
From: Giles Rawdon
Sent: 07 December 2023 12:04
To: Matt Jedruch
Subject: FW: 23/01050/FUL - Proposed steel fabrication workshop
Attachments: FP McCann Cadeby DOC-10-15105-AM-20231117-Response to EHO Enquiries - Rev1.pdf

Hi Matt

Sorry for the delay in responding to this.

I have reviewed the response and recommend the conditions below.

The building has been assessed with doors closed (Section 6.1 of the NIA) and as such there should be controls in place to ensure that doors are kept closed while the plant is in operation. The condition below has been applied to planning permission 16/01092/FUL for the same site.

I recommend a condition relating to potential land contamination in the event that unforeseen contamination is encountered during the development.

I would also recommend that construction hours are conditioned.

Recommended conditions:

Prior to the use of the fabrication building hereby permitted for any manufacturing purposes, the doors shall be fitted with a locking mechanism to prevent the plant being operated whilst the doors are open. The locking mechanism shall be retained at all times and doors shall remain closed whilst the plant is in operation.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties from noise and disturbance to accord with Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

C75. Land Contamination Found Later

- a) If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, no further development shall take place until a scheme for the investigation of all potential land contamination is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall include details of how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.
- b) Any remediation works so approved shall be carried out prior to the site first being occupied.

Site preparation and construction shall be limited to the following hours;

Monday – Friday 07:30 – 18:00

Saturday 08:00 – 13:00

No working on Sundays and Bank Holidays

Kind regards

Giles Rawdon

Environmental Health Officer (Pollution)

Tel: 01455 255684

Email: giles.rawdon@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

Web: www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics LE10 0FR



Sign up for our email updates: www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/emailupdates



@Hinckandbos_bc



Hinckandbosbc



@Hinckandbosbc

From: Paul Hamill (FP McCann) <PHamill@fpmccann.co.uk>

Sent: 21 November 2023 10:42

To: Matt Jedruch <Matt.Jedruch@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>

Cc: Giles Rawdon <Giles.Rawdon@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 23/01050/FUL - Proposed steel fabrication workshop

Hi Matt,

Please see attached our response to the recent comments from Environmental Health. I have also cc'd Giles here for your convenience.

Hopefully all points have been adequately answered/addressed but if any further clarification is required then please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Best regards,

Paul Hamill MRTPI

Estates Manager



+44(0)28 6772 1286 tel

+44(0)28 6772 4013 dd

+44(0)73 4179 0988 mob

phamill@fpmccann.co.uk email

www.fpmccann.co.uk web

105 Nutfield Road, Slush Hill, Lisnaskea, BT92 0HP



This message (including any attachments) is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you should not disclose, copy or use any part of it - please delete all copies immediately and notify the IT Department of FP McCann Ltd. Any information, statements or opinions contained in this message (including any attachments) are given by the author. They are not given on behalf of FP McCann Ltd. FP McCann Limited is a company registered in Northern Ireland, with its Registered Office at Knockloughrim Quarry, 3 Drumard Road, Magherafelt, BT45 8QA. The company registration number is: NI 13563

From: Matt Jedruch <Matt.Jedruch@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2023 1:43 PM
To: Paul Hamill (FP McCann) <PHamill@fpmccann.co.uk>
Subject: 23/01050/FUL - Proposed steel fabrication workshop

Caution!

Elements of this email suggest the sender is external to our organisation and may have malicious intent.

Please check the sender is genuine. If in doubt, contact this person via telephone.

Hi Paul,

I hope all is well.

Please see the attached response from our Environmental Health team with a few queries regarding the submitted noise survey. Please can you ask your consultant to respond to the queries and I can they re-consult?

Kind regards,

Matt

Matt Jedruch (He/Him)

Senior Planning Officer

Tel: 01455 255809

Mob: 07721857007

Email: Matt.Jedruch@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

Web: www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics LE10 0FR

**Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council**

Sign up for our email updates: www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/emailupdates



@Hinckandbos_bc



Hinckandbosbc



@Hinckandbosbc

This email and any files sent with it are confidential.

If this email isn't intended for you, please notify the sender immediately and then permanently delete it. You must not read, print, store, disclose, copy or take any other action in respect of this email.

We routinely monitor incoming and outgoing email messages to ensure they comply with Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council's policy on the use of electronic communications.

The contents of emails may have to be disclosed to a request under the Data Protection Act 2018, Freedom of Information Act 2000 and/or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

The views expressed by the author may not necessarily reflect the views or policies of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.

Attachments to email messages may contain viruses that may damage your system.

Whilst Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise this risk, we cannot accept any liability for any damage you suffer as a result.

You are advised to carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Save paper - only print this email if necessary.

Visit us online: www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

Main office: Hinckley Hub, Rugby Road, Hinckley, Leics LE10 0FR. Main switchboard: 01455 238141

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

FP McCann Cadeby – New Fabrication Building. Response to EPU Enquiries dated 17/11/2023.

