

Louise St John Howe  
Programme Officer  
PO Services  
PO Box 10965  
Sudbury  
Suffolk  
CO10 3BF

By e-mail to [louise@poservices.co.uk](mailto:louise@poservices.co.uk)

4 November 2019

Dear Louise

LAF019/AW

**RE: WELWYN HATFIELD LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

We are writing on behalf of **Tarmac Trading Ltd.** in response to the Inspector's invitation to comment on Examination documents EX154-160 inclusive.

This representation relates to Cole Jarman's Noise Assessment of Birchall Garden Suburb (EX157) and to Cole Jarman's Non-Technical Summary of that report (EX158).

Our representation follows our recent discussions with Council officers, during which they have asked us to assess the implications of more stringent criteria for noise from Burnside than the criteria assessed previously by Cole Jarman.

Those more stringent criteria are 46 dB  $L_{A,T,r}$  for receptors to the north of Burnside and 47 dB  $L_{A,T,r}$  for receptors to its east.

Initial noise modelling taking account of those more stringent criteria undertaken by Cole Jarman indicated the appropriateness of raising the assumed height of our proposed noise bund/barrier adjacent to Burnside from 5m to 10m.

**Enclosure A**, contributed by David Jarvis Associates, illustrates that 10m noise bund/barrier, set back approximately 3.5m from the Burnside boundary, thereby allowing access for maintenance purposes. A 5m noise bund/barrier adjacent to the A414, as we assumed previously, is also shown. Drainage features within our proposed 60m buffer to Burnside and the A414 are also indicated, but planting/vegetation has been omitted from the plan to maximise its legibility. The section on the plan demonstrates that a 10m noise bund/barrier would also have the benefit of screening Burnside from the nearest proposed residential buildings within Birchall Garden Suburb (BGS) some 60m to its north and east.

**Enclosure B** is a version of our Illustrative Master Plan for BGS relocating the proposed primary school to the site indicated for that purpose on the Council's Strategy Diagram for the BGS allocation in its draft Local Plan.

**DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES LIMITED**  
50 North Thirteenth Street  
Central Milton Keynes  
Buckinghamshire  
MK9 3BP

☎ +44 (0) 1908 666276  
✉ [mail@davidlock.com](mailto:mail@davidlock.com)  
🌐 [www.davidlock.com](http://www.davidlock.com)

**Enclosure C** is a design study we have undertaken of the edge of BGS nearest Burnside. We have sketched two indicative options for the design of that edge of BGS that would minimise the penetration of noise from Burnside into BGS. We have presented four examples of such noise-limiting design within as-built developments, including one development in Welwyn Garden City (the award-winning Clockhouse Gardens scheme) and other developments adjacent to noise sources in Leighton Buzzard, Cambridge and Stockton-on-Tees.

**Enclosure D**, contributed by Cole Jarman, presents noise contour plans for the two sketch layout options (Figure 15/0494/DIS/NC02), from which it can be seen that the first option ("Sketch Layout 1") is more effective than the second ("Sketch Layout 2") in minimising the penetration of noise from Burnside into BGS.

A further contour plan (Figure 15/0494/DIS/NC03) presents a minor variation of Sketch Layout 1 that optimises the reduction of noise from Burnside by slightly raising the height of the buildings closest to Burnside on its northern side from 12m to 14m, 'plugging' two gaps between those buildings and adding a building to the north east of Burnside in order to reduce the space between those buildings to the north of Burnside and those to its east. That minor variation of Sketch Layout 1 would enable the more stringent noise criteria the Council requested we assess to be fully met.

### **Conclusion and implications**

This further evidence demonstrates that the buffer we have assumed to both Burnside and the A414 of 60m would still enable these more stringent noise criteria to be met at BGS, assuming a noise bund/barrier adjacent to the Burnside boundary of 10m (an appropriate height for such a feature), a localised increase in the maximum height of proposed buildings nearest BGS on its northern side to 14m (corresponding to 4-storey development, which would not be unduly high in this location) and an overall form of development that reflects successful schemes both locally and more widely.

We trust this further evidence provides appropriate reassurance that the 60m buffer we have assumed would result in an entirely acceptable noise climate at the edge of BGS closest to Burnside (and the A414), even if the more stringent noise criteria requested by Council officers are taken into account in the assessment.

We also trust this further evidence enables the consideration of the BGS allocation at a single further hearing session rather than over two further hearing sessions, which would now be entirely inappropriate.

Yours sincerely

ANDREW WINTERSGILL  
PARTNER

Email: [awintersgill@davidlock.com](mailto:awintersgill@davidlock.com)

cc: Sue Tiley, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Encl: A to D inclusive, as above