

**Appendix G** additional  
response from EHO

**Stone, Derek**

---

**From:** Stone, Derek  
**Sent:** 14 June 2017 16:12  
**To:** 'Wallsgrove, Jon'  
**Subject:** FW: South Parade Pier - Application - Additional Comments

**Importance:** High

Dear Jon.

Please see below the response from EHO re the points made by the applicants acoustic expert Mr Vine.

I think the response deals with the concerns that EHO still have regarding the current Pier structure and sound proofing capability, and as such their representation remains the same.

If this is going to be contentious, EHO are offering to produce contour maps at the hearing which I believe will be by powerpoint for the panel to see but I have not seen these yet.

I have arranged a projector and screen just in case it is needed but this may not be necessary once you have taken further advice from Mr Vine.

If you require anything further from me just let me know

Kind regards

Derek.

---

**From:** Lee, Richard  
**Sent:** 14 June 2017 15:27  
**To:** Stone, Derek  
**Cc:** Humphreys, Nickii; Maidment, Richard; Baily, Stephen; Baulf, Peter  
**Subject:** South Parade Pier - Application - Additional Comments  
**Importance:** High

Dear Derek,

You are aware this service received the below email from Mike Vine at 16:29 on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> June. This was not picked up by Richard Maidment until his night duty began on the 12<sup>th</sup> June and therefore not received by me until yesterday the 13<sup>th</sup> June. Whilst I appreciate Mr Wallsgrove's enthusiasm to receive comments in respect to the suitability or otherwise of Mike Vine's email his email to Richard Maidment yesterday requesting such is not particularly helpful. It would perhaps be sensible if you could recommend that the applicant ensure that all correspondence is handled through your team so close to Committee next week.

In response to the points raised by Mike Vine, I note that no concerns have been presented in respect to our previous correspondence and conclusions. I therefore assume that the content of our formal report has been accepted in its entirety and won't be the subject of debate at Committee.

It is interesting that further requests for our assistance in respect to an acceptable criteria have been received - particularly interesting as our previous advice in respect to such was not heeded / met. As I see it, our role is to comment on proposals and the accuracy of predictions, not to carry them out ourselves. However, in order to remain obliging in such matters, I have taken the time to remodel the impact using the proposed 10-200-6 window specification at the consultants proposed operating level of 95dB(A) based upon our spectrum adaptation (Cdm). It would perhaps have been expedient if the applicant had attempted this themselves and submitted that for our consideration.

This exercise, demonstrates to me that there may be marginal compliance with the broad band criteria and that the impact at 125Hz will decrease however the results indicate that there will remain significant impact above the previously recommended and still relevant criteria at the front façade of the McCarthy Stone complex and the Royal Beach Hotel. We have produced contour maps to demonstrate this problem to the Committee as necessary.

As Mike Vine has not provided performance data at 63Hz for the glazing specifications we have used insulation prediction software which provides an expected performance of 28dB. This is in line with our experiences and therefore we have used this in our predictions. We have not carried out any modelling for the proposed specifications involving acoustic reveals / liners predominantly as the problem occurs at low frequencies and therefore there will be little absorption in the low frequencies - this is confirmed when comparisons are made of the performances at 125Hz and 250Hz in Mike Vine's e-mail - this will only secure about a 1dB improvement. Consequently there is no point in going to the increased expense for so little return.

As I mentioned yesterday, checking the partial levels indicates that the increased performance of the windows means the roof is now contributing to the impact upon residents so any further improvements are likely to require works to the roof as well. Therefore whilst the 10/200/6 secondary glazing might be a good idea the problems in respect to the impact of the lower frequencies would still need to be restricted or tackled through further combative constructions. I have calculated the predicted levels and would be interested to receive comments from the applicant as to their own assessment / results / conclusions and whether they may match.

In conclusion, whilst improving the window specification at the venue is predicted to reduce the domain of the impact we conclude that there will still be the potential for significant impact at the McCarthy Stone complex and The Royal Beach Hotel. Our opinions therefore remain unchanged in respect to what may be acceptable to the Committee and therefore I offer no change to our recommendations in order to prevent public nuisance and to assess the impacts and control once the venue is operational. It is our position that the measures as presented within Mike Vine's email dated the 9<sup>th</sup> June have not resolved the potential for significant impact to local residents from amplified music used during the provision of regulated entertainment at levels deemed viable by the applicant. I have not communicated this conclusion directly to Mr Wallsgrove so I would be grateful if you would do so on our behalf.

Regards

Rich

**From:** Mike Vine [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 June 2017 16:29  
**To:** Maidment, Richard  
**Cc:** Tommy Ware; Tommy Ware; Jon Wallsgrove  
**Subject:** South Parade Pier

Good Afternoon Richard,

Further to the receipt of your report for the above venue. I have had extensive communication with the client and they have stated that the recommended internal levels within your conclusion for 63Hz & 125Hz of 89dB would not be achievable for them to maintain the quality that they require for the functions.

Based on this they have agreed to extensive mitigation measures of the facades of the function room by installing secondary glazing along both facades. I am sure you can appreciate not only the cost implications but the substantial improvements such a system would offer for the sound reduction of the facades. Secondary glazing is a very effective mitigation measures that will drastically improve the sound attenuation of the facades, this should then enable the cline to operate at a satisfactory level for the functions.

The table below clearly shows the improvement such secondary glazing system would achieve. As stated previously such systems will greatly improve the SRI of the facades and reduce the music break out front he function room.

Could you please indicate to the client that these measures are acceptable, and if they are implemented what internal criteria you would deem acceptable based on your measured data. The client can then check with the necessary people to ensure that they can work with the revised internal criteria based on the upgraded SRI of the significantly upgraded facades.

	125Hz	250Hz	500Hz	1KHz	2KHz	4KHz	Rw
10-200-6	35	46	46	46	56	65	49
10-200-6 lined reveals	37	47	48	50	58	68	52
6-200-10 absorbent reveals	36	45	58	59	55	66	55
Existing (your data)	24	26	33	33	35	44	31

My literature regarding these systems does not include the value for 63Hz but based on the other frequencies it will be substantially higher than the existing.

The client will have to confirm the location of the secondary glazing panels, due to the curved nature of the facade it may be the the panels are installed in a straight line thus creating an even bigger void which would in turn create a higher level of sound attenuation (the client can confirm all of the required/necessary information once they have received your response regarding the proposed mitigation measures that they are prepared to install).

In addition to the revised internal noise levels, perhaps a post installation assessment can be carried out to ensure the necessary values are being achieved.

Thank you.

*Kind Regards*

Mike Vine, BSc Hons, MIOA

Airtight Noisecheck Ltd | Noisecheck Solutions Ltd

