


Kirkan Wind Farm. **Environmental noise** **assessment.**

REVISION 3 - 20 MARCH 2019
AUTHOR: MATTHEW CAND



Audit sheet.

| Rev. | Date | Description | Prepared | Verified |
|------|------------|------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1 | 21/12/2018 | First draft | MMC | RC |
| 2 | 30/01/2019 | Second version following comments | MMC | MJ |
| 3 | 20/03/2019 | Further version following comments | MMC | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

This document has been prepared for RSK only and solely for the purposes expressly defined herein. We owe no duty of care to any third parties in respect of its content. Therefore, unless expressly agreed by us in signed writing, we hereby exclude all liability to third parties, including liability for negligence, save only for liabilities that cannot be so excluded by operation of applicable law.

Contents.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Audit sheet. | 2 |
| Non-Technical Summary | 5 |
| 1. Introduction | 6 |
| 2. Policy and Guidance Documents | 6 |
| 3. Scope and Methodology | 8 |
| 3.1 Methodology for Assessing Construction Noise | 8 |
| 3.2 Methodology for Assessing Wind Farm Operational Noise | 9 |
| 3.3 Construction Noise Criteria | 10 |
| 3.4 Operational Noise Criteria | 12 |
| 3.5 Consultation | 12 |
| 4. Baseline | 13 |
| 4.1 General Description | 13 |
| 4.2 Details of the Baseline Background Noise Survey | 13 |
| 4.4 Measured Background Noise Levels | 14 |
| 5. Predicted Noise Effects | 17 |
| 5.1 Predicted Construction Noise Levels | 17 |
| 5.2 Construction Noise & Vibration Levels – Blasting | 21 |
| 5.3 De-commissioning Noise | 21 |
| 5.4 Operational Wind Turbine Emissions Data | 21 |
| 5.5 Choice of Wind Farm Operational Noise Propagation Model | 23 |
| 5.6 Predicted Wind Farm Operational Noise Immission Levels | 24 |
| 5.7 ETSU-R-97 assessment | 25 |
| 5.8 Assessment of potential Lochluichart Wind Farm Extension II | 29 |
| 5.9 Low Frequency Noise, Vibration and Amplitude Modulation | 30 |
| 5.10 Substation and battery storage | 31 |
| 5.11 Evaluation of Effects | 31 |
| 6. Mitigation, Offsetting and Enhancement Measures | 32 |
| 6.1 Proposed Construction Noise Mitigation Measures | 32 |
| 6.2 Proposed Operational Noise Mitigation Measures | 32 |
| 7. Monitoring | 32 |
| 8. Summary of Key Findings and Conclusions | 33 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 9. References | 33 |
| Annex A - General Approach to Noise Assessment & Glossary | 35 |
| Glossary of Acoustics Terminology | 52 |
| Annex B – Location maps and calculation details | 55 |
| Annex C – Noise Monitoring Information Sheets | 58 |
| Annex D – Wind Speeds and Directions | 67 |
| Annex E – Background Noise and Noise Limits | 69 |
| Annex F – Wind Speed Calculations | 74 |

Non-Technical Summary

Hoare Lea (HL) have been commissioned by RSK to undertake a noise assessment for the construction and operation of the proposed Kirkan Wind Farm. Noise will be emitted by equipment and vehicles used during construction and decommissioning of the wind farm and by the turbines during operation. The level of noise emitted by the sources and the distance from those sources to the receiver locations are the main factors determining levels of noise at receptor locations.

Construction Noise

Construction noise has been assessed by a desk based study of a potential construction programme and by assuming the wind farm is constructed using standard and common methods. Noise levels have been calculated for receiver locations closest to the areas of work and compared with guideline and baseline values. Construction noise, by its very nature, tends to be temporary and highly variable and therefore much less likely to cause adverse effects. Various mitigation methods have been suggested to reduce the effects of construction noise, the most important of these being suggested restrictions of hours of working. It is concluded that noise generated through construction activities will generally have a negligible effect.

The effect of the predicted construction traffic, under a worst-case unmitigated scenario, could represent a slight to moderate impact which would represent a temporary adverse significant effect for some receptors along the A835: between the Site and Garve. Under a more realistic and/or mitigated scenario, the temporary impact would be slight adverse at most which would not be significant.

De-commissioning is likely to result in less noise than during construction of the Development, in particular due to reduced traffic volumes. It was therefore concluded that de-commissioning will have, at most slight temporary adverse noise effects which is not significant.

Operational Noise

Operational turbines emit noise from the rotating blades as they pass through the air. This noise can sometimes be described as having a regular 'swish'. The amount of noise emitted tends to vary depending on the wind speed. When there is little wind the turbine rotors will turn slowly and produce lower noise levels than during high winds when the turbine reaches its maximum output and maximum rotational speed. Background noise levels at nearby properties will also change with wind speed, increasing in level as wind speeds rise due to wind in trees and around buildings, etc.

Noise levels from operation of the turbines have been predicted for those locations around the site most likely to be affected by noise. Surveys have been performed to establish existing baseline noise levels at a number of these properties. Noise limits have been derived from data about the existing noise environment following the method stipulated in national planning guidance. Predicted noise levels take full account of the potential combined effect of the noise from the Development along with Corriemoillie Windfarm and Lochluichart and Extension Windfarms. Other, more distant wind farms were not considered as they do not make an acoustically relevant contribution to cumulative noise levels.

Predicted operational noise levels have been compared to the limit values to demonstrate that turbines of the type and size which would be installed can operate within the limits so derived. It is concluded therefore that operational noise levels from the wind farm will be within levels deemed, by national guidance, to be acceptable for wind energy schemes, but can also operate within more stringent alternative requirements recommended by the Highland Council.

This Non-Technical Summary contains an overview of the noise assessment and its conclusions. No reliance should be placed on the content of this Non-Technical Summary until this report has been read in its entirety.

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 This report presents an assessment of the potential construction and operational noise effects of the Kirkan Wind Farm (the Development) on the residents of nearby dwellings. The assessment considers both the construction and operation of the Development and also the likely effects of its de-commissioning. Assessment of the operational noise effects accounts for the cumulative effect of the Development as well as other wind farms nearby. Other wind farms considered were those closest and consisted of: Corriemoillie Windfarm (approximately 2 kilometres west) and the Lochluichart Windfarm and Extension (approximately 3.5 kilometres further west). The potential effects of the proposed Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II (LWFE2) have been considered separately as the proposal was still at pre-application stage prior to finalisation of this assessment. Other, more distant wind farms were not considered because as their potential noise contribution was considered negligible.
- 1.1.2 Noise and vibration which arises from the construction of a wind farm is a factor which should be taken into account when considering the total effect of the Development. However, in assessing the effects of construction noise, it is accepted that the associated works are of a temporary nature. The main work locations for construction of the turbines are distant from nearest noise sensitive residences and are unlikely to cause significant effects. The construction and use of access tracks may, however, occur at lesser separation distances. Assessment of the temporary effects of construction noise is primarily aimed at understanding the need for dedicated management measures and, if so, the types of measures that are required. Further details of relevant working practices, traffic routes, and proposed working hours are described in the construction and traffic chapters of the Environmental Statement.
- 1.1.3 Once constructed and operating, wind turbines may emit two types of noise. Firstly, aerodynamic noise is a 'broad band' noise, sometimes described as having a characteristic modulation, or 'swish', which is produced by the movement of the rotating blades through the air. Secondly, mechanical noise may emanate from components within the nacelle of a wind turbine. This is a less natural sounding noise which is generally characterised by its tonal content. Traditional sources of mechanical noise comprise gearboxes or generators. Due to the acknowledged lower acceptability of tonal noise in otherwise 'natural' noise settings such as rural areas, modern turbine designs have evolved to minimise mechanical noise radiation from wind turbines. Aerodynamic noise tends to be perceived when the wind speeds are low, although at very low wind speeds the blades do not rotate or rotate very slowly and so, at these wind speeds, negligible aerodynamic noise is generated. In higher winds, aerodynamic noise is generally masked by the normal sound of wind blowing through trees and around buildings. The level of this natural 'masking' noise relative to the level of wind turbine noise determines the subjective audibility of the wind farm. The relationship between wind turbine noise and the naturally occurring masking noise at residential dwellings lying around the Development will therefore generally form the basis of the assessment of the levels of noise against accepted standards.
- 1.1.4 An overview of environmental noise assessment and a glossary of noise terms are provided in Annex A.

2. Policy and Guidance Documents

- 2.1.1 Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)ⁱ provides advice on how the planning system should manage the process of encouraging, approving and implementing renewable energy proposals including onshore wind farms. Whilst SPP suggests noise impacts are one of the aspects that will need to be considered it provides no specific advice. Planning Advice Note PAN1/2011ⁱⁱ provides general advice on the role of the planning system in preventing and limiting the adverse effects of noise without prejudicing investment in enterprise, development and transport. PAN1/2011 provides general advice on a range of noise related planning matters, including references to noise associated with both construction

activities and operational wind farms. In relation to operational noise from wind farms, Paragraph 29 states that:

'There are two sources of noise from wind turbines - the mechanical noise from the turbines and the aerodynamic noise from the blades. Mechanical noise is related to engineering design. Aerodynamic noise varies with rotor design and wind speed, and is generally greatest at low speeds. Good acoustical design and siting of turbines is essential to minimise the potential to generate noise. Web based planning advice on renewable technologies for Onshore wind turbines provides advice on 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms' (ETSU-R-97) published by the former Department of Trade and Industry [DTI] and the findings of the Salford University report into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise.'

- 2.1.2 The Scottish Government's Online Renewables Planning Advice on Onshore wind turbinesⁱⁱⁱ provides further advice on noise, and confirms that the recommendations of 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms' (ETSU-R-97)^{iv} "*should be followed by applicants and consultees, and used by planning authorities to assess and rate noise from wind energy developments*". The aim of ETSU-R-97 is:

'This document describes a framework for the measurement of wind farm noise and gives indicative noise levels thought to offer a reasonable degree of protection to wind farm neighbours, without placing unreasonable restrictions on wind farm development or adding unduly to the costs and administrative burdens on wind farm developers or local authorities. The suggested noise limits and their reasonableness have been evaluated with regard to regulating the development of wind energy in the public interest. They have been presented in a manner that makes them a suitable basis for noise-related planning conditions or covenants within an agreement between a developer of a wind farm and the local authority.'

- 2.1.3 The recommendations contained in ETSU-R-97 provide a robust basis for assessing the noise implications of a wind farm. ETSU-R-97 has become the accepted standard for such developments within the UK. Guidance on good practice on the application of ETSU-R-97 has been provided by the Institute of Acoustics (IOA Good Practice Guide or GPG)^v. This was subsequently endorsed by the Scottish Government^{vi} which advised in the web based planning advice note that this *'should be used by all IOA members and those undertaking assessments to ETSU-R-97'*. The methodology of ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG has therefore been adopted for the present assessment and is described in greater detail below.
- 2.1.4 With regard to infrasound and low-frequency noise, the above-referenced online planning advice note, Onshore wind turbines refers to a report for the UK Government which concluded that *'there is no evidence of health effects arising from infrasound or low frequency noise generated by the wind turbines that were tested'*.
- 2.1.5 PAN1/2011 and the Technical Advice Note^{vii} accompanying PAN1/2011 note that construction noise control can be achieved through planning conditions that limit noise from temporary construction-sites, or by means of the Control of Pollution Act (CoPA) 1974^{viii}. The CoPA provides two means of controlling construction noise and vibration. Section 60 provides the Local Authority with the power to impose at any time operating conditions on the development site. Section 61 allows the developer to negotiate a prior consent for a set of operating procedures with the Local Authority before commencement of site works.
- 2.1.6 For detailed guidance on construction noise and its control, the Technical Advice Note refers to British Standard BS 5228^{ix} 'Noise control on construction and open sites', Parts 1 to 4 but confirms that the updated version of this standard, published in January 2009 is relevant when used within the planning process. The 2009 version consolidates all previous parts of the standard into BS 5228-1: 2009 (amended 2014)^x (BS 5228-1) for airborne noise and BS 5228-2: 2009 (amended 2014)^{xi} (BS 5228-2) for ground-borne vibration. These updated versions have therefore been adopted as the relevant versions upon which to base this assessment.

