[redacted]

[redacted]

Subject: RE: P/2025/0833 - Roxburgh House. Wrexham

Hi Philip,

We have also received a response from NoiseAir, who originally prepared the acoustic report. They have provided a commentary against the points raised as per the below –

"1) Table 10 identifies the worst case noise levels. The worst case nighttime level for the front on the proposal is quoted in table 7 as 69 dB, yet Table 5 that quotes the monitoring results shows this to be 72dB.

Table 10 outlines the glazing performance requirements, not the worst case noise levels. Table 7 states a worst case nighttime noise level of 69 dB(A) as stated. Table 5 states two worst case nighttime values; one being 69 dB(A) and the other being 72 dB(A). The first is a worst case measured noise level as measured over 16 hours (LAeq,16hrs) and the second is the worst case measured noise level as measured of 1 hour (LAeq,1hr). Assessment of noise is typically undertaken based on the LAeq,16hrs metric, this the approach for TAN11 and also BS 8233:2014. There the values given in Table 7 are based on LAeq,16hrs (07:00 to 23:00 hrs) for the daytime condition and LAeq,8hrs (23:00 to 07:00 hrs) for the nighttime condition. The sound insulation scheme is then based on these values.

2) Tabel 10 identified the worst case noise level for the rear of the building at night to be 52dB yet tables 8and 9 shows his to be 55dB.

Table 10 does not give the value stated. Table 7 however does state 52 dB(A) as the worst case nighttime noise level to the rear. Tables 8 and 9 however show BS 4142:2014 initial assessment values, for Table 8 the 55 dB(A) value is the BS 4142 rating level and is not comparable to the value given ion Table 7. The specific sound level presented for the daytime and night-time in Table 8 are derived from more detailed assessment of the mechanical plant noise as presented in Figures 7 and 8.

Table 9 shows a level of +55 dB(A) however this is the excess of the rating level over the background sound level for potential delivery activities. The values for this are assumed as no deliveries occurred during the survey.

Furthermore Table 6 has identified the highest noise level exceeded more than 10 times overnight. The value from the front of the proposal is quoted as 83.6 dBLAmax. TAN 11 has a further caveat for nighttime noise:

Night-time noise levels (2300-0700): sites where individual noise events regularly exceed 82dBLAmax (Stime weighting) several times in any hour should be treated as being in NEC C, regardless of the LAeq,8H(except where the LAeq,8H already puts the site in NEC D).

Our report presents LAfmax noise levels however TAN11 requires LAsmax noise levels, the first metric is a 'fast' time weighting with the second being a 'slow' time weighting. The sound level meters generally can only measure one or the other with the fast time weighting providing more information for assessment should it be needed. This is typically a more modern approach to acoustic survey work and provides information for other noise characteristics, such as impulsivity for a BS 4142 assessment. The 'fast' time weighting will provide higher discrete noise levels by several dB as it is measuring at faster time intervals. I note the

exceedance of the 82 dB LAsmax of the LAfmax level is 1.6 dB. It is highly likely that should the time weighting have been set to 'slow' the 82 dB LAmax level would not have been exceeded.

I would also note that the time period for the LAfmax assessment was 2 minutes which is conservative."

We would appreciate your consideration of the above points, and would be happy to accept an appropriately worded condition, if needed to progress the application to determination.

Thanks,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Good afternoon Philip,

Further to [redacted] yesterday, please see response below from Weetwood regarding the phosphates issue at Roxburgh House, which will hopefully alleviate concerns–

"Our report presented an argument that the site will not increase phosphates into the SAC for two reasons:

i) Foul water volumes generated are less for the proposed residential use in comparison to the office use; and

ii) DCWW have confirmed that the receiving wastewater treatment works is currently compliant with its phosphates permit and there is capacity within the treatment works to accommodate foul water from a 30 apartment development.

I see there has been discussion regarding the present office use and that the building has been empty for some time and that we may not be able to argue point i) above.

Irrespective, DCWW have confirmed that the wastewater treatment works is compliant with its phosphates consent AND has the capacity to receive foul water from the proposed re-development. If the treatment works can accommodate the development then it can be interpreted that the treated effluent discharged into the SAC will not adversely impact the SAC catchment.

The emails from the planning officer do not seem to address the performance of the treatment works and the DCWW comment that the development can be accommodated."

[redacted]