

**From:** Chris Beale  
**To:** [Nick Chapman](#)  
**Cc:** [Steve Thomas](#); [Michael Moss](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Revised proposals  
**Date:** 11 July 2018 14:49:35  
**Attachments:** [Mail logo.png](#)

---

Hi Nick,

My suggestion was intended to overcome your concerns about the effect of aircraft noise. You mentioned that it would be difficult to know the frequency of aircraft overflights, but that they could be as frequently as every 30 seconds at times. I doubt that, as separation is usually 2 minutes at Gatwick, but they could be more frequent if there is a hold point close to Wilderness Farm. If aircraft noise is dominant and frequent then it would clearly affect the L90 and we might have trouble measuring MNL.

In order to redact 1 minute readings in which aircraft noise features we obviously need to have collected sufficient data. I suggested 30 minute intervals as any more frequent calculations would be quite a burden. Obviously we have the 1 minute and 1 second data in real time and we have live audio from the meters, so we have the means to conduct independent real-time evaluation. Regarding compliance, the council would have to determine what metric should be used. As you are aware, the CoP recommends 15 minute LAeq but you could specify any period duration you wished providing that it was reasonable.

I suggested 35dBLAeq(t) as a suitable level during low level music periods because, given other noise sources including overflights and the background murmur from the festival, it is hard to imagine being able to measure and manage accurately at a lower level than that. Further, even a moderate wind or light rain would invalidate very low level measurements.

Hope this helps,

Best,

Chris



---

Main 01455 502400 | Cell 0791 779 7649  
Mallory Park Circuit | Kirkby Mallory | Leicestershire | LE9 7QE

IMPORTANT - This e-mail and attachments are strictly confidential to the addressee and may contain information that is privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender by return and be advised that you must not disclose, forward, copy or take action in reliance of this e-mail or attachments and that you must delete it from your records. The content of this e-mail is attributed solely to the sender and its content may not represent the opinion of SPLtrack Limited.

Where possible we practice paperless administration to reduce waste and preserve natural resources. Please contribute by printing only when necessary.

On 11 Jul 2018, at 14:10, Nick Chapman [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Chris,

Whilst I appreciate that we discussed condition 5.1:

*“Mindful of the difficulty in avoiding noise from aircraft, noise measurements will be recorded*

*in period intervals of 1 minute. Periods that indicate aircraft noise will be redacted*

*and the arithmetic mean of the remaining periods will be calculated in 30 minute*

*segments. The result will be used as the guide for compliance with licence*

*conditions.”*

I would be grateful if could you clarify how you envisage this will work in practice (particularly if aircraft are frequently overhead). If, for example, aircraft were determined to effect 15 measurements in every half hour period would it take 1hr to determine compliance with the condition? Or would the non-redacted measurements (i.e. the 15 measurements unaffected by aircraft) be reviewed as an arithmetic mean every 30 minutes?

Can you also confirm if you intend to use this measurement as a guide (i.e. indicated by the remote monitors), or is the intention that this is the condition for compliance?

Thanks

Nick

---

**From:** Chris Beale <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** 11 July 2018 05:59

**To:** Nick Chapman <[REDACTED]>

**Cc:** Steve Thomas <[REDACTED]>; Lee Denny // LeeFest <[lee@leefest.org](mailto:lee@leefest.org)>; Alex Lepingwell <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Revised proposals

Hi Nick,

As discussed I attach the revised copy of the proposed licence conditions for Neverworld. These have been discussed with the other stakeholders in detail and they are fully supportive. As you know, there is concern over the viability of the event should the eventual licence conditions be too stringent however there is also a very strong commitment on the part of the organiser to prevent public nuisance. I trust that you will be satisfied that, providing the early hour noise controls that I have suggested are met, the licensing objective with respect to noise would be satisfied.

Best regards,

Chris