- 2.1.7 BS 5228-1 provides guidance on a range of considerations relating to construction noise including the legislative framework, general control measures, example methods for estimating construction noise levels and example criteria which may be considered when assessing effect significance. Similarly, BS 5228-2 provides general guidance on legislation, prediction, control and assessment criteria for construction vibration.
- 2.1.8 Planning Advice Note PAN50^{xii} “Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings” gives guidance on the environmental effects of mineral working. The main document summarises the key issues with regard to various environmental effects relating to surface mineral extraction and processing such as road traffic, blasting, noise, dust, visual intrusion etc. In addition, several annexes to the main document have been published which consider specific aspects in more detail: Annex A, “The Control of Noise at Surface Mineral Workings” and Annex D “The Control of Blasting at Surface Mineral Workings”. BS 5228-1 and BS 5228-2 also provide guidance relating to surface mineral extraction including the assessment of noise and vibration effects associated with quarry blasting. BS 6472-2 2008^{xiii} gives similar guidance on assessing vibration from blasting associated with mineral extraction.

3. Scope and Methodology

3.1 Methodology for Assessing Construction Noise

- 3.1.1 Construction works include both moving sources and static sources. The moving sources normally comprise mobile construction plant and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). The static sources include construction plant temporarily placed at fixed locations and in some instances noise arising from blasting activities where rock is to be worked through.
- 3.1.2 The analysis of construction noise has been undertaken in accordance with BS 5228-1 which provides methods for predicting construction noise levels on the basis of reference data for the emissions of typical construction plant and activities. These methods include for the calculation of construction traffic along access tracks and haul routes and also for construction activities at fixed locations such as the bases of turbines, site compounds or sub stations.
- 3.1.3 The BS 5228 calculated levels are then compared with absolute noise limits for temporary construction activities which are commonly regarded as providing an acceptable level of protection from the short-term noise levels associated with construction activities.
- 3.1.4 Separate consideration is also given to the possible noise impacts of construction related traffic passing to and from the site along local surrounding roads. In considering potential noise levels associated with construction traffic movement on public roads, reference is made to the accepted UK prediction methodology provided by ‘Calculation of Road Traffic Noise’^{xiv} (CRTN).
- 3.1.5 The nature of works and distances involved in the construction of a wind farm are such that the risk of significant effects relating to ground borne vibration are very low (excluding blasting). Occasional momentary vibration can arise when heavy vehicles pass dwellings at very short separation distances, but again this is not sufficient to constitute a risk of significant impacts in this instance. Accordingly, vibration impacts do not warrant detailed assessment and are therefore not discussed further in this assessment.
- 3.1.6 It is anticipated that some rock extraction from borrow pits by means of blasting operations could be required in some instances. The analysis of the related potential impacts has been made in accordance with PAN50, BS 6472-2 2008 and BS 5228.

3.2 Methodology for Assessing Wind Farm Operational Noise

- 3.2.1 The ETSU-R-97 assessment procedure specifies that noise limits should be set relative to existing background noise levels at the nearest properties and that these limits should reflect the variation in both turbine source noise and background noise with wind speed. The wind speed range which should be considered is between the cut-in speed (the speed at which the turbines begin to operate) for the turbines and 12 m/s (43.2 km/h), where all wind speeds are referenced to a ten metre measurement height (refer to Annex F for a discussion of how wind speeds are referenced to ten metre height).
- 3.2.2 Separate noise limits apply for the day-time and night-time. Day-time limits are chosen to protect a property's external amenity whilst outside their dwellings in garden areas and night-time limits are chosen to prevent sleep disturbance indoors. Absolute lower limits, different for day-time and night-time, are applied where the line of best-fit representation of the measured background noise levels equates to very low levels (< 30 dB(A) to 35 dB(A) for day-time, and < 38 dB(A) during the night).
- 3.2.3 The day-time noise limit is derived from background noise data measured during the 'quiet periods of the day' defined in ETSU-R-97: these comprise weekday evenings (18:00 to 23:00), Saturday afternoons and evenings (13:00 to 23:00) and all day and evening on Sundays (07:00 to 23:00). Multiple samples of ten-minute background noise levels using the $L_{A90,10min}$ measurement index are measured contiguously over a wide range of wind speed conditions (a definition of the $L_{A90,10min}$ index is given in Annex A). The measured noise levels are then plotted against the simultaneously measured wind speed data and a 'best-fit' curve is fitted to the data to establish the background noise level as a function of wind speed. The ETSU-R-97 day-time noise limit is then set to the greater of either: a level 5 dB(A) above the best-fit curve to the background noise data over a 0-12 m/s wind speed range or a fixed level in the range 35 dB(A) to 40 dB(A). The precise choice of the fixed lower limit within the range 35 dB(A) to 40 dB(A) depends on a number of factors: the number of noise affected properties, the likely duration and level of exposure and the consequences of the choice on the potential power generating capability of the wind farm.
- 3.2.4 ETSU-R-97 clearly indicates that the day-time limit is intended to lie within the range from 35 dB(A) to 40 dB(A). Therefore one can conclude that there must be projects where 35 dB(A) is appropriate and conversely, projects where 40 dB(A) is appropriate. Within ETSU-R-97 there is a specific example: *"A single wind turbine causing noise levels of 40 dB(A) at several nearby residences would have less planning merit (...) than 30 wind turbines also causing the same amount of noise at several nearby residences"*. Therefore, where a project offers relatively low power generating potential, the day-time limit should naturally tend towards the lower end of the range, unless the number of noise affected properties and the extent to which those properties would be affected by the higher noise levels is sufficiently low to justify noise limits tending towards the upper end of the range. Conversely, sites with relatively large power generating capacity should naturally justify limits towards the upper end of the range. The appropriate choice of value is considered subsequently in this Report.
- 3.2.5 The night-time noise limit is derived from background noise data measured during the night-time periods (23:00 to 07:00) with no differentiation being made between weekdays and weekends. The ten minute $L_{A90,10min}$ noise levels measured over these night-time periods are again plotted against the concurrent wind speed data and a 'best-fit' correlation is established. As with the day-time limit, the night-time noise limit is also set as the greater of: a level 5 dB(A) above the best-fit background curve or a fixed level of 43 dB(A). This fixed lower night-time limit of 43 dB(A) was set in ETSU-R-97 on the basis of World Health Organization (WHO) guidance^{xv} for the noise inside a bedroom and an assumed difference between outdoor and indoor noise levels with windows open. In the time since ETSU-R-97 was released, the WHO guidelines were revised to suggest a lower internal noise level, but conversely, a higher assumed difference between outdoor and indoor noise levels. Notwithstanding the WHO guideline revisions, the ETSU-R-97 limit remains consistent with current national planning

policy guidance with respect to night-time noise levels. In addition, following revision of the night-time WHO criteria, ETSU-R-97 has been incorporated into planning guidance for Wales, England and Scotland and at no point during this process was it felt necessary to revise the guidance within ETSU-R-97 to reflect the change in the WHO guideline internal levels. The advice contained within ETSU-R-97 remains a valid reference on which to continue to base the fixed limit at night.

3.2.6 The exception to the setting of both the day-time and night-time lower fixed limits occurs in instances where a property occupier has a financial involvement in the wind farm development. Where this is the case then the lower fixed portion of the noise limit at that property may be increased to 45 dB(A) during both the day-time and the night-time periods alike.

3.2.7 ETSU-R-97 also offers an alternative simplified assessment methodology:

'For single turbines or wind farms with very large separation distances between the turbines and the nearest properties a simplified noise condition may be suitable. We are of the opinion that, if the noise is limited to an $L_{A90,10min}$ of 35dB(A) up to wind speeds of 10m/s at 10m height, then this condition alone would offer sufficient protection of amenity, and background noise surveys would be unnecessary.'

3.2.8 The noise limits defined in ETSU-R-97 relate to the total noise occurring at a dwelling due to the combined noise of all operational wind turbines. The assessment will therefore need to consider the combined operational noise of the Development with other wind farms in the area to be satisfied that the combined cumulative noise levels are within the relevant ETSU-R-97 criteria. ETSU-R-97 also requires that the baseline levels on which the noise limits are based do not include a contribution from any existing turbine noise, to prevent unreasonable cumulative increases.

3.2.9 To undertake the assessment of noise effects in accordance with the foregoing methodology the following steps are required:

- specify the number and locations of the wind turbines on all wind farms;
- identify the locations of the nearest, or most noise sensitive, neighbours;
- measure the background noise levels as a function of site wind speed at the nearest neighbours, or at least at a representative sample of the nearest neighbours;
- determine the day-time and night-time noise limits from the measured background noise levels at the nearest neighbours;
- specify the type and noise emission characteristics of the wind turbines;
- calculate the noise immission levels due to the operation of the wind turbines as a function of site wind speed at the nearest neighbours; and
- compare the calculated wind farm noise immission levels with the derived noise limits and assess in the light of planning requirements.

3.2.10 The foregoing steps, as applied to the Development, are set out subsequently in this assessment.

3.2.11 Note that in the above, and subsequently in this assessment, the term 'noise emission' relates to the sound power level actually radiated from each wind turbine, whereas the term 'noise immission' relates to the sound pressure level (the perceived noise) at any receptor location due to the combined operation of all wind turbines on the Development.

3.3 Construction Noise Criteria

3.3.1 BS 5228-1 indicates a number of factors are likely to affect the acceptability of construction noise including site location, existing ambient noise levels, duration of site operations, hours of work, attitude of the site operator and noise characteristics of the work being undertaken.

3.3.2 BS 5228-1 informative Annex E provides example criteria that may be used to consider the significance of any construction noise effects. The criteria do not represent mandatory limits but rather a set of example approaches intended to reflect the type of methods commonly applied to

construction noise. The example methods are presented as a range of possible approaches (both facade and free field noise levels, hourly and day-time averaged noise levels) according to the ambient noise characteristics of the area in question, the type of development under consideration, and the expected hours of construction activity. In broad terms, the example criteria are based on a set of fixed limit values which, if exceeded, may result in a significant effect unless ambient noise levels (i.e. regularly occurring levels without construction) are sufficiently high to provide a degree of masking of construction noise.

- 3.3.3 Based on the range of guidance values set out in BS 5228 Annex E, and other reference criteria provided by the World Health Organization (WHO) and PAN50 Annex A: The Control of Noise at Surface Mineral Workings (1996), the following significance criteria have been derived. The values have been chosen in recognition of the relatively low ambient noise typically observed in rural environments. The presented criteria have been normalised to free-field day-time noise levels occurring over a time period, T, equal to the duration of a working day on-site. BS 5228-1 Annex E provides varied definitions for the range of day-time working hours which can be grouped for equal consideration. The values presented in Table 1 have been chosen to relate to day-time hours from 07:00 to 19:00 on weekdays, and 07:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.

Table 1 - Free-field Noise Criteria against which Construction Noise Effects are Assessed

| Significance | Condition |
|--------------|--|
| Major | Construction noise is greater than 72 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$ for any part of the construction works or exceeds 65 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$ for more than 4 weeks in any 12 month period |
| Moderate | Construction noise is less than or equal to 65 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$ throughout the construction period. |
| Minor | Construction noise is generally less than or equal to 60 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$, with periods of up to 65 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$ lasting not more than 4 weeks in any 12 month period |
| Negligible | Construction noise is generally less than or equal to 55 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$, with periods of up to 60 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$ lasting not more than 4 weeks in any 12 month period |

- 3.3.4 When considering the impact of short-term changes in traffic, associated with the construction activities, on existing roads in the vicinity of the Project, reference can be made to the criteria set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB^{xvi}). A classification of magnitudes of changes in the predicted traffic noise level calculated using the CRTN methodology is set out: for short-term changes such as those associated with construction activities, changes of less than 1 dB(A) are considered negligible, 1 to 3 dB(A) is minor, 3 to 5 dB(A) moderate and changes of more than 5 dB(A) constitute a major impact. This classification can be considered in addition to the criteria of Table 1.
- 3.3.5 The nature of works and distances involved in the construction of the proposed development are such that the risk of significant effects relating to ground borne vibration are generally very low. Excluding blasting, occasional momentary vibration can arise when heavy vehicles pass dwellings at very short separation distances, as is the case with the existing traffic in the area, but again this is not sufficient to constitute a risk of significant effects in this instance.
- 3.3.6 Blasting operations at borrow pits can generate airborne pressure waves or “air overpressure”. This covers both those pressure waves generated which are in the frequency range of human audibility (approximately 20 Hz to 20 kHz) as well as infrasonic pressure waves (those with a frequency of below 20 Hz), which, although outside the range of human hearing, can sometimes be felt.

