

**Doc. No. SSE/12/d
Case Ref. 2032278**

Appeal by BAA Ltd and Stansted Airport Ltd following the refusal by Uttlesford District Council of planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL

**Note of Meeting to Discuss
Ground Noise Evidence
7 September 2007**

Martin Peachey
Chris Bennett

9 October 2007



PO Box 311
Takeley
Bishop's Stortford
Herts CM22 6PY

Tel: 01279 870558

www.stopstanstedexpansion.com
info@stopstanstedexpansion.com

NOTE OF MEETING TO DISCUSS GROUND NOISE EVIDENCE 7 September 2007 (1400 to 1745)

Attendance:

Dr Ian Flindell, Acoustics Consultant for BAA
Martin Peachey, SSE
Chris Bennett, SSE

Purpose of note:

During the cross-examination on 19th July (transcript page 119, lines 1-20) of Mr Peachey on SSE's evidence on Ground Noise (SSE/12), Counsel for BAA offered a meeting with Dr Ian Flindell to assist in explaining or clearing up any misunderstandings about the technical evidence. This note is intended to place on record that a meeting duly took place and to summarise the main points of the discussion that took place.

The following detailed matters were agreed/not agreed;

1. The measured background sound levels (LA90) presented by BAA in ES Volume 8 were agreed.
2. The calculated combined aircraft taxiing and APU sound levels (LAeq) for 25 mppa and 35 mppa presented by BAA in ES Volume 8 were agreed.
3. Subject to the further points set out below, the generic process for testing significance set out by BAA in ES Volume 8 was agreed.
4. SSE did not agree the method of use of the change comparison for testing significance for the 25 and 35 mppa cases set out by BAA in ES Volume 8.
5. SSE did not agree with all of the benchmark values adopted by BAA in ES Volume 8. The night-time 45 LAeq benchmark was agreed, but SSE preferred lower daytime and evening benchmarks of 50 LAeq instead of the 55 LAeq daytime and evening benchmarks adopted by BAA in ES Volume 8.
6. When using the change comparison between 25mppa and 35mppa cases, the effects of adopting different benchmarks cancel out.
7. The adjustments for the effects of wind of +3dB downwind and –10 dB upwind set out in Dr Flindell's evidence were agreed.
8. When using the change comparison between 25mppa and 35mppa cases, the effects of tonality and wind cancel out.
9. It was agreed that the 10dB difference threshold (between background sound levels and predicted sound levels) used in the process for testing significance set out by BAA in ES Volume 8 is based on standard practice and is consistent with although not reliant upon the method of assessment set out in BS 4142.