Noise Monitoring Steering Group

Site – 9th October 2012 2pm – 3:30pm

Present:

John Wade (JW) Construction Director, MVV Juergen Folz (JF) Site Manager, Envi-Con Sarah Taylor (ST) **Environment Agency** David Mudge (DM) **Environment Agency** • Graham Hooper (GH) Public Protection Service, PCC Nicola Horne (NH) Public Protection Service, PCC Alf Maneylaws (AM) URS • Daniel Ellis (DE) **URS** Jane Ford (JFd) Community Liaison Manager, MED

ITEM		ACTION
	Introductions	
1.	Confirmation of Chair and Agenda	
	Confirmed, MVV to chair and minute the meetings	JW/JFd
2.	Purpose of the group and meetings	
	NH explained that the project is under close scrutiny due to its sensitive nature and that minutes from these meetings would be presented to the planning committee and should be posted on MVV's website.	JFd
	Minutes to be circulated for agreement ASAP and issued formally with AH (planning) in cc.	JFd
	The frequency of meetings was discussed, and if necessary it was agreed that a special meeting could be called in response to specific events – this was agreed by all.	
	Next meeting to be held in December and a recurring invitation will be sent out for quarterly meetings from then on.	JFd
	It was acknowledged that this inaugural meeting was held later than originally intended for various unavoidable reasons. However informal discussions, liaison and interim meetings have taken place and monitoring started on 13 th August 2012.	
	AM confirmed monitoring was being carried out in accordance with the procedure set out in the agreed Noise Management Plan and the results reported on the acoustic monitoring sheets Three discs containing all the acoustic monitoring sheets will be provided at the earliest opportunity. It was agreed that these will be available at each meeting to take away from here on in.	JFd/DE

	It was noted that monitoring is currently taking place weekly, rather than fortnightly as stated in the plan. This is due to the rapidly changing nature of the site at the present time and will become fortnightly as activities stabilise.	
3.	Monitoring report	
	AM explained that 30 minute monitoring sessions were taking place at each of the agreed receptors. If the L _{Aeq} is within agreed limits, an acoustic monitoring sheet is completed and a copy given to the site management. If the L _{Aeq} is above agreed limits then a further 2 hour monitoring session is undertaken. If the 2 hour session shows that the site is working within agreed limits, an acoustic monitoring sheet is completed and a copy given to the site management. In the case of a continued exceedance, the likely cause is identified and mitigation measures are implemented. Further monitoring is then undertaken to ensure that levels have been reduced to within agreed limits.	
	Savage Road (Receptor R3) during a 30 minute monitoring session. This was due to a piling rig having to drill through obstructions in the ground. A further 2 hour monitoring session showed continued exceedance of agreed limits and an acoustic barrier was installed, followed by further monitoring which indicated that noise levels were within the limits (it was noted that a full monitoring session was not possible due to adverse weather conditions and NH requested that times of monitoring be recorded accurately). NH reported that a breach is in fact a breach of condition 19 and requires communication with the LPA immediately.	JFd/JF
	Monitoring sheets to be amended to include times for follow-up monitoring.	AM
	NH suggested that acoustic barriers should be used as a matter of course to prevent future exceedances for the same reason. It was noted that this is a requirement of the CEMP under point 4.3 and it was acknowledged that noise monitoring and mitigation is covered by both the NMP and the CEMP. She stated that this breach will have to be reported to the planning committee and asked that the acoustic monitoring sheets be amended to highlight that the LPA should be notified immediately of any breach.	АМ
	JW noted that additional noise barriers have already been ordered for site and that it is sometimes difficult for AM to identify specific sources of noise exceedance due to general engine and mechanical noise across site.	
	AM stated that the Wolseley Road receptor (R20) is particularly difficult to monitor due to excessive road traffic noise.	