- 3.3.7 Noise from blasting (i.e. pressure waves in the human audible range) is not considered in the same way as noise from other construction activities due to the fact that a large proportion of the energy contained within pressure waves generated by a blast is at frequencies that are below the lower frequency threshold of human hearing, and that the portion of energy contained within the audible range is generally of low frequency and of smaller magnitude than the infrasonic pressure variations.
- 3.3.8 The relevant guidance documents advise controlling air overpressure (and hence noise from blasting) through the use of good practices during the setting and detonation of charges as opposed to absolute limits on the levels produced, therefore no absolute limits for air overpressure or noise from blasting will be presented in this assessment.
- 3.3.9 In accordance with the guidance in PAN50 Annex D, ground vibration caused by blasting operations will be considered acceptable if peak particle velocity (PPV) levels, at the nearest sensitive locations, do not exceed 6 mm/s for 95% of all blasts measured over any 6-month period, and no individual blast exceeds a PPV of 12 mm/s.

3.4 Operational Noise Criteria

- 3.4.1 The acceptable limits for wind turbine operational noise are clearly defined in the ETSU-R-97 document and these limits should not be breached. Consequently, the test applied to operational noise is whether or not the calculated wind farm noise immission levels at nearby noise sensitive properties lie below the noise limits derived in accordance with ETSU-R-97. Depending on the levels of background noise the satisfaction of the ETSU-R-97 derived limits can lead to a situation whereby, at some locations under some wind conditions and for a certain proportion of the time, the wind farm noise may be audible. However, noise levels at the properties in the vicinity of the Development will still be within levels considered acceptable under the ETSU-R-97 assessment method.

3.5 Consultation

- 3.5.1 Prior to undertaking the background surveys, and as recommended in The Highland Council's (THC) scoping response, the survey approach was discussed with THC representatives. A summary of the proposed monitoring locations and of the proposed approach was forwarded to the Environmental Health Department of THC for comment, and were agreed to be representative for the purpose of an ETSU-R-97 assessment. This consultation was based on a preliminary project layout which was of a similar form to the layout currently proposed. An officer from the Environmental Health Department of THC was invited to site when the equipment was deployed but declined the invitation. The agreed noise monitoring locations are shown on the plan in Annex B. Further information about the equipment used and pictures of the survey locations are presented in Annex C.
- 3.5.2 In response to the initial scoping request, THC also expressed a preference for the following alternative, more stringent noise limits, similar to those of ETSU-R-97 described above in section 3.2 but with:
- the lower day-time limit set to a level of 35 dB(A), at the lowest end of the range of 35 to 40 dB(A) set out in ETSU-R-97, regardless of the site-specific factors which ETSU-R-97 recommends as needing consideration when setting a value within this range; and
 - the lower limit at night-time set at a level of 38 dB(A) instead of 43 dB(A) as prescribed in ETSU-R-97; or
 - the simplified limit of 35 dB(A) set out in ETSU-R-97 (for day and night-time).
- 3.5.3 These limits would apply for a wind farm scheme in isolation or for cumulative levels.

- 3.5.4 In November 2018, an outline of the cumulative noise assessment method set out in the present report was sent to a representative of the Environmental Health Department of THC for comment, and no adverse comment was received in response.

4. Baseline

4.1 General Description

- 4.1.1 The Development will cover an area extending approximately 2 kilometres north to south and 2 km west to east and is located in an area of relatively low population density. The noise environment in the surrounding area is generally characterised by 'natural' sources, such as water courses, wind-disturbed vegetation, and birds. Other sources of noise include road traffic on the A835.

4.2 Details of the Baseline Background Noise Survey

- 4.3 A total of three noise monitoring locations were agreed with the Local Authority as being representative of the background noise environment for the nearest residences to the proposed wind farm site. The three locations are shown on the plan in Annex B and listed in Table 2.

Table 2 - Background Noise Monitoring Locations (approximate Easting / Northing)

| No. | Property | Easting | Northing |
|-----|---------------|---------|----------|
| 1 | Aultguish Inn | 235094 | 870470 |
| 2 | Lubfearn | 238465 | 870203 |
| 3 | Hydro house | 237318 | 871100 |

- 4.3.1 Although baseline noise monitoring was previously undertaken at Aultguish Inn as part of the application¹ for the Extension to Lochluichart Wind Farm, the noise measurements were effectively referenced to wind speed measurements at 10 m height above ground which does not accord with current recommended good practice as set out in the IOA GPG.
- 4.3.2 The assessment has considered the effects of the Development at the monitoring locations noted above, as well as other residential properties: these assessment locations are listed in Table 3. The list of receptor locations is not intended to be exhaustive but sufficient to be representative of noise levels typical of those receptors closest to the Development. The property Lubfearn belongs to the turbine development landowner. Other receptors might also stand to benefit from financial involvement in the scheme in due course.
- 4.3.3 The survey results obtained at Hydro House were used at the neighbouring house at Black Bridge: as discussed in Annex C, this represents a conservative assumption given the increased level of water flow noise at the latter property. This is in accordance with the guidance provided by ETSU-R-97 and current good practice as set out in the IOA GPG.

¹ Planning reference 11/03204/S36.

Table 3 - Assessment Properties in the Vicinity of the Wind Farm

| Property | Easting | Northing | Approximate Distance to Closest Turbine (m) | Closest Turbine (ID) | Survey Location |
|---------------|---------|----------|---|----------------------|-----------------|
| Aultguish Inn | 235139 | 870408 | 2290 | T03 | Aultguish Inn |
| Black Bridge | 237187 | 870996 | 2670 | T06 | Hydro house |
| Hydro House | 237322 | 871064 | 2760 | T06 | Hydro house |
| Lubfearn | 238454 | 870182 | 2320 | T10 | Lubfearn |

- 4.3.4 The background noise monitoring exercise was conducted over a period of just over 4 weeks. The equipment used for the survey comprised three Rion NL-31 and NL-52 logging sound level meters. All meters were enclosed in environmental cases with battery power to enable continuous logging at the required ten-minute averaging periods. Outdoor enhanced windshield systems were used to reduce wind induced noise on the microphones and provide protection from rain. These windshield systems were supplied by the sound level meter manufacturer and maintain the required performance of the whole measurement system when fitted. The environmental enclosures provided an installed microphone height of approximately 1.2 to 1.5 metres above ground level, consistent with the requirements of ETSU-R-97.
- 4.3.5 The sound level meters were located on the side of the property facing the proposed wind farm where possible, unless this was over-riden to minimise other sources of noise (such as road traffic noise at Aultguish Inn). In all cases, the chosen location was never closer than 3.5 metres from the façade of the property and as far away as was practical from obvious atypical localised sources of noise such as running water, trees or boiler flues. Details and photographs of the measurement locations are presented in Annex C.
- 4.3.6 All measurement systems were calibrated on their deployment on 09 May 2018, on an interim service visit (22 May 2018) and upon collection of the equipment on the 07 June 2018. No acoustically important (>0.5 dB(A)) drifts in calibration were found to have occurred on any of the systems. This equates to a total ETSU-R-97 analysis period of at least 29 days for each location, which is in excess of the minimum of one week suggested by ETSU-R-97 and is compliant with the IOA GPG requirements. At Hydro House however, as the resident had moved the monitoring equipment at some point during the second half of the measurement survey, this part of the monitoring period was excluded from the analysis as a precautionary measure. However, as shown below, the remaining data coverage was considered sufficient in line with the good practice guidance of the IOA GPG.
- 4.3.7 All measurement systems were set to log the $L_{A90,10min}$ and $L_{Aeq,10min}$ noise levels continuously over the deployment period. The internal clocks on the sound level meters were all synchronized with Greenwich Mean Time (GMT) by the use of a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver. The clock on the met mast from which wind data was subsequently collected for the analysis of the measured background noise as function of wind speed was also set to GMT.

4.4 Measured Background Noise Levels

- 4.4.1 The ETSU-R-97 assessment method requires noise data to be related to wind speed data at a standardised height of ten metres, with wind speeds either directly measured at a height of ten metres or by calculation from measurement at other heights, the appropriate choice being determined by practitioner judgement and the available data sources. Since the publication of ETSU-R-97, the change in wind speed with increasing height above ground level has been identified as a potential source of variability when carrying out wind farm noise assessments. The effect of site

specific wind shear can be appropriately addressed by implementing the ETSU-R-97 option of deriving ten metre height reference data from measurements made at taller heights. It is this method that has been used in the noise assessment for the Development to account for the potential effect of site-specific wind shear. This method is consistent with the preferred method described in the IOA GPG. Wind speeds were measured on an 80-metre-high meteorological mast located within the boundary of the development site (approximate easting and northing 237060 / 868124). Values of wind speed at a standardised height of ten metres were calculated from those measured on the tall mast (“standardised wind speed”). Full details of the calculation method are given in Annex F.

- 4.4.2 Figures D1 to D4 reproduced at Annex D show the range of wind conditions experienced during the noise survey period. During the quiet day-time and night-time periods wind speeds were typically less than 10 m/s. The wind was observed to be directed from the north-east or the south for the majority of the survey period. The northerly winds in particular represented conditions in which the locations would be upwind from existing turbines in the area, thereby minimising the influence of this source in accordance with ETSU-R-97 and good practice requirements (see below). Although limited data was obtained at the highest wind speed (above 10 m/s), the range over which sufficient data was obtained included wind speeds of up to 8 m/s, at which the turbines considered reach their maximum level of noise emissions (see below). The survey extent therefore accords with IOA GPG requirements.
- 4.4.3 Figures E1 to E6 of Annex E show the results of the background noise measurements at each of the three survey locations. The background noise data are presented in terms of $L_{A90,10min}$ background noise levels plotted as a function of ten metre height wind speed. Two plots are shown for each location, one for quiet day-time periods and the other for night-time periods, both derived in accordance with ETSU-R-97.
- 4.4.4 Data from all survey locations were inspected to identify periods which may have been influenced by extraneous noise sources, giving rise to atypical and elevated levels. ETSU-R-97 requires in particular that any data affected by rainfall be excluded from the analysis. A rain gauge was installed at Lubfearn during the noise survey period; data from this gauge were therefore used to exclude those periods where rain was indicated. Such exclusions are indicated on the charts with blue dots.
- 4.4.5 In addition to the impact noise on surrounding vegetation and the sound level meter itself, in some environments rainfall can result in appreciable changes in background sound levels, for example as a result of wet roads which increase tyre noise emissions or dissipating flow noise in water courses and drainage systems. The contribution of traffic noise was minimised at each of the survey locations and thus the possible effect of increased tyre noise from wet roads is not considered significant in this case. In terms of water flow noise, similarly this was minimised in each case and was not a dominant factor on the measured levels. The monitoring locations were also positioned as far as practically possible from any residential drainage systems to minimise any associated noise influence. Based on the above, rainfall is considered to have a limited effect on background sound levels. Inspection of the data generally tends to support this, given the absence of any identifiable clear data trends that are normally characteristic of a site affected by rain-related background sound levels (such as flat clusters of data on the noise versus wind plot, or sharp increases in noise followed by a progressive decrease with time).
- 4.4.6 The measured background noise data may also have been increased by other extraneous sources or atypical events. Time-histories of the noise levels at each survey location were therefore inspected to look for any atypical relationships when compared to the wind speeds present during that time. Any elevated levels found in this way were excluded. The trend of the data when plotted against wind speed was also inspected to look for atypical relationships or outliers within the data-set (particularly at low wind speeds) which were excluded.
- 4.4.7 Furthermore, at Aultguish Inn, as a precautionary measure, periods with southerly winds were excluded from the analysis to minimise the potential influence from operational turbines to the south, as these would correspond to periods when the property is downwind of the existing Corriemoillie

Windfarm. Please note that this was also investigated at Hydro House but as this resulted in marginally higher noise levels, this data exclusion was not applied and suggests the influence of the turbine noise levels was marginal or negligible.

