Consultee Comments for Planning Application 22/501335/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/501335/FULL
Address: Land North Of Little Cheveney Farm Sheephurst Lane Marden Kent
Proposal: Installation of a renewable energy led generating station comprising of ground-mounted solar PV arrays, associated electricity generation infrastructure and other ancillary equipment comprising of storage containers, access tracks, fencing, gates and CCTV together with the creation of woodland and biodiversity enhancements.
Case Officer: Marion Geary

Consultee Details

Name: . Environmental Protection Team MIDKENT Environmental Health
Address: Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Town Hall, Mount Pleasant Road Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN1 1RS
Email: Not Available
On Behalf Of: MBC - Environmental Services

Comments

MIDKENT ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
MEMORANDUM
From: Sarah Jane Edwards-Bonner
Environmental Protection Team To: Marion Geary
Planning Department

Date: 5th October 2022
Our Ref: 22/517112/GENPLA
Planning Details and Application Ref:
PLANNING REF 22/501335/FULL

UPRN 010095450872

ADDRESS
Land North Of Little Cheveney Farm
Sheephurst Lane
Marden
Kent

NATURE
Installation of a renewable energy led generating station comprising of ground-mounted solar arrays, associated electricity generation infrastructure and other ancillary equipment comprising of storage containers, access tracks, fencing, gates and CCTV together with the creation of woodland and biodiversity enhancements.
REASON

MAIN POINTS CONSIDERED:

Noise. Amenity. Air Quality. Land contamination. Asbestos. Radon. Lighting. Odour. Accumulations. Sewage. Private Water Supplies.

SITE VISITED:

No.

COMMENTS:

This is a second consultation, and previously my colleague had concerns regarding the Noise Assessment (Acoustic Consultants report Project Ref 10253 by dB Consultation Ltd Document Ref: dBC/Origin/10253/ML/02) submitted as follows:

They have used BS4124 assessment for one location but not the other. This is based on the fact that location 2 had a very low background level and would have delivered an unfavourable assessment. I feel they should have done this and then used context (and other methodologies) to show that the impact was not excessive.
They have picked the modal LA90 values but the modal value has 66% of the LA90 values lower than it and only 17% higher (this is not representative of worst case.
UK Powernetworks acknoldege the impact of low frequency noise from their transformers and use NANR45 Procedure for the assessment of low frequency noise complaints as a supplementary assessment method. I would also suggest the use of Phon graphs. Both these use third octave bands to assess audibility and intrusion of LF noises. The NANR45 is for internal levels but it is possible to do assessments to predict internal levels and these would be very useful.
Having a low background noise levels makes other noise source potentially more audible. This can mean that lower levels of noise that would be masked by other environmental noise can be more intrusive. Artificially working to a 30dB level is not a great assessment of the impact in a low background area.
The use of a 4m barrier can be an issue with LF noise due to the long wavelengths of LF noise. I

would like more information on this.

I note that the energy storage facility has been removed from the proposal, but apart from the Cover letter and Response document I can find no further Noise related information submitted to the planning portal.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Refusal unless further satisfactory noise data is submitted.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for further advice or information in relation to this matter.

Sarah Jane Edwards-Bonner
Scientific Officer