
To: Anthony Scholes

Your Ref: PL/24/1534

From: Rebecca Moon - Environmental Health Officer
My Ref:

Date: 23 July 2025

Application Number: PL/24/1534

Premises Address: 20 Norcot Road, Tilehurst, RG30 6BU

Application For: Demolition of existing garage workshops, canopy extension, and detached spray booth building, and replacement with metal clad building for General Industrial purposes (Class B2 - Vehicle Workshop and Vehicle Body Spraying) accessed via Lemart Close, with carparking, and waste storage

Environmental Protection concerns

- Noise from the spray booth
- Solvent/paint odour and fumes
- Noise from car repair activities

Noise from the spray booth

The noise from the spray booth as assessed by the Jostec noise report, does not comply with our policy EN17 which states that the specific noise level should be 10 dB below background and the rating level should be 0 dB above background. This is in order to prevent background creep and to protect residential amenity from plant noise that would otherwise cause an increase to the background noise level and cause disturbance to living conditions.

- The Jostec noise report concludes that the specific noise level from the plant at the single storey dwelling next to the site is 4 dBA above the background noise, as assessed in accordance with BS4142. This is therefore 14 dBA higher than our policy states it should be in order to preserve residential amenity.
- The Jostec noise report also concludes that the noise level from the plant is 3 dB below the background at the other nearby receptor 11 Recreation Road. This is 7 dB higher than our policy states it should be in order to preserve residential amenity.
- The situation is worse than presented in this report, however, for the following reasons:
 1. The background noise level which the plant noise is assessed against is higher than an assessment previously carried out on behalf of Reading Borough Council, which found that the representative

background noise level at the rear of 11 Recreation Road was 37 dBA and not the reported 41.2 dBA. This creates significant uncertainty regarding the correct background noise level.

2. No correction has been made to the plant noise level to account for intermittency, whereas because it is noticeable when the plant is on or off, a 3dB penalty should be applied in accordance with BS4142.
3. The receptor at 11 Recreation Road has been assumed in the Jostec report to be the façade of the house, whereas it is my professional opinion that it should be the garden, which is regularly used by the occupant for relaxation and recreation, and is significantly closer to the plant than the house façade, due to the plant being located just the other side of the end of the garden boundary fence, and the fact that the garden is relatively long. Therefore the plant noise level at the 11 Recreation Rd receptor is in fact somewhere between 49.3 dBA which is the level in the centre of the garden, and 61.3 dBA which is the level at the source. This is a minimum of 8 dBA above the Jostec reported background noise level.
4. If you take all of the above into account, the level of noise at the two receptors considered above are assessed to be:
11 Recreation Rd - 49.3 (minimum - would be louder in other parts of the garden nearer the source) plus 3 which is 52.3 dBA compared to a background noise level of 37 dBA therefore the level is 15.3 dBA above the background.
Single storey next door dwelling - Jostec predicted to be 4 dBA above background, plus 3 dBA for intermittency therefore the level is 7 dBA above background.

The levels are therefore actually 17 dBA above our policy level for the single storey next door dwelling and 25.3 dBA above our policy level for 11 Recreation Rd.

- The significance of this is that the amenity of nearby residents will be impacted 6 days of the week, with the spray booth operating on and off at indiscriminate times, and the noise is likely to cause significant distress and disruption to their everyday life.
- It is acknowledged that the noise abatement notice that was served in relation to noise from the spray booth impacting on 11 Recreation Rd was withdrawn following a reduction in the noise level, however, the threshold for a statutory nuisance is very much higher than a loss of amenity. It was made clear by the RBC EHO at the time that the level of noise from the spray booth would still not comply with planning requirements.

Solvent/paint odour and fumes

There is also a concern regarding odour and fumes from the spray booth. Despite a number of requests, no information has been provided by the business to RBC regarding the filtration installed and the amount of solvent paint used by the business, so it is not possible to determine whether the extraction system meets requirements in terms of solvent emissions and

odour. This is very significant given that the booth is situated on the boundary with two residential properties (Recreation Rd).

Noise from car repair activities

No information has been submitted by the applicant regarding the noise insulation measures to be installed for the car repair workshop therefore we cannot determine whether the impact from this is acceptable or not.

If you have any queries please contact me.

Kind regards,

Rebecca Moon - Environmental Health Officer