Table 4 - Day time $L_{A90,T}$ noise limits derived from the baseline noise survey according to ETSU-R-97

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Aultguish Inn | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.1 | 38.5 | 38.6 | 38.6 | 38.6 | 38.6 | |
| Black Bridge | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.7 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | |
| Hydro House | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.7 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | |
| Lubfearn | 38.1 | 38.9 | 40.0 | 41.1 | 42.4 | 43.9 | 43.9 | 43.9 | 43.9 | |

Table 5 - Night time $L_{A90,T}$ noise limits derived from the baseline noise survey according to ETSU-R-97

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Aultguish Inn | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | |
| Black Bridge | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | |
| Hydro House | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | |
| Lubfearn | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | |

Table 6 - Day time $L_{A90,T}$ noise limits derived from the baseline noise survey based on THC preferences

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Aultguish Inn | 35.5 | 36.6 | 37.5 | 38.1 | 38.5 | 38.6 | 38.6 | 38.6 | 38.6 | |
| Black Bridge | 35.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 36.6 | 38.7 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | |
| Hydro House | 35.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 36.6 | 38.7 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | |
| Lubfearn | 38.1 | 38.9 | 40.0 | 41.1 | 42.4 | 43.9 | 43.9 | 43.9 | 43.9 | |

Table 7 - Night time $L_{A90,T}$ Noise Limits Derived from the Baseline Noise Survey based on THC preferences

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Aultguish Inn | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | |
| Black Bridge | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | |
| Hydro House | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | |
| Lubfearn | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.8 | 39.5 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 39.7 | |

4.4.8 Any data removed from the analysis in the above ways is indicated on the charts as red circles. The analysis and filtering of the data was therefore undertaken in accordance with current good practice as set out in the IOA GPG.

- 4.4.9 Following removal of those data points, best-fit lines were generated using a polynomial fit of a maximum of 4th order. These lines of best-fit were then used to derive the noise limits required by ETSU-R-97 that apply during the day-time and night-time periods up to 12 m/s, on the current assumption of none of the properties being financially involved in the project. The corresponding ETSU-R-97 noise limits are summarised in Table 4 and Table 5. The noise limits have been set either at the prevailing measured background level plus 5 dB, or at the relevant fixed lower limit, whichever is the greater. The derivation of the relevant fixed lower limit value used for day-time periods (38 dB(A)), in accordance with ETSU-R-97, is described in Section 5,7 below.
- 4.4.10 In addition, alternative and more stringent alternative noise limits based on the Council preferences (set out in Section 3.5 above) are presented in Tables 6 and 7 above.

5. Predicted Noise Effects

5.1 Predicted Construction Noise Levels

- 5.1.1 The level of construction noise that occurs at the surrounding properties will be highly dependent on a number of factors such as the final site programme, equipment types used for each process, and the operating conditions that prevail during construction. It is not practically feasible to specify each and every element of the factors that may affect noise levels, therefore it is necessary to make reasonable allowance for the level of noise emissions that may be associated with key phases of the construction.
- 5.1.2 In order to determine representative emission levels for this study, reference has been made to the scheduled sound power data provided by BS 5228. Based on experience of the types and number of equipment usually associated with the key phases of constructing a wind farm, the scheduled sound power data has been used to deduce the upper sound emission level over the course of a working day. In determining the rating applicable to the working day, it has generally been assumed that the plant will operate for between 75% and 100% of the working day. In many instances, the plant would actually be expected to operate for a reduced percentage, thus resulting in noise levels lower than predicted in this assessment.
- 5.1.3 To relate the sound power emissions to predicted noise levels at surrounding properties, the prediction methodology outlined in BS 5228 has been adopted. The prediction method accounts for factors including screening and soft ground attenuation. The size of the site and resulting separation distances to surrounding properties allows the calculations to be reliably based on positioning all the equipment at a single point within a particular working area (for example, in the case of turbine erection, it is reasonable to assume all associated construction plant is positioned at the base of the turbine under consideration). In applying the BS 5228 methodology, it has been conservatively assumed that there are no screening effects, and that the ground cover is characterised as 50% hard / 50% soft.
- 5.1.4 Table 8 lists the key construction activities, the associated types of plant normally involved, the expected worst-case sound power level over a working day for each activity, the property which would be closest to the activity for a portion of construction, and the predicted noise level. It must be emphasised that these predictions only relate to the noise level occurring during the time when the activity is closest to the referenced property. In many cases, such as access track construction and turbine erection, the separating distances will be considerably greater for the majority of the construction period and the predictions are therefore the worst-case periods of the construction phase.
- 5.1.5 As its hardstand base will already have been laid down for purpose of the main substation construction, supplementary activities associated with the construction of any prospective form of battery energy storage facility would be limited to the delivery and installation of a relatively small

number of modular battery storage units and ancillary electrical plant. Cranes and other necessary construction equipment would already be located on-site. Combined with large separation distances involved, this means that the associated activities did not require specific assessment.

- 5.1.6 The assessment of noise from onsite construction activities is based on the period when each potential activity would occur closest to each of the nearest noise-sensitive locations. Therefore, onsite construction activities from other sites are considered unlikely to produce any additional noise impacts, even if the construction periods were to coincide, given the conservative nature of this approach.

Table 8 - Predicted Construction Noise Levels

| Task Name | Plant/Equipment | Upper Collective Sound Emission Over Working Day $L_{WA,T}$ dB(A) | Nearest Receiver | Minimum Distance to Nearest Receiver | Predicted Upper Day-Time L_{Aeq} |
|------------------------------------|---|---|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Construct temporary site compounds | excavator / dump truck / tippers / rollers/ delivery trucks | 120 | Aultguish Inn | 530 | 55 |
| Construct site tracks | excavators / dump trucks / tippers / dozers / vibrating rollers | 120 | Aultguish Inn | 630 | 53 |
| Construct Sub-Station | excavator / concrete truck / delivery truck | 110 | Lubfearn | 2900 | 28 |
| Construct crane hardstandings | excavators / dump trucks | 120 | Aultguish Inn | 2200 | 41 |
| Construct turbine foundations | Piling Rigs / excavators / tippers / concrete trucks / mobile cranes / water pumps / pneumatic hammers / compressors / vibratory pokers | 120 | Aultguish Inn | 2290 | 40 |
| Excavate and lay site cables | excavators / dump trucks / tractors & cable drum trailers / wacker plates | 110 | Aultguish Inn | 2290 | 30 |
| Erect turbines | cranes / turbine delivery vehicles / artics for crane movement / generators / torque guns | 120 | Aultguish Inn | 2290 | 40 |

| Task Name | Plant/Equipment | Upper Collective Sound Emission Over Working Day $L_{WA,T}$ dB(A) | Nearest Receiver | Minimum Distance to Nearest Receiver | Predicted Upper Day-Time L_{Aeq} |
|--|--|---|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Reinstate crane bases | excavator / dump truck | 115 | Aultguish Inn | 2200 | 36 |
| Reinstate road verges | excavator / dump truck | 115 | Aultguish Inn | 530 | 50 |
| Lay cable to sub-stations | JCB / saws / hydraulic breaker / dump truck/ tipper / wacker plate / tandem roller / tractor & cable drum trailer / delivery truck | 115 | Aultguish Inn | 2290 | 35 |
| Borrow Pit Quarrying | Primary and secondary stone Crushers / excavators / screening systems / pneumatic breakers / conveyors | 125 | Aultguish Inn | 2150 | 46 |
| Concrete Batching | Batching Plant | 110 | Aultguish Inn | 530 | 45 |
| Forestry felling around turbines and access tracks | Harvesters and forwarders, characterised by saw noise diesel engine noise emissions commonly associated with tractors and excavation noise | 115 | Lubfearn | 2240 | 36 |

- 5.1.7 Comparing the above predicted noise levels to the range of background noise levels measured around the Development suggests that the noisier construction activities may be audible at various times throughout the construction phase at some properties. However, comparing the levels to the significance criteria presented previously in Table 1 indicates that the construction activities will have effects of negligible significance.
- 5.1.8 In addition to on-site activities, construction traffic passing to and from the site will also represent a potential source of noise to surrounding properties. The traffic assessment presented in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Development has identified a worst-case scenario in which 100% of stone is imported to site over an 18-month construction period. In this case, the most intensive traffic will occur in months 6 to 8 when this stone import coincides with timber felling and import of concrete materials, during which an average of 408 daily HGV movements are predicted. In a more realistic case, in which substantially less stone import to site is

required and borrow pits are used instead, the maximum traffic will occur during the first months of construction with 120 daily HGV movements. Table 11.8 of Chapter 11 has been used to ascertain the projected traffic flows for scenarios with and without the Development. Chapter 11 did not identify likely significant increases in traffic due to cumulative considerations.

- 5.1.9 The above-referenced projected changes in traffic flow are summarised in Table 9. On this basis, the methodology set out in CRTN has been used to determine the associated maximum total change in the average day time traffic noise level at any given location due to construction of the Development: see Table 10.

Table 9 - Projected traffic flows

| Road | Without Development | | With Development, realistic case (worst-case in brackets) | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | Annual Average Daily Traffic Flow | % Heavy Goods Vehicles | Annual Average Daily Traffic Flow | % Heavy Goods Vehicles |
| A835: between Site and Garve | 1383 | 11.8% | 1583 (1951) | 17.9% (29.3%) |
| A835: between Garve and Contin | 2769 | 8.2% | 2969 (3337) | 11.7% (19.0%) |
| A835: between Contin and Maryburgh | 3229 | 12.0% | 3429 (3797) | 14.8% (20.9%) |
| A9: between Tore and Cromarty Bridge | 9853 | 9.9% | 9863 (9886) | 10.0% (10.2%) |
| A9: between Cromarty Bridge and Alness | 12594 | 7.8% | 12604 (12627) | 7.9% (8.0%) |

Table 10 - CRTN predicted increase in day time average traffic noise levels (LA_{10,18hour})

| Road | Maximum Change in Traffic Noise Level, dB(A) | |
|--|--|----------------|
| | Worst-case | Realistic case |
| A835: between Site and Garve | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| A835: between Garve and Contin | 2.6 | 1.0 |
| A835: between Contin and Maryburgh | 1.9 | 0.7 |
| A9: between Tore and Cromarty Bridge | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| A9: between Cromarty Bridge and Alness | 0.1 | 0.0 |

- 5.1.10 Under worst-case unmitigated assumptions, Table 10 indicates a maximum potential increase of 1.9 to 5 dB(A) in the day time average noise level during particular phases of the construction programme at locations adjoining the A835. Based on the criteria set out in the DMRB, these predicted short-term changes in traffic noise level would correspond to a slight impact generally but potentially a moderate impact for locations along the A835 between the Site and Garve. Along the A9, the predicted increase is less than 0.1 dB(A): this would represent a negligible impact. For the realistic case, the predicted increase would reduce to 0.7 to 2 dB along the A835, corresponding to a slight impact at most, with a negligible impact for receptors along the A9.

- 5.1.11 The separating distances between the construction activities and the nearest residential locations are such that no significant vibration effects are considered likely based on available guidance. Occasional momentary vibration can arise when heavy vehicles pass dwellings at very short separation distances, but again this is not sufficient to constitute a risk of significant effects.
- 5.1.12 In conclusion, noise from construction activities has been assessed and is generally predicted to result in temporary negligible effects, with the exception of traffic associated with the construction which is predicted to result in a slight to moderate impact under a worst-case unmitigated scenario, which would represent a significant temporary adverse effect for some receptors located along the A835 without further mitigation. However, under a more realistic scenario, the temporary impact would be slight adverse at most which would not be significant.
- 5.1.13 In Section 6 below, mitigation measures are proposed which include a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) which will comprise measures to reduce daily construction traffic volumes in the event that a high percentage of stone import to site is required. This will reduce peak daily generated traffic values to levels closer to the realistic case assessed above. Therefore, following implementation of these mitigation measures, the temporary impact would be slight adverse at most which would not be significant.

5.2 Construction Noise & Vibration Levels – Blasting

- 5.2.1 Because of the difficulties in predicting vibration and air overpressure resulting from blasting operations, these activities are best controlled following the use of good practice during the setting and detonation of charges, as set out earlier in this report. However, given the separation distances between the location of borrow pits and the nearest noise sensitive receptors (approximately 3 kilometres as a minimum) it is very unlikely that these activities would cause unacceptable residual adverse effects. On this basis, no additional mitigation measures are proposed in this instance.

5.3 De-commissioning Noise

- 5.3.1 De-commissioning is likely to result in less noise than during construction of the Development. The construction phase has been considered to generally have negligible noise effects, therefore most de-commissioning activities will, in the worst case, also have negligible noise effects. The potential exception would be the associated traffic, but as no rock import would be required for the decommissioning, it is likely that traffic volumes would be closer to the “realistic” scenario and therefore the impact would be slight at most and therefore not significant.