Following the submission of the noise report reference 'REP-1015105-AM-20231014-Noise Assessment-Rev1' dated 1st November 2023, comments have been received from Mr Giles Rawdon on behalf of HBBC ES Pollution 2. A response to each of the items raised are detailed below for consideration.

With regard to noise I have the following comments relating to the Noise Impact Assessment:

I note the use of the Pluristar 2BK plant in the assessment- is this the proposed plant or a surrogate? Please provide manufacturers data if the plant is known- preferably with frequencies.

The Pluristar 2BK plant is the proposed item of plant for this development proposal. At present, only the data provided in Appendix 2 of the submitted report is available.

What is the greatest diameter bars that FP McCann use- the Pluristar plant is able to bend poles to 16mm the Acad assessment reports on noise from 5-10mm bars.

At the FP McCann Cadeby site, there is only the requirement for the production of 6mm, 8mm and 10mm bars. Of these sizes, the majority of the works on site requires the 8mm and 10mm. The assessment is based upon the lesser used but noisier 10mm bars as this is the largest diameter which will be formed. On the basis of the above, for the majority of the time, based upon the data presented in Section 5.2 of the report internal noise levels will be in the order of 2 to 4dB lower than those used in the noise break-out assessment but a worst-case scenario based upon the machine operating on a 100% basis has been presented.

Was the Acad reporting on single or double strands and can the applicant provide details on any difference in sound levels for each? The manufacturers website states that there are different operating modes (stirrup mode or rotor mode) is there a difference in sound levels between modes?

For the product samples used, it is assumed that the Acad report relates only to single strands. We understand that the proposed machine can only process double strands in certain circumstances (to form specific, simple shapes and where dimension tolerances are less critical). The proposed installation will operate using single strand only.

The two operating modes occur simultaneously as the machine operates. In basic terms, the rotor mode straightens the coiled rebar for use, the stirrup function then bends/forms the straightened bar to create the desired shape.

As the rotor and stirrup modes are an integral part of the overall process, the Acad report considers both. As both modes are effectively bending the steel bar to a desired shape we are not aware of any noticeable difference in sound levels. In our experience, the noisiest part of the forming process occurs when the formed component is dropped from the machine to the collection area (not during the forming/shaping process itself). Please note that the receiving surfaces are coated with rubber to reduce noise from this part of the process.

What is the relevance of the Charlie Fleming Associates Report Table 1(b) (Appendix 2)?

The 'Charlie Fleming Associates' data unfortunately relates to a separate development site not related to this planning application and as such, is not relevant in this matter and should be disregarded. Our sincere apologies for any confusion caused by its erroneous inclusion in this submission.

The LaFMax in the Acad report is 11dB higher than the Laeq at 101dB(A). This has not been mentioned in the report other than adding a 3dB correction to the rating level for impulse noise. This maximum noise level would be clearly distinguishable (and justify a greater correction).

It is disputed that maximum noise levels in this instance would be clearly distinguishable.

With regard to maximum noise levels, ProPG: 'Planning and Noise' 2017 advises that night time maximum sound levels in bedrooms at night should not normally exceed a level of L_{Amax} 45dB more than ten times over the course of the night.

The Acad International Report states a maximum noise level of L_{AFmax} 101 dB. The report states that all measurements were recorded within the direct sound field of the noise source and as such, no additional corrections for room acoustics are deemed necessary.

As detailed in Section 6 of the submitted report, the building envelope will have a minimum manufacturer's rated sound reduction of R_w 25dB(A) which, according to standard theory, will result in a noise level immediately outside of the building of $(101 - 25 - 6)$ L_{AFmax} 70 dB.

The proposed building is set at a closest distance of 290 metres from the nearest residential dwelling and as such, distance attenuation of $(20 \times \log 1/290)$ 49dB can be expected, resulting in an external noise level of L_{AFmax} 21dB at the dwelling.

Section G1 of BS8233 advises that the typical sound reduction that is achievable through open windows is limited to 15dB and as such, the maximum noise level within a habitable room with open windows will be approximately L_{AFmax} 6 dB. When windows are closed, internal noise levels will be significantly (>16dB) lower.

On this basis, it is considered highly unlikely that the ProPG level of L_{Amax} 45dB will ever be exceeded by plant from the new Fabrication Building at the nearest sensitive dwellings.

These maximum levels are significantly lower than the existing ambient and background levels of traffic noise on the nearby A447 Ashby Road/Hinckley Road and as such, would likely be masked at all times of the day and night. Under these circumstances, it could be argued that no character correction (+0 dB) for the purposes of assessment would be appropriate.

Will any noise control methods be used to reduce noise exposure to employees from the plant that will benefit emissions from the building?

Due to the nature of the manufacturing process, it has not been deemed practical by FP McCann to provide any additional noise control methods other than the provision of ear defenders to employees which will be provided as necessitated by the Noise at Work Regulations. Whilst the machine will be enclosed within a safety cage structure, it is essential that operatives are able to see all parts of the machine while it is in operation. It is therefore not possible to shroud/enclose the machine due to health and safety requirements. *Is any external plant proposed?*

There is no external plant proposed as part of the development. All activities including loading and unloading will occur within the building.