

## Noise Monitoring Steering Group

Site – 11<sup>th</sup> December 2012  
2pm – 4pm

Present:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Wade</li> <li>• Jurgen Folz</li> <li>• Sarah Taylor</li> <li>• Nicola Horne</li> <li>• Gregg Portass</li> <li>• Graham Hooper</li> <li>• Caroline Leatherdale</li> <li>• Chris Watson</li> <li>• Alf Maneylaws</li> <li>• Daniel Ellis</li> <li>• Jane Ford</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction Director, MVV</li> <li>Site Manager, Envi-Con</li> <li>Environment Agency</li> <li>Public Protection Service, PCC</li> <li>Public Protection Service, PCC</li> <li>Public Protection Service, PCC</li> <li>Environmental manager, Kier / MVV</li> <li>Planning compliance officer, PCC</li> <li>URS</li> <li>URS</li> <li>Community Liaison Manager, MVV</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

Apologies:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Mudge</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

ITEM		ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions, present and apologies</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Confirmation of agenda</b>	
	AOB added – PCC leader’s request; monitoring locations; mitigation measures	<b>NH</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Noise monitoring report</b>	
	<p>It was confirmed that four days of monitoring had taken place since the last meeting and full sets of monitoring records were provided by URS to PPS and EA. A summary of these records is also available on MVV’s website, showing that in 47 monitoring sessions there have been 3 exceedances.</p> <p>It was pointed out by NH that 50 % of the days that monitoring was undertaken since the last NMSG meeting had resulted in breaches and there were further indications of breaches on one further date although the full 2 hour measurement showed compliance, this was unacceptable and disappointing. MVV were asked to carefully consider their activities and how they will prevent further exceedances. The NMP also requires that noise monitoring is carried out to capture the significant noise on site</p>	

	<p>so MVV were asked to clarify how they ensured that this did occur.</p> <p>It was noted that there had been exceedances of noise limits at the same receptor on two of these occasions, and indications of a possible breach on other dates. There was some discussion about why the barriers had not been deployed in advance of piling to limit the noise impact in this area, especially as this was the resultant action in the case of the first breach at this location so should therefore have been standard practice in advance of any further breaches. MVV have been asked to ensure this practice occurs in future, rather than realising there is an issue before deployment. The CEMP requires the deployment of appropriate mitigation, at all times where possible to ensure the best noise climate for residents.</p> <p>A noise monitor is held on site for supplementary monitoring (for site management's internal purposes) and records are held by the site health and safety manager. NH asked for copies of this monitoring information to be submitted to PPS.</p> <p>MVV will reinstate weekly noise monitoring from the restart of construction in January until the end of the piling period which was reported by MVV to finish by the end of January. It was agreed to review the frequency of monitoring at that point.</p> <p>It was confirmed that reinforced concrete works will continue after the piling is completed. MVV commented that obstructions are being encountered in approximately 50% of the pile positions and are being dealt with every day and at that stage there were 220 piles still to be drilled and it is therefore not possible to pick a 'quiet' day for monitoring. It was noted that (depending on the nature of the obstruction) clearance could take between 20 and 45 minutes, and that the nature and depth of the obstruction being cleared affects the type and level of noise produced.</p> <p>MVV clarified the process of piling after request from GP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ground is probed</li> <li>• If obstructions are encountered an LDP rig is deployed</li> <li>• Acoustic barriers are placed around the rig where practicable</li> <li>• Clearing of the obstruction is carried out.</li> <li>• The pile is installed using a CFA rig</li> </ul>	<p><b>MVV / JF</b></p> <p><b>H&amp;S / JFd</b></p> <p><b>MVV / URS</b></p>
--	--	--

MVV confirmed there were 6 piling rigs on site at present, but not all are operating at any one time.

PCC stated that as MVV have the knowledge that the clearance of obstructions is particularly noisy, they were asked to consider how they are approaching noise mitigation. Given that on at least one occasion deployment of barriers had not resulted in significant enough reductions in noise what further mitigation were they utilising, or could they use; what was plan b?

It was suggested by PPS that further mitigation could be to turn all other plant off, however some support plant is needed for the piling and URS expressed the opinion that this would have little effect on the noise levels overall in such circumstances. It was reiterated by PPS that the method to control the noise and to remain within the noise level covered by the planning permission was a matter for MVV but it should be considered very carefully to ensure no further breaches of the noise level occur.

It was noted that the acoustic barriers are effective at ground level but the effect becomes more limited with height. In addition it was noted that whilst working close to the site boundary, space limitations can limit the deployment of acoustic barriers.

PPS asked why acoustic barriers were not placed in position prior to piling commencing and stated as a matter of 'best practice' that acoustic barriers *must* be put in position before any piling commences particularly when used in problem areas or areas close to residential properties. This point was accepted by MVV.

It was suggested that if the barriers were not appropriate on all occasions then other forms of mitigation should be used.

Alternatives and additional mitigation measures were discussed including intermittent rig operation when clearing obstructions.

PCC planning compliance officer acknowledged the steps being taken by MVV to secure compliance with planning conditions and stressed the importance of this.