5.4 Operational Wind Turbine Emissions Data

- 5.4.1 The exact model of turbine to be used at the site will be the result of a future tendering process and therefore an indicative turbine model has been assumed for this noise assessment. This operational noise assessment is based upon the noise specification of the Nordex N133 4.8 MW wind turbine. 17 turbines have been modelled using the layout as indicated on the map at Annex B. The candidate turbine is a variable speed, pitch regulated machine with a rotor diameter of 133 metres and a hub height of 108.5 metres. Due to its variable speed operation, the sound power output of the Nordex N133 turbine varies considerably with wind speed, being quieter at the lower wind speeds when the blades are rotating more slowly. Furthermore, the turbine is equipped with serrated trailing edges (STE) technology which results in lower noise emissions and this was assumed in the present case.
- 5.4.2 Nordex have supplied noise emission data for the Nordex N133 turbine. In the absence of specific information about uncertainty allowances in the data, a further correction factor of +2 dB was added to the specification data in line with advice in the IOA GPG. The sound power data has been made available for standardised reference wind speeds of 4 m/s to 12 m/s inclusive. In addition to the

overall sound power data, reference has been made to additional manufacturer documentation which set out representative sound spectrum for the turbine. The overall sound power and spectral data are presented in Table 11 and Table 12.

- 5.4.3 Assessment of cumulative effects from operating the Development with other wind farms requires source information for the turbine types similar to that presented in Table 11 and Table 12 for each wind farm.
- 5.4.4 The data assumed for the Corriemoillie Wind Farm based on a GE 3.2-103 turbine model (73.5 m hub height) which is understood to be the installed turbine model. Preliminary noise calculations at nearby receivers were undertaken based on manufacturer information for this turbine similar to that set out above for the Nordex N133 turbine, including suitable margins of uncertainty in line with IOA GPG guidance. The consent for the Corriemoillie Wind Farm limits noise from that wind farm at neighbouring noise-sensitive locations to no more than 35 dB during quiet periods of the day and 38 dB at night. Preliminary calculations (set out in Annex B) showed that noise emissions from the GE turbines could be 3.5 dB higher without exceeding the most stringent of these limits (the day-time limits in this case). Therefore, a further uplift of +3.5 dB was added to the noise emissions derived from manufacturer specifications: the resulting data is set out in Table 11.
- 5.4.5 A similar process was done for the Lochluichart Wind Farm and Extension. Documents submitted by the developer to THC have confirmed that a Siemens SWT-3.0-101 turbine is installed at this site, with a 74.5 m hub height. Noise limits for this site are based on general preferences expressed by THC above in Section 3.5 above: the greatest of 35/38 dB (for day/night respectively) or background noise levels +5 dB. Predictions at the location of Forest Hill (easting/northing 233388 / 863667, see Annex B) showed a potential margin of 4 dB with the lower noise limit for night-time. At this property, based on the assessment^{xvii} supporting the planning application for the Extension scheme, the night-time limit is the most stringent. An uplift of +4 dB was therefore added to the manufacturer data in addition to margins for measurement uncertainties in line with current good practice. The resulting data is also set out in Table 11.
- 5.4.6 It is therefore unlikely that noise emissions from these sites could be higher without resulting in potential excess of their individual consent noise limits. This is therefore consistent with the guidance of the IOA GPG as well as more recent publications on the subject^{xviii}. These assumptions and approach to the assessment were outlined to THC and no adverse comment was received.

Table 11 – Wind Turbine Sound Power Levels Used in the Noise Assessment. Values shown for the adjacent windfarms are those derived from the manufacturers data, and include uncertainty factors. Values of the additional uplifts which are added to these values when predicting cumulative effects are shown in brackets.

| Standardised Wind Speed (m/s) | Sound Power Level (dB L _{Aeq}) | | |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Nordex N133 | GE 3.2-103 (+uplift) | Siemens SWT-3.0-101 (+uplift) |
| 4 | 97.0 | 97.0 (+3.5) | 95.4 (+4) |
| 5 | 102.5 | 97.9 (+3.5) | 100.2 (+4) |
| 6 | 106.7 | 101.4 (+3.5) | 105.3 (+4) |
| 7 | 108.0 | 104.6 (+3.5) | 107.2 (+4) |
| 8 | 108.0 | 106.5 (+3.5) | 108.0 (+4) |
| 9 | 108.0 | 107.0 (+3.5) | 108.0 (+4) |
| 10 | 108.0 | 107.0 (+3.5) | 108.0 (+4) |
| 11 | 108.0 | 107.0 (+3.5) | 108.0 (+4) |

| Standardised Wind Speed (m/s) | Sound Power Level (dB LAeq) | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Nordex N133 | GE 3.2-103 (+uplift) | Siemens SWT-3.0-101 (+uplift) |
| 12 | 108.0 | 107.0 (+3.5) | 108.0 (+4) |
| <i>Derived from:</i> | <i>Nordex document F008_272_A13_EN, 01/03/2018</i> | <i>GE Technical Documentation 3.2-103 Rev 4, 20/03/14</i> | <i>Siemens document E R WP SP EN-10-0000-0034-00, 12.07.2006</i> |

Table 12 – Octave Band Sound Power Spectrum (dB LAeq) For Reference Wind Speed Conditions (v10 = 8 m/s)

| Octave Band Centre Frequency (Hz) | A-Weighted Sound Power Level (dB(A)) | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Nordex N133 | GE 3.2-103 | Siemens SWT-3.0-101 |
| 63 | 89.5 | 93.1 | 86.8 |
| 125 | 95.3 | 97.8 | 98.7 |
| 250 | 98.5 | 99.3 | 105.4 |
| 500 | 100.9 | 101.0 | 108.7 |
| 1000 | 102.8 | 102.7 | 105.4 |
| 2000 | 101.9 | 102.6 | 97.5 |
| 4000 | 96.5 | 96.7 | 86.6 |
| 8000 | 82.7 | 77.5 | 83.3 |
| <i>Derived from:</i> | <i>Nordex document F008_272_A14_EN, 01/03/2018</i> | <i>GE Technical Documentation 3.2-103 Rev 4, 20/03/14</i> | <i>Siemens document E R WP SP EN-10-0000-0034-00, 12.07.2006</i> |

5.4.7 In addition, the potential effect of the proposed second Lochluichart Windfarm Extension (LWFE2) has been considered on the basis of a 9-turbine layout². For the purpose of this assessment, the same turbine model as installed on the Lochluichart Windfarm (Siemens SWT-3.0-101) was assumed, but without assuming an uplift as the site is not consented.

5.5 Choice of Wind Farm Operational Noise Propagation Model

5.5.1 The ISO 9613-2 model^{mix} has been used to calculate the noise immission levels at the selected nearest residential neighbours as advised in the IOA GPG. The model accounts for the attenuation due to geometric spreading, atmospheric absorption, and barrier and ground effects. All attenuation

² As illustrated in an email from Infinergy Project Director Nick Sage to Debbie Flaherty at the Energy Consents Unit, dated 17th August 2017, layout titled "revised post-Scoping turbine layout"

calculations have been made on an octave band basis and therefore account for the sound frequency characteristics of the turbines.

- 5.5.2 For the purposes of the present assessment, all noise level predictions have been undertaken using a receiver height of four metres above local ground level, mixed ground ($G=0.5$) and an air absorption based on a temperature of 10°C and 70% relative humidity. A receiver height of four metres will be typical of first floor windows and result in slightly higher predicted noise levels than if a 1.2 to 1.5 metre receiver height were chosen in the ISO 9613 algorithm. The attenuation due to terrain screening accounted for in the calculations has been limited to a maximum of 2 dB(A). In situations of propagation above concave ground, a correction of +3 dB was added. Annex B sets out the associated terrain screening/amplification factors taken into account in the calculations.
- 5.5.3 This method is consistent with the recommendations of the above-referenced Institute of Acoustics Good Practice Guide which provides recommendations on the appropriate approach when predicting wind turbine noise levels. The IOA GPG also allows for directional effects to be taken into account within the noise modelling; under upwind propagation conditions between a given receiver and the wind farm the noise immission level at that receiver can be as much as 10 dB(A) to 15 dB(A) lower than the level predicted using the ISO 9613-2 model. However, predictions have been made assuming downwind propagation from every turbine to every receptor at the same time as a worst-case.

5.6 Predicted Wind Farm Operational Noise Immission Levels

- 5.6.1 Table 13 shows predicted noise immission levels at each of the selected assessment locations for each wind speed from 4 m/s to 12 m/s inclusive. All wind farm noise immission levels in this report are presented in terms of the $L_{A90,T}$ noise indicator in accordance with the recommendations of the ETSU-R-97 report, obtained by subtracting 2 dB(A) from the calculated $L_{Aeq,T}$ noise levels based on the turbine sound power levels presented in Table 11 and Table 12.

Table 13 – Predicted $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each of the Noise Assessment Locations as a Function of Standardised Wind Speed for the Development alone.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 20.5 | 26.0 | 30.2 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 |
| Black Bridge | 19.0 | 24.5 | 28.7 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Hydro House | 18.9 | 24.4 | 28.6 | 29.9 | 29.9 | 29.9 | 29.9 | 29.9 | 29.9 |
| Lubfearn | 19.9 | 25.4 | 29.6 | 30.9 | 30.9 | 30.9 | 30.9 | 30.9 | 30.9 |

- 5.6.2 Table 14 shows predicted cumulative noise immission levels at each of the selected assessment locations for each standardised wind speed from 4 m/s to 12 m/s inclusive. These predictions are cumulative assuming all other existing wind farms are operating as set out in Section 5.4 and that all receptors are downwind of all wind turbines at the same time: this represents a conservative assumption in many cases.

Table 14 – Predicted Cumulative $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each of the Noise Assessment Locations as a Function of Standardised Wind Speed

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 28.0 | 32.2 | 36.1 | 37.9 | 38.3 | 38.3 | 38.3 | 38.3 | 38.3 |
| Black Bridge | 24.6 | 29.0 | 33.0 | 34.7 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 |
| Hydro House | 24.6 | 28.9 | 32.9 | 34.6 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 |
| Lubfearn | 23.6 | 28.2 | 32.3 | 33.8 | 34.1 | 34.1 | 34.1 | 34.1 | 34.1 |

5.7 ETSU-R-97 assessment

- 5.7.1 Figures E1 to E6 (Annex E) show the calculated wind farm noise immission levels predicted at the three noise monitoring locations and correspond to those already presented in Tables 13 and 14 (as well as predictions for individual wind farms) plotted as a function of standardised wind speed. The calculated noise immission levels are shown overlaid on the day-time and night-time noise limit curves. These limit curves have been derived by calculating best-fit regression lines through the measured background noise data to give the prevailing background noise curve required by ETSU-R-97. The noise limits have then been set either at the prevailing measured background level plus 5 dB or at the relevant fixed lower limit whichever is the greater. Both the derived ETSU-R-97 noise limits of Tables 4 and 5 as well as the alternative noise limits preferred by THC of Tables 6 and 7.
- 5.7.2 The ETSU-R-97 noise limits assume that the wind turbine noise contains no audible tones. Where tones are present a correction is added to the measured or predicted noise level before comparison with the recommended limits. The audibility of any tones can be assessed by comparing the narrow band level of such tones with the masking level contained in a band of frequencies around the tone called the critical band. The ETSU-R-97 recommendations suggest a tone correction which depends on the amount by which the tone exceeds the audibility threshold and should be included as part of the consent conditions. The turbines to be used for this site will be chosen to ensure that the noise emitted will comply with the requirements of ETSU-R-97 including any relevant tonality corrections.
- 5.7.3 The results of Table 13 show that the predicted wind farm noise immission levels from the proposed scheme in isolation clearly meet the simplified ETSU-R-97 noise criterion of 35 dB(A) under all wind speeds and at all locations.
- 5.7.4 The assessment (shown in tabular form in Table 15 and Table 16) shows that the predicted cumulative wind farm noise immission levels meet the ETSU-R-97 derived noise limits under all wind speeds and at all locations, based on a lower day-time limit of 38 dB(A).

