

**From:** David Trew <DTrew@bickerdikeallen.com>  
**Sent:** 03 November 2023 14:31  
**To:** clerk@clystthoniton.org.uk  
**Cc:** Janvrin Edbrooke; garycollier@clystthoniton.org.uk; grantharrison@clystthoniton.org.uk; mikemuir@clystthoniton.org.uk; seanwheeldon; suzannehales@clystthoniton.org.uk  
**Subject:** RE: A11317 Clyst Honiton NA document

Hello Rob,

Thanks for the e-mail. I see that the airport has objected. This is not unreasonable considering the proximity of the site to the airport. We updated our acoustic report this year to include a discussion regarding the 2009 and 2017 contours. Was this issued as part of the NDO and NP process? If instructed, we can prepare a formal response to the technical issues raised in the letter. This would be a time charge extension to our previous brief and would cost less than £1,000. I set out some general comments below.

There is reference to the phrase “unacceptable” within their summary paragraph. This is not supported by national and planning policy regarding noise. The correct interpretation is that “unacceptable” noise impacts are so severe that applications can be refused on noise grounds alone and relate to conditions where there is an “inability to mitigate effects of noise”. (Planning Practice Guidance: Noise PPG(N)). The unmitigated noise effects for this site are significant but they are not unacceptable.

The objection refers to sound levels in gardens as being unacceptable. This is covered in our acoustic report dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2023 but the relevant guidance is reproduced here *“However, it is also recognized that these guideline values are not achievable in all circumstances where development might be desirable. In higher noise areas, such as city centres or urban areas adjoining the strategic transport network, a compromise between elevated noise levels and other factors, such as the convenience of living in these locations or making efficient use of land resources to ensure development needs can be met, might be warranted. In such a situation, development should be designed to achieve the lowest practicable levels in these external amenity spaces, but should not be prohibited.”*. The noise levels in the gardens will not be particularly desirable but are not unacceptable.

The objection refers to night time noise being unacceptable. This is not correct. The night time noise effects are significant and they will require mitigation in the form of high acoustic performance windows and acoustic ventilation to reduce the need to open windows at night. It is possible to mitigate this adverse effect and so by definition the noise is not unacceptable.

There is reference to the daytime levels being greater than “suggested in the NDO”. I am not sure what document this is referring to, but our 2023 report included an assessment of daytime these greater levels from the earlier 2009 contours.

Any queries let me know.

**David Trew**  
Partner