	NH requested that the NMSG receive feedback regarding exceedances and a reasonable response time of two weeks was agreed. She further pointed out that all noisy activity must stop pending mitigation measures in the event of an exceedance and reiterated that the LPA must be informed immediately.	JFd
	JW requested advice on implementing this and it was agreed that a discussion should take place with AH.	JW
4.	Site actions to date and moving forward	
	JF stated that the maximum number of piling rigs is likely to be six, based on experience so far.	
	AM explained that times for monitoring were discussed beforehand with JF in order to ensure representative times are being monitored.	
	NH stated that PPS are carrying out their own monitoring and it was noted that AM/GP (PPS) have agreed to carru out some joint monitoring at Talbot Gardens to determine if the noise measurement varies with height.	AM/GP
	Site breaks were discussed. These take place between 10am and 11am and between 1pm and 2pm. It was acknowledged that it is not always possible for the whole site to take their break at the same time but that half an hour would be taken within each of the stated hour-long periods.	
	JF suggested monitoring during these times to asses the impact of these breaks. AM pointed out that over a 10-hour period, even if the site were completely quiet during these times, the correction for these breaks would be no more than 1dB.	
	Working after 6pm in extreme cases was discussed. NH pointed out that the CEMP clearly states this cannot happen without prior, written permission from the LPA and in practice, was unlikely to be granted unless there were extreme circumstances. It is a requirement of the CEMP to keep to the specified hours.	
	JW pointed out that all works are planned to avoid this but there will be situations where due to unforeseen circumstances for example plant breakdown or process problems, that overruns may occur and that whilst all reasonable efforts are made to minimise the overrun this is unavoidable.	
	In a recent specific example where a cage failure necessitated continuing operations to drill out placed concrete, the implications of not doing this would be that more noise and disturbance would later be caused by having to break out the concrete.	
	NH suggested that MVV liaise with AH to find a practical means of notifying the LPA at short notice and late hours. Known breaches	JW

	of working hours will be reported to AH with NH in cc. The previous breach will also be reported.	JFd
	JW pointed out that it is not possible (by definition) to mitigate against unforeseen circumstances.	
	GH questioned whether the concrete pour took a known length of time and JW confirmed that this was the case, reiterating that works are planned to avoid going past 6pm in all normal circumstances.	
	It was confirmed that MVV are using their programme to identify future noisy activities and plan mitigation and appropriate times for monitoring. The next significant construction phase is identified as the steel erection, beginning April 2013 and continuing until the end of 2013.	
5.	This will be included in the next construction newsletter. Complaints	JFd
	NH noted that PPS had received a complaint about the site security dogs barking, being off their leads and security staff shouting from two separate sources. JFd clarified that there had been a break in a fortnight ago and people whistling at the dogs in the night on 3 rd October (as recorded in the security log book). Security staff have been asked to record times as well as dates in future and the MOD police have agreed to share information if necessary (they are still patrolling the site boundary).	
	Other complaints include workers shouting and sounding horns on site before 8am.	
	This complaint is rejected as all site staff are fully aware of the sensitive nature of the project and site management will not tolerate this sort of behaviour.	
	PPS have also received complaints about noise from six separate sources – all from Talbot Gardens and Cardinal Avenue.	
	JFd confirmed that these correspond to the areas MVV are receiving complaints from as well.	
	JF pointed out that the low limit imposed on Savage Road (R3) makes this a difficult area to mitigate for. JW stated that the limits set are very low and consequently we will always be working at or near the limits.	
	JW confirmed that other acoustic attenuation measures include semi-permanent barriers around fixed concrete pumping plant (a photograph confirming this was shown to the group).	

	JFd and Tim Roberts (MVV health and safety manager) showed the group new noise monitoring equipment and software purchased by MVV that will be used for additional check monitoring in accordance with the NMP. A new, short-term monitoring report sheet will be drawn up.	АМ
6.	AOB	
	GH asked whether the site would close down over Christmas. JF stated that likely closure dates would be 24 th December – 1 st January but this will be confirmed in December.	
7.	Date of next meeting	
	Tuesday 11 th December, 2pm, site meeting room – invitations to be sent out for a 3-monthly recurrence.	JFd