Table 15 – Difference between the ETSU-R-97 Derived Day time Noise Limits and the Cumulative Predicted $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each Noise Assessment Location. Values are based on a 38 dB(A) lower day time limit and negative values indicate the noise immission level is below the limit.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | -10.0 | -5.8 | -1.9 | -0.2 | -0.1 | -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.3 |
| Black Bridge | -13.4 | -9.0 | -5.0 | -3.3 | -3.5 | -5.9 | -5.9 | -5.9 | -5.9 |
| Hydro House | -13.4 | -9.1 | -5.1 | -3.4 | -3.6 | -6.0 | -6.0 | -6.0 | -6.0 |
| Lubfearn | -14.4 | -10.7 | -7.7 | -7.3 | -8.3 | -9.7 | -9.7 | -9.7 | -9.7 |

Table 16 – Difference between the ETSU-R-97 Derived Night time Noise Limits and the Cumulative Predicted $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each Noise Assessment Location. Negative values indicate the immission level is below the limit.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | -15.0 | -10.8 | -6.9 | -5.1 | -4.7 | -4.7 | -4.7 | -4.7 | -4.7 |
| Black Bridge | -18.4 | -14.0 | -10.0 | -8.3 | -7.9 | -7.9 | -7.9 | -7.9 | -7.9 |
| Hydro House | -18.4 | -14.1 | -10.1 | -8.4 | -7.9 | -7.9 | -7.9 | -7.9 | -7.9 |
| Lubfearn | -19.4 | -14.8 | -10.7 | -9.2 | -8.9 | -8.9 | -8.9 | -8.9 | -8.9 |

- 5.7.5 The ETSU-R-97 fixed part of the limit during the day-time should lie within the range from 35 dB(A) to 40 dB(A). The factors to be used to determine where in this range have been discussed above. These are discussed in turn below:
- **Number of properties:** there is a relatively low number of properties affected by noise in this case. The area of the Development and its surroundings clearly has a low population density, with a limited number of surrounding properties.
 - **Duration and level of exposure:** The charts of Annex E show that, even during quiet periods of the day, the predicted levels of noise from the Development are clearly below the range of measured baseline background levels. Although predicted cumulative noise levels are closer to the upper end of the range of measured values, these are predicted on a conservative basis. Furthermore, as all four properties considered in Table 3 are located north of the proposed and existing wind turbines, they would experience reduced noise levels during northerly winds, thereby reducing the duration of exposure.
 - **Generation capacity:** the effect that having a limit at the lower end of the ETSU-R-97 range of 35 to 40 dB(A) would have on the number of turbines installed might not necessarily be very significant for the scheme, based on the analysis undertaken and the observation that predicted cumulative noise levels at the closest location properties are dominated by the other cumulative schemes considered. However, the generation capacity of the site is also a relevant consideration in this context. The generation capacity of more than 50 MW for the Development is nationally significant. At the time the ETSU-R-97 guidance was produced, a wind farm comprising more than 100 turbines would have been required to achieve a similar generating capacity to that of the Development. When considering cumulative noise levels, the combination of the large generation capacity of the existing turbines would reinforce this conclusion.
- 5.7.6 Based on the above considerations and from experience of other comparable wind farm developments, it is considered wholly appropriate to set the limit toward the middle end of the range, at 38 dB(A). This has therefore been the basis of the analysis above.
- 5.7.7 In addition, the more stringent alternative noise limits determined in Tables 6 and 7 based on the preference expressed by THC can also be considered. The assessment (shown in tabular form in Tables 17 and 18) shows that the predicted cumulative wind farm noise immission levels generally meet the derived noise limits under all wind speeds and at all locations, based on a lower limit of 35 and 38 dB(A) for day and night-time respectively, as preferred by THC.
- 5.7.8 There is a marginal predicted exception at Aultguish Inn but this is not considered significant for a number of reasons: first of all, the predicted excess is of less than 0.4 dB which is acoustically negligible and would not be perceptible. Furthermore, as illustrated in Figures E1/E2 of Annex E, the cumulative noise predictions at the relevant property are dominated by noise from the other wind farms considered in the cumulative assessment, to which uplifts of between +3 to +4 dB were applied as set out above. Finally, the relevant predictions are made on a conservative basis, with limited

screening and assuming downwind propagation from all turbines, and it is therefore unlikely that even this negligible excess above the Council preferred limits would occur in reality. In any case, Tables 15 and 16 demonstrates that the ETSU-R-97 noise limits for non-financially involved properties, applicable under Scottish Planning Guidance, would be comfortably met.

Table 17 – Difference between the Derived THC preferred Day time Noise Limits and the Cumulative Predicted $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each Noise Assessment Location. Values are based on a 35 dB(A) lower day time limit and negative values indicate the noise immission level is below the limit.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | -7.5 | -4.4 | -1.3 | -0.2 | -0.1 | -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.3 |
| Black Bridge | -10.4 | -6.0 | -2.0 | -1.9 | -3.5 | -5.9 | -5.9 | -5.9 | -5.9 |
| Hydro House | -10.4 | -6.1 | -2.1 | -2.0 | -3.6 | -6.0 | -6.0 | -6.0 | -6.0 |
| Lubfearn | -14.4 | -10.7 | -7.7 | -7.3 | -8.3 | -9.7 | -9.7 | -9.7 | -9.7 |

Table 18 – Difference between the Derived THC preferred Night time Noise Limits and the Cumulative Predicted $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each Noise Assessment Location. Values are based on a 38 dB(A) lower night time limit and negative values indicate the immission level is below the limit.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | -10.0 | -5.8 | -1.9 | -0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Black Bridge | -13.4 | -9.0 | -5.0 | -3.3 | -2.9 | -2.9 | -2.9 | -2.9 | -2.9 |
| Hydro House | -13.4 | -9.1 | -5.1 | -3.4 | -2.9 | -2.9 | -2.9 | -2.9 | -2.9 |
| Lubfearn | -14.4 | -9.8 | -6.6 | -5.6 | -5.5 | -5.5 | -5.5 | -5.5 | -5.5 |

5.7.9 In addition, the potential cumulative effects at more distant locations south of the Development can also be evaluated. Predicted immission noise levels at Corriemoillie Farm (easting/northing 235627 / 863959), which was considered in Annex B, are set out below in Table 19. These results show that the predictions for the Development are almost 10 dB lower than those of the combination of the existing, consented schemes, therefore representing an effectively insignificant cumulative increase (no more than 0.5 dB). Furthermore, the predicted cumulative noise levels (on a conservative basis, as described above) are below 37 dB(A) which is below the applicable noise limits as shown in the assessment^{xvii} for the Lochluichart Wind Farm Extension. For other properties situated further to the south or east, the relative contribution from the Development is further reduced and negligible, with similar conclusions reached.

Table 19 – Predicted L_{A90} Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Corriemoillie Farm, both for individual wind farm schemes and cumulatively.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| The Development | 15.9 | 21.4 | 25.6 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 26.9 |
| Corriemoillie Wind Farm | 23.5 | 27.0 | 30.2 | 32.1 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Lochluichart Wind Farm and Extension | 20.6 | 25.4 | 30.5 | 32.4 | 33.2 | 33.2 | 33.2 | 33.2 | 33.2 |
| Cumulative total for the existing schemes (Corriemoillie and Lochluichart) | 25.3 | 29.3 | 33.4 | 35.3 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 35.9 |
| Cumulative total when adding the Development | 25.8 | 29.9 | 34.0 | 35.8 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 36.4 |

5.7.10 It is finally concluded that predicted noise from the Development in isolation as well as cumulatively are compliant with the ETSU-R-97 criteria and effectively compliant with preferred THC noise limits at all locations and all wind speeds and are therefore acceptable and not significant.

5.7.11 Satisfactory control of cumulative noise immission levels would therefore be achieved through enforcement of the individual consent limits for each of the individual wind farms. Partial noise limits which apply to the project in isolation) are set out in Tables 20 and 21. These partial limits were derived by apportioning the total ETSU-R-97 limit in relation to the proportion of predicted noise levels between the Project and the other sites considered in the cumulative noise assessment. The resulting partial noise limits are such that compliance of the proposed development with these noise limits would maintain the conclusion of the cumulative assessment and result in cumulative levels which do not exceed the derived ETSU-R-97 noise criteria as well as the more stringent alternative THC noise limits (with negligible exceptions in the cumulative case as discussed above).

Table 20 – Specific day-time noise limits (L_{A90} , dB) proposed for the proposed development in isolation

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 29.5 | 30.6 | 31.4 | 32.1 | 32.5 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Black Bridge | 27.5 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 29.1 | 31.2 | 33.6 | 33.6 | 33.6 | 33.6 |
| Hydro House | 27.4 | 27.4 | 27.4 | 29.0 | 31.0 | 33.4 | 33.4 | 33.4 | 33.4 |
| Lubfearn | 29.8 | 30.7 | 31.7 | 32.9 | 34.2 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 35.6 |

Table 21 – Specific night-time noise limits (L_{A90} , dB) proposed for the proposed development in isolation

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Black Bridge | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 |
| Hydro House | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.4 |
| Lubfearn | 29.8 | 29.8 | 30.6 | 31.2 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 31.4 |

5.8 Assessment of potential Lochluichart Wind Farm Extension II

- 5.8.1 The potential effects of the proposed Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II (LWFE2) have been considered separately as the proposal was still at pre-application stage prior to finalisation of this assessment. The assumptions for the modelling are set out in Section 3 above.
- 5.8.2 Table 22 sets out predicted levels for LWFE2 in isolation. Table 23 then sets out the cumulative noise levels which result from the addition of the cumulative levels of Table 14 above and the predictions for LWFE2 of Table 22. This therefore represents the potential cumulative noise levels should both the proposed development and LWFE2 be consented. This shows that the predicted cumulative levels at Lubfearn are below the simplified ETSU-R-97 assessment criteria of 35 dB and therefore remain acceptable.
- 5.8.3 The assessment shown in tabular form in Tables 24 and 25 compares the predicted cumulative wind farm noise immission levels of Table 23 (including LWFE2) with the noise limits preferred by THC (Table 6 and 7). This shows that the predicted cumulative levels meet these more stringent alternative noise requirements at all properties except Aultguish Inn, where the day and night limits are exceeded by a margin of approximately 2 dB for day-time and night-time periods.
- 5.8.4 This is also illustrated in Figure E7 to E10 of Annex E, which show the predictions in relation to the derived limits at Aultguish Inn and Hydro House. These figures illustrate that:
- The predicted cumulative levels also exceed the derived full ETSU-R-97 noise limits for day-time periods set out in Table 4 at Aultguish Inn but meet the night-time limits.
 - This is the case both with and without the presence of the Kirkan Wind Farm (the proposed development), as illustrated in Figure E7. Therefore, these potentially significant effects relate predominantly to LWFE2 rather than the proposed development.
 - If the fixed lower limit for day-time periods for non-financially involved properties was increased to 40 dB(A), at the upper end of the range of 35 to 40 dB(A) allowed in ETSU-R-97, then the predicted cumulative levels of Table 23 would only be very marginally above the resulting ETSU-R-97 noise limits (by 0.1 dB). It would be necessary to consider if, in the context of the cumulative total, this increase to the upper end of the fixed part of the ETSU-R-97 day-time limit would meet the three criteria set out above, given in particular the total scale of developments to which the elevated 40 dB(A) criteria is being applied.