**MVV /  
JF**

**JW / JF**

	<p>The incident of an auger being shaken to clear spoil was raised and it was confirmed that this had been a one-off incident due to the introduction of a new rig and operator. It was made clear that if this is the case communication on site was not adequate as this should not have happened. This should not recur and management should ensure that similar issues such as this are prevented.</p> <p>Details of the most recent noise exceedances were discussed in detail. It was requested by PPS and agreed by MVV that MVV would provide a schedule of proposed future noise monitoring sessions to PPS and inform them when they were monitoring on site.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the CDs containing noise monitoring records were a complete set. Noise monitoring records will always be made available to PCC, PPS and EA on request. A summary of noise monitoring results will be regularly updated on MVV's website. MVV agreed to review this information.</p> <p>URS confirmed that noise monitoring is planned to cover normal site activities and does not take place during break or lunch times in order to fulfil the commitment in the NMP that potentially noisy activities are fully captured.</p> <p>The exceedance of noise limits reported on 10<sup>th</sup> October was revisited for clarification. It was pointed out that the 2 hour set of monitoring carried out after the first indication of a breach confirmed there was a breach, however MVV did not follow their protocol and stop noisy works until appropriate mitigation was put in place. PCC explained that this is unacceptable. The Noise Monitoring Plan outlines that where a breach has occurred activity ceases until further mitigation has been put in place.</p> <p>MVV has indicated, in correspondence, that monitoring was carried out at another receptor in order to obtain useful information with regards to differences in noise levels at various receptors.</p> <p>Although "useful information" may have been gleaned from monitoring in another location, it clearly shows a breach of procedure. Irrespective of the fact that the further monitoring at</p>	<p><b>DE</b></p> <p><b>JFd</b></p>
--	---	------------------------------------

	<p>the same location didn't show a significant enough reduction in noise levels to allow for work to continue, this therefore lends doubt to whether the procedure was followed for the rest of that working day and early part of the following day until the monitoring took place to show compliance with the noise levels.</p> <p>It was noted that this was the first instance of following the exceedance notification procedure for all involved and that in this instance lines of communication were not ideal. Site management/MVV/URS are all confident that the correct lines of communication are now in place.</p> <p>PPS also reiterated that it is critical that noise issues are addressed.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Site actions and update</b>	
	<p>The second main stage of construction is reinforced concrete works, which have started already and will continue after the end of piling.</p> <p>GH reminded MVV that all works must be kept within agreed working hours and concrete pours should not commence unless they were completed within these hours.</p> <p>MVV stated that all concrete pours are planned to be completed within the normal site working hours.</p> <p>The next main construction stage will be the steelwork erection. Possible mitigation for this stage is already being considered and will be advised in due course in accordance with the principles of the CEMP.</p>	<b>JW / JF</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Complaints</b>	
	<p>PPS confirmed that the majority of complaints received by them were about noise, and in addition had related to specific issues of cleaning the auger, and the use of whistles on site was queried.</p> <p>Site management confirmed that a whistle is used from time to time when heavy loads are being lifted on site to alert workers and this is a necessary health and safety measure.</p> <p>Other complaints included vibration, which was discussed. PPS</p>	

	<p>had received a complaint of a problem at Talbot gardens. This could be related to the use of a vibrating roller on access roads. MVV confirmed this equipment was used infrequently and MVV agreed to carry out monitoring when this is operating.</p> <p>URS stated that vibration monitoring had been carried out and the results had shown that measured vibration levels were unlikely to be perceptible and an order of magnitude below those required to cause cosmetic damage to properties. It is considered unlikely that the piling operations are responsible.</p> <p>GP queried AM on possibility of amplification of vibration with height in tower blocks? Unsure and as such would consider vibration monitoring again if necessary.</p>	<p><b>AM</b></p> <p><b>AM</b></p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<p><u>PCC Leader's request</u></p> <p>Please could the next meeting of the Noise Monitoring Steering Group consider the requirement for improved monitoring and consider, alongside other suggestions, the costs and benefits of increasing the two weekly monitoring to weekly for the construction stages that we know, from experience elsewhere can be particularly disturbing to nearby residents</p> <p>MVV confirmed they will carry out weekly monitoring until the end of the piling works.</p> <p>The use of a permanent unmanned monitoring station was discussed but it was generally agreed that this is not a very satisfactory option due to the unsuitability of unmanned monitoring, as noise could be detected from other sources nearby, MVV are to consider other options for monitoring.</p> <p><u>Monitoring locations</u></p> <p>The receptor at Wolseley Road was discussed. It was generally acknowledged that this monitoring location is not suitable due to the high levels of passing traffic.</p> <p>MVV was asked to consider the identification of an alternative receptor location in the same general direction and an appropriate comparative noise level derived from the noise assessment model. It was agreed that the NMSG had the ability</p>	<p><b>MVV / URS</b></p> <p><b>MVV / URS</b></p>

	<p>to change the location of the monitoring stations, so MVV will consider this for the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Monitoring of noise at height</u></p> <p>It was agreed that a monitoring exercise should occur to identify difference in noise levels between ground floor and height within the blocks in Talbot Gardens, GP to liaise with DE to arrange.</p> <p><u>Mitigation measures</u></p> <p>MVV were asked to provide further detail of the acoustic barriers used on site, including their limitations.</p> <p>PCC planning compliance officer pointed out that a report on the noise exceedences and working hours breaches was to be considered by the Council's Planning Committee on 3 January 2013 at the request of Planning Committee members in the light of complaints to the Council in respect of these matters.</p>	<p><b>MVV / URS</b></p> <p><b>GP/DE</b></p> <p><b>JW</b></p>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
	<b>Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2013, 2pm, site meeting room – recurrence will be assessed at each meeting</b>	<b>JFd</b>