .....              | 5        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Comment on the Potential for Noise Impact</b> .....  | <b>6</b> |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Responses to 0008863P25</b>                          |          |



- 2.3 In the revised Statement of Common Ground, with regard to noise WCC agreed that Worcestershire Regulatory Services (the statutory consultees with regard to noise impacts) were satisfied with the noise assessment report prepared by WBM in 2019 for the proposed quarry, albeit in isolation.
- 2.4 With regard to cumulative impact and noise, in the Statement of Common Ground and also in WCC's Statement of Case, WCC confirm that the appellant has provided sufficient information to determine that the appeal proposals, in combination with other development, would not cause amenity harm with regard to noise to residential dwellings or Heathfield Knoll School and First Steps Nursery, subject to the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.





4.6





- 5.5 Site noise calculations were undertaken, including the consideration of the mitigation required to ensure that appropriate noise levels were met for the reasonable worst case scenarios. The receptors considered included the nearest residential properties and also the Heathfield Knoll School and Nursery.
- 5.6 I have considered cumulative impact from noise in my proof and shown that this does not affect the outcome of the noise assessments for the original and revised schemes. This reasoning should also be sufficient to respond to the Rule 6 Party concerns regarding noise.

## **6 Summary and Conclusions**

- 6.1 The proof of evidence regarding noise has addressed the reasons for the refusal relating to noise of the planning application for a proposed quarry at land at Lea Castle Farm, Wolverley

- 6.5 Construction noise will be variable and temporary, and only likely to be in close proximity to any noise sensitive receptors for relatively short durations. In addition, the calculated site noise levels due to the quarry are worst case, which would not happen in practice. Taking this into account, the cumulative impact from both normal site activities from the quarry and construction operations is unlikely to be significant at any receptor.
- 6.6 As such, the consideration of cumulative impact does not alter the outcome of the original noise assessment of the site.
- 6.7 Heathfield Knoll School and Nursery are located approximately 1 kilometre from the Lea Castle Village site. At this distance, any construction noise from the Lea Castle site would be insignificant and is likely to be inaudible at the school and nursery, and as such would not change the impact assessment of quarry noise affecting this receptor.
- 6.8 The consideration of cumulative impact does not affect the outcome of the original noise assessment for the original scheme, nor the updated noise assessment for the revised scheme.

**Rachel Canham** BEng MSc CEng FIOA