Table 22 – Predicted $LA_{90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each of the Noise Assessment Locations as a Function of Standardised Wind Speed for the Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II alone.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 22.7 | 27.5 | 32.6 | 34.5 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.3 |
| Black Bridge | 16.1 | 20.9 | 26.0 | 27.9 | 28.7 | 28.7 | 28.7 | 28.7 | 28.7 |
| Hydro House | 15.7 | 20.5 | 25.6 | 27.5 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.3 |
| Lubfearn | 11.4 | 16.2 | 21.3 | 23.2 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |

Table 23 – Predicted cumulative $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each of the Noise Assessment Locations as a Function of Standardised Wind Speed, including the Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 29.1 | 33.4 | 37.7 | 39.5 | 40.1 | 40.1 | 40.1 | 40.1 | 40.1 |
| Black Bridge | 25.2 | 29.6 | 33.8 | 35.5 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |
| Hydro House | 25.1 | 29.5 | 33.7 | 35.4 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 35.9 |
| Lubfearn | 23.9 | 28.5 | 32.6 | 34.2 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 34.5 |

Table 24 – Difference between the Derived THC preferred Day time Noise Limits and the Cumulative Predicted $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each Noise Assessment Location, including the Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II. Values are based on a 35 dB(A) lower day time limit and negative values indicate the noise immission level is below the limit.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | -6.4 | -3.2 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Black Bridge | -9.9 | -5.4 | -1.2 | -1.1 | -2.6 | -5.0 | -5.0 | -5.0 | -5.0 |
| Hydro House | -9.9 | -5.5 | -1.3 | -1.2 | -2.8 | -5.1 | -5.1 | -5.1 | -5.1 |
| Lubfearn | -14.2 | -10.4 | -7.4 | -6.9 | -7.9 | -9.3 | -9.3 | -9.3 | -9.3 |

Table 25 – Difference between the Derived THC preferred Night time Noise Limits and the Cumulative Predicted $L_{A90,T}$ Wind Farm Noise Immission Levels at Each Noise Assessment Location, including the Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II. Values are based on a 38 dB(A) lower night time limit and negative values indicate the immission level is below the limit.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | -8.9 | -4.6 | -0.3 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| Black Bridge | -12.9 | -8.4 | -4.2 | -2.5 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |
| Hydro House | -12.9 | -8.5 | -4.3 | -2.6 | -2.1 | -2.1 | -2.1 | -2.1 | -2.1 |
| Lubfearn | -14.1 | -9.5 | -6.2 | -5.3 | -5.1 | -5.1 | -5.1 | -5.1 | -5.1 |

5.8.5 In conclusion, based on the preliminary information available, the proposed Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II could potentially result in significant cumulative operational noise impacts, particularly in relation to the stringent alternative noise limits preferred by THC. This would however be the case even in the absence of the proposed development.

5.9 Low Frequency Noise, Vibration and Amplitude Modulation

5.9.1 Low frequency noise and vibration resulting from the operation of wind farms are issues that have been attracting a certain amount of attention over recent years. Consequently, Annex A includes a detailed discussion of these topics. In summary of the information provided therein, the current recommendation is that ETSU-R-97 should continue to be used for the assessment and rating of operational noise from wind farms.

5.9.2 Annex A also discusses the most recently published research on the subject of wind turbine blade swish Amplitude Modulation (or AM). As a consequence of the combined results of this research, and in particular the development by the IOA of an objective technique for identifying and quantifying AM noise, as well as a review of the subjective response to AM noise by a Government-commissioned research group, a penalty-type approach to account for instances of increased AM outside what is expected from 'normal' blade swish has been proposed. Some uncertainty remains at this stage over the application of such a penalty and this will be subject to a period of testing and review over the next few years.

5.10 Substation and battery storage

5.10.1 The main noise sources associated with the substation are likely to be the power transformers and the cooling fans. Operational noise associated with any battery energy storage facility would arise from HVAC systems, modular inverters and lower-voltage transformers (forming combined the 'power conversion systems') and higher-voltage transformers associated with grid connection (were this not to be shared with the main wind farm substation).

5.10.2 Given the large separation distances of around 3 km or more between the substation and battery storage area and the nearest residential properties, experience of similar installations and professional judgement, the associated levels of operational noise would be negligible and not significant. Therefore, no specific mitigation is required in this instance.

5.11 Evaluation of Effects

Table 26 – Summary of effects

| Potential Effect | Evaluation of Effect |
|--------------------|--|
| Construction Noise | Noise levels from the different construction activities have been predicted using the methodology set out in BS 5228. Based on assessment criteria derived and supported by a range of noise policy and guidance, overall construction noise levels are considered to represent a negligible effect, and therefore considered not significant in EIA terms. The effect of the predicted construction traffic was assessed using CRTN and the criteria set out the DMRB. Under a worst-case unmitigated scenario, this could represent a slight to moderate impact which would represent a temporary adverse significant effect for some receptors along the A835: between the Site and Garve. Under a more realistic and/or mitigated scenario, the temporary impact would be slight adverse at most which would not be significant. |
| Operational Noise | Noise criteria have been established in accordance with ETSU-R-97. It has also been shown that these criteria are achievable with a commercially available turbine suitable for the site. This includes cumulative levels of other existing wind farms in the area. The basis of the ETSU-R-97 method is to define acceptable noise limits thought to offer reasonable protection to residents in areas around wind farm developments. At some locations under some wind conditions and for a certain proportion of the time, the wind farm noise may be audible; however, operational noise immission levels are acceptable in terms of the guidance commended by planning policy for the assessment of wind farm noise, and therefore considered not significant in EIA terms. |

| Potential Effect | Evaluation of Effect |
|------------------|--|
| | The potential cumulative levels of operational noise including the Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II could exceed the derived stringent alternative THC or ETSU-R-97 noise limits, but this would be the case regardless of the proposed development. |

6. Mitigation, Offsetting and Enhancement Measures

6.1 Proposed Construction Noise Mitigation Measures

- 6.1.1 To reduce the potential effects of construction noise, the following types of mitigation measures are proposed:
- Those activities that may give rise to audible noise at the surrounding properties and heavy goods vehicle deliveries to the site would be limited to the hours 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Turbine deliveries would only take place outside these times with the prior consent of the Council and the Police. Those activities that are unlikely to give rise to noise audible at the site boundary will continue outside of the stated hours.
 - All construction activities shall adhere to good practice as set out in BS 5228.
 - All equipment will be maintained in good working order and any associated noise attenuation such as engine casing and exhaust silencers shall remain fitted at all times.
 - Where flexibility exists, activities will be separated from residential neighbours by the maximum possible distances.
 - A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be developed and secured through a planning condition to control the movement of vehicles to and from the Development site. The CTMP will include measures to reduce daily construction traffic volumes if a high percentage of stone import to site is required, through traffic management and programme design, including potentially extending the construction period.
 - Construction plant capable of generating significant noise and vibration levels will be operated in a manner to restrict the duration of the higher magnitude levels.

6.2 Proposed Operational Noise Mitigation Measures

- 6.2.1 The selection of the final turbine to be installed at the site would be made on the basis of enabling the relevant ETSU-R-97 noise limits to be achieved at the surrounding properties.

7. Monitoring

- 7.1.1 It is proposed that if planning consent is granted for the Development, conditions attached to the planning consent should include the requirement that, in the event of a noise complaint, noise levels resulting from the operation of the wind farm are measured in order to demonstrate compliance with the conditioned noise limits. Such monitoring should be done in full accordance with ETSU-R-97 and include penalties for characteristics of the noise such as tonality (if present).

8. Summary of Key Findings and Conclusions

- 8.1.1 This report has presented an assessment of the effects of construction and operational noise from the Development on the residents of nearby dwellings.
- 8.1.2 A number of residential properties lying around the wind farm have been selected as being representative of the closest located properties to the wind farm. The minimum separation distance to the closest residential property with the scheme is approximately 2300 metres. Noise assessments have been undertaken at these properties by comparing predicted construction and operational noise levels with relevant assessment criteria. In the case of construction noise, relevant assessment criteria are in the form of absolute limit values derived from a range of environmental noise guidance. In relation to operational noise, the limits have been derived from the existing background noise levels at three surrounding properties, as derived from measurements made over approximately four weeks.
- 8.1.3 The construction noise assessment has determined that levels associated with most construction activities are expected to be audible at various times throughout the construction programme, but remain with acceptable limits such that their temporary effects are considered negligible. The effect of the predicted construction traffic, under a worst-case unmitigated scenario, could represent a slight to moderate impact which would represent a temporary adverse significant effect for some receptors along the A835: between the Site and Garve. Under a more realistic and/or mitigated scenario, the temporary impact would be slight adverse at most which would not be significant.
- 8.1.4 Operational noise from the wind farm has been assessed in accordance with the methodology set out in the 1996 DTI Report ETSU-R-97, 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind farms'. This document provides a robust basis for assessing the operational noise of a wind farm as recommended in Scottish Planning Policy.
- 8.1.5 It has been demonstrated that both day-time and night-time noise limits can be satisfied at all properties across all wind speeds, either when derived in accordance with ETSU-R-97 or more stringent alternative requirements recommended by The Highland Council (with negligible exceptions). This accounted for the cumulative impact of the Development with the existing Corriemoillie, Lochluichart and Extension windfarms. This assessment has been based on the use of the manufacturer's warranted sound power data for the Nordex N133 4.8 MW wind turbine which is typical of the type and size of turbine which may be considered for this site, and assuming worst case downwind propagation.
- 8.1.6 In summary, the noise associate with most construction activities is considered to represent a negligible effect, but mitigated impacts associated with construction traffic represent a slight temporary adverse effect which is not significant. At some locations under some wind conditions and for a certain proportion of the time, the wind farm noise may be audible; however, operational noise immission levels are acceptable in terms of the guidance commended by planning policy for the assessment of wind farm noise, and therefore considered not significant in EIA terms.
- 8.1.7 The potential cumulative levels of operational noise including the Lochluichart Windfarm Extension II could exceed the derived stringent alternative THC or ETSU-R-97 noise limits, but this would be the case regardless of the proposed development.

9. References

-
- i Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), Scottish Government, 2014.
- ii Planning Advice Note 1/2011: Planning & Noise, Scottish Government, March 2011.

-
- iii Scottish Government, Online Renewables Planning Advice, Onshore Wind Turbines (<http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0045/00451413.pdf>). Updated May 28, 2014.
 - iv ETSU-R-97, the Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms, Final ETSU-R-97 Report for the Department of Trade & Industry. The Working Group on Noise from Wind Turbines, 1997.
 - v A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise, M. Cand, R. Davis, C. Jordan, M. Hayes, R. Perkins, Institute of Acoustics, May 2013.
 - vi Letter from John Swinney MSP, Scottish Government, 29/05/2013
 - vii PAN1/2011 Technical Advice Note – Assessment of Noise, Scottish Government, March 2011.
 - viii Control of Pollution Act, Part III, HMSO, 1974.
 - ix BS 5228 Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites, Parts 1 to 4.
 - x BS 5228-1:2009-A:2014 ‘Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise’.
 - xi BS 5228-2:2009-A:2014 ‘Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 2: Vibration’.
 - xii Planning Advice Note 50: Controlling The Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings, 1996.
 - xiii BS 6472-2:2008:Guide to evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings - Part 2: Blast-induced vibration.
 - xiv Calculation of Road Traffic Noise, HMSO Department of Transport, 1988.
 - xv Environmental Health Criteria 12 – Noise. World Health Organisation, 1980.
 - xvi Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, section 3, Part 7, Traffic Noise and Vibration, The Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, Transport Wales, The Department for Regional Development (Northern Ireland)
 - xvii Environmental Statement, Extension to Lochluichart Wind Farm, comprising six turbines and two borrow pits, Land Between Lochluichart And Loch Glascarnoch Garve, planning reference 11/03204/S36.
 - xviii Wind farms cumulative impact assessment, D. Bowdler et. al., Insitute of Acoustics Bulletin, Jan/Feb 2016.
 - xix ISO 9613-2:1996 ‘Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors – Part 2: General method of calculation’, International Standards Organisation, 1996.


Annex A - General Approach to Noise Assessment & Glossary

- A.1 Some sound, such as speech or music, is desirable. However, desirable sound can turn into unwanted noise when it interferes with a desired activity or when it is perceived as inappropriate in a particular environment.
- A.2 When assessing the effects of sound on humans there are two equally important components that must both be considered: the physical sound itself, and the psychological response of people to that sound. It is this psychological component which results in those exposed differentiating between desirable sound and unwanted noise. Any assessment of the effects of sound relies on a basic appreciation of both these components. This Annex provides an overview of these topics. A glossary of acoustic terminology is included at the end of this Annex.
- A.3 The assessment of environmental noise can be best understood by considering physical sound levels separately from the likely effects that these physical sound levels have on people, and on the environment in general.
- A.4 Physical sound is a vibration of air molecules that propagates away from the source. As acoustic energy (carried by the vibration back and forth of the air molecules) travels away from the source of the acoustic disturbance it creates fluctuating positive and negative acoustic pressures in the atmosphere above and below the standing atmospheric pressure. For most types of sound normally encountered in the environment these acoustic pressures are extremely small compared to the atmospheric pressure. When acoustic pressure acts on any solid object it causes microscopic deflections in the surface. For most types of sound normally encountered in the environment these deflections are so small they cannot physically damage the material. It is only for the very highest energy sounds, such as those experienced close to a jet engine for example, that any risk of physical damage exists. For these reasons, most sound is essentially neutral and has no cumulative damaging physical effect on the environment. The effects of environmental sound are therefore limited to its effects on people or animals.
- A.5 Before reviewing the potential effects of environmental sound on people, it is useful first to consider the means by which physical sound can be quantified.

Indicators of Physical Sound Levels

- A.6 Physical sound is measured using a sound level meter. A sound level meter comprises two basic elements: a microphone which responds in sympathy with the acoustic pressure fluctuations and produces an electrical signal that is directly related to the incident pressure fluctuations, and a meter which converts the electrical signal generated by the microphone into a decibel reading. Figure A1 shows an example of the time history of the decibel readout from a sound level meter located approximately 50 metres from a road. The plot covers a total time period of approximately 2 hours. The peaks in the sound pressure level trace correspond to the passage of individual vehicles past the measurement location.
- A.7 Assigning a single value to the time varying sound pressure level presented in Figure A1 is clearly not straightforward, as the sound pressure level varies by over 50 dB with time. To overcome this, the measurement characteristics of sound level meters can be varied to emphasise different features of the sound that are thought to be most relevant to the effect under consideration.

Figure A1 Sample plot of the sound pressure level measured close to a road over a period of approximately two hours.



Objective measures of noise

- A.8 The primary purpose of measuring environmental noise is to assess its effects on people. Consequently, any sound measuring device employed for the task should provide a simple readout that relates the objectively measured sound to human subjective response. To achieve this, the instrument must, as a minimum, be capable of measuring sound over the full range detectable by the human ear.
- A.9 Perceived sound arises from the response of the ear to sound waves travelling through the air. Sound waves comprise air molecules oscillating in a regular and ordered manner about their equilibrium position. The speed of the oscillations determines the frequency, or pitch, of the sound, whilst the amplitude of oscillations governs the loudness of the sound. A healthy human ear is capable of detecting sounds at all frequencies from around 20 Hz to 20 kHz over an amplitude range of approximately 1,000,000 to 1. Even relatively modest sound level meters are capable of detecting sounds over this range of amplitudes and frequencies, although the accuracy limits of sound level meters vary depending on the quality of the unit. When undertaking measurements of wind turbine noise, as with all other noise measurements, it is important to select a measurement system that possesses the relevant accuracy tolerances and is calibrated to a matching standard.
- A.10 Whilst measurement systems exist that are capable of detecting the range of sounds detected by the human ear, the complexities of human response to sound make the derivation of a likely subjective response from a simple objective measure a non-trivial problem. Not only does human response to sound vary from person to person, but it can also depend as much on the activity and state of mind of an individual at the time of the assessment, and on the 'character' of the sound, as it can on the actual level of the sound. In practice, a complete range of responses to any given sound may be observed. Thus, any objective measure of noise can, at best, be used to infer the average subjective response over a sample population.

Sound Levels and Decibels

- A.11 Because of the broad amplitude range covered by the human ear, it is usual to quantify the magnitude of sound using the decibel scale. When the amplitude of sound pressure is expressed using decibels (dB) the resultant quantity is termed the sound pressure level. Sound pressure levels are denoted by a capital 'L', as in L dB. The conversion of sound pressure from the physical quantity of Newton per square metre, or Nm^{-2} , to sound pressure level in dB reduces the range from 0 dB at the threshold of hearing to 120 dB at the onset of pain. Both of these values are derived with respect to the hearing of the average healthy young person.
- A.12 Being represented on a logarithmic amplitude scale, the addition and subtraction of decibel quantities does not follow the normal rules of linear arithmetic. For example, two equal sources acting together produce a sound level 3 dB higher than either source acting individually, so $40 \text{ dB} + 40 \text{ dB} = 43 \text{ dB}$ and $50 \text{ dB} + 50 \text{ dB} = 53 \text{ dB}$. Ten equal sound sources acting together will be 10 dB louder than each source operating in isolation. Also, if one of a pair of sources is at least 10 dB quieter than the other, then it will contribute negligibly to the combined noise level. So, for example, $40 \text{ dB} + 50 \text{ dB} = 50 \text{ dB}$.
- A.13 An increase in sound pressure level of 3 dB is commonly accepted as the smallest change of any subjective significance. An increase of 10 dB is often claimed to result in a perceived doubling in loudness, although the basis for this claim is not well founded. An increase of 3 dB is equivalent to a doubling in sound energy, which is the same as doubling the number of similar sources. An increase of 10 dB is equivalent to increasing the number of similar sources tenfold, whilst an increase of 20 dB requires a hundredfold increase in the number of similar sources and an increase of 30 dB requires a thousand times increase in the number of sources.

Frequency Selectivity of Human Hearing and A-weighting

- A.14 Whilst the hearing of a healthy young individual may detect sounds over a frequency range extending from less than 20 Hz to greater than 20 kHz, the ear is not equally sensitive at all frequencies. Human hearing is most sensitive to sounds containing frequency components lying within the range of predominant speech frequencies from around 500 Hz to 4000 Hz. Therefore, when relating an objectively measured sound pressure level to subjective loudness, the frequency content of the sound must be accounted for.
- A.15 When measuring sound with the aim of assessing subjective response, the frequency selectivity of human hearing is accounted for by down-weighting the contributions of lower and higher frequency sounds to reduce their influence on the overall reading. This is achieved by using an 'A'-weighting filter. Over the years, the A-weighting has become internationally standardised and is now incorporated into the majority of environmental noise standards and regulations in use around the world to best replicate the subjective response of the human ear. A-weighting filters are also implemented as standard on virtually all sound measurement systems.
- A.16 Sound pressure levels measured with the A-weighting filter applied are referred to as 'A weighted' sound pressure levels. Results from such measurements are denoted with a subscripted capital A after the 'L' level designation, as in 45 dB LA, or alternatively using a bracketed 'A' after the 'dB' decibel designation, as in 45 dB(A).

Temporal Variation of Noise and Noise Indices

- A.17 The simple A-weighted sound pressure level provides a snapshot of the sound environment at any given moment in time. However, as is adequately demonstrated by Figure A1, this instantaneous sound level can vary significantly over even short periods of time. A single number indicator is therefore required that best quantifies subjective response to time varying environmental noise, such as that shown in Figure A1. The question thus arises as to how temporal variations in level should be accounted for. This is most often achieved in practice by selecting a representative time period and

calculating either the average noise level over that time period or, alternatively, the noise level exceeded for a stated proportion of that time period, as discussed below.

Equivalent Continuous Sound Level, $L_{Aeq,T}$

- A.18 The equivalent continuous sound level, or $L_{Aeq,T}$ averages out any fluctuations in level over time. It is formally defined as the level of a steady sound which, in a stated time period 'T' and at a given location, has the same sound energy as the time varying sound. The $L_{Aeq,T}$ is a useful 'general' noise index that has been found to correlate well with subjective response to most types of environmental noise.
- A.19 The equivalent continuous sound level is expressed $L_{Aeq,T}$ in dB, where the A-weighting is denoted by the subscripted 'A', the use of the equivalent continuous index is denoted by the subscripted 'eq', and the subscripted 'T' refers to the time period over which the averaging is performed. So, for example, 45 dB $L_{Aeq,1hr}$ indicates that A-weighted equivalent continuous noise level measured over a one hour period was 45 dB.
- A.20 The disadvantage of the equivalent continuous sound level is that it provides no information as to the temporal variation of the sound. For example, an $L_{Aeq,1hr}$ of 60 dB could result from a sound pressure level of 60 dB(A) continuously present over the whole hour's measurement period, or it could arise from a single event of 96 dB(A) lasting for just 1 second superimposed on a continuous level of 30 dB(A) which exists for the remaining 59 minutes and 59 seconds of the hour long period. Clearly, the subjective effect of these two apparently identical situations (if one were to rely solely on the L_{Aeq} index) could be quite different.
- A.21 The aforementioned feature can produce problems where the general ambient noise level is relatively low. In such cases the $L_{Aeq,T}$ can be easily 'corrupted' by individual noisy events. Examples of noisy events that often corrupt $L_{Aeq,T}$ noise measurements in situations of low ambient noise levels include birdsong or a dog bark local to a noise monitoring point, or an occasional overflying aircraft or a sudden gust of wind. This potential downside to the use of $L_{Aeq,T}$ as a general measurement index is of particular relevance to the assessment of ambient noise in quiet environments, such as those typically found in rural areas where wind farms are developed.
- A.22 Despite these shortcomings in low noise environments, the $L_{Aeq,T}$ index is increasingly becoming adopted as the unit of choice for both UK and European guidance and legislation, although this choice is often as much for reasons of commonality between standards as it is for overriding technical arguments. In the Government's current planning policy guidance notes the $L_{Aeq,T}$ noise level is the index of choice for the general assessment of environmental noise. This assessment is undertaken separately for day time ($L_{Aeq,16hr}$ 07:00 to 23:00) and night time ($L_{Aeq,8hr}$ 23:00 to 07:00) periods. However, it is often the case for quiet environments, or for non-steady noise environments, that more information than can be gleaned from the $L_{Aeq,T}$ index may be required to fully assess potential noise effects.

Maximum, L_{Amax} , and percentile exceeded sound level, $L_{An,T}$

- A.23 Figure A1 shows, superimposed on the time varying sound pressure level trace and in addition to the $L_{Aeq,T}$ noise level, examples of three well established measurement indices that are commonly used in the assessment of environmental noise impacts. These are the maximum sound pressure level, L_{Amax} , the 90 percentile sound pressure level, $L_{A90,T}$ and the ten percentile sound pressure level, $L_{A10,T}$.
- A.24 The $L_{Amax,F}$ readings is suited to indicating the physical magnitude of the single individual sound event that reaches the maximum level over the measurement period, but it gives no indication of the number of individual events of a similar level that may have occurred over the time period.
- A.25 Unlike the $L_{Aeq,T}$ index and the $L_{Amax,F}$ indices, percentile exceeded sound levels, percentage exceeded sound levels provide some insight into the temporal distribution of sound level throughout the averaging period. Percentage exceeded sound levels are defined as the sound level exceeded by a

fluctuating sound level for $n\%$ of the time over a specified time period, T . They are denoted by $L_{An,T}$ in dB, where 'n' can take any value between 0% and 100%.

- A.26 The $L_{A10,T}$ and $L_{A90,T}$ indices are the most commonly encountered percentile noise indices used in the UK.
- A.27 The 10%ile index, or $L_{A10,T}$ provides a measure of the sound pressure level that is exceeded for 10% of the total measurement period. It therefore represents the typical upper level of sound associated with specific events, such as the passage of vehicles past the measurement point. It is the traditional index adopted for road traffic noise. This index is useful because traffic noise is not usually constant, but rather it fluctuates with time as vehicles drive past the receptor location. The $L_{A10,T}$ therefore characterises the typical level of peaks in the noise as vehicles drive past, rather than the lulls in noise between the vehicles.
- A.28 The $L_{A90,T}$ noise index is the noise level exceeded for 90% of the time period, T . It provides an estimate of the level of continuous background noise, in effect performing the inverse task of the $L_{A10,T}$ index by detecting the lulls between peaks in the noise. It is for this reason that the $L_{A90,T}$ noise index is the favoured unit of measurement for wind farm noise where, for the reasons discussed above, the generally low $L_{Aeq,T}$ noise levels are easily corrupted by intermittent sounds such as those produced by livestock, agricultural vehicles or the occasional passing vehicle on local roads. The $L_{A90,T}$ noise level represents the typical lower level of sound that may be reasonably expected to be present for the majority (90%) of the time in any given environment. This is usually referred to as the 'background' noise level.

Temporal Variations Outside the Noise Index Averaging Periods, 'T'

- A.29 Averaging noise levels over the time period 'T' of the $L_{Aeq,T}$ and $L_{An,T}$ noise indices can successfully account for variations in noise over the time period, T . Some variations, however, exhibit trends over longer periods. At larger distances from noise sources meteorological factors can significantly affect received noise levels. At a few hundred metres from a constant level source of noise the potential variation in noise levels may be greater than 15 dB(A). To account for this variability consideration must be taken of meteorological conditions, particularly wind direction, when measurements and predictions are undertaken. As a general rule, when compared with the received noise level under neutral wind conditions, wind blowing from the source to the receiver can slightly enhance the noise level at the receiver (typically by no more than 3 dB(A)), but wind blowing from the receiver to the source can very significantly reduce the noise level at the receiver (typically by 15 dB(A) or more).
- A.30 A similar effect occurs under conditions of temperature inversion, such as may exist after sunset when radiative cooling from the ground lowers the temperature of the air lying at low level more quickly than the air at higher levels, by loss of temperature through convective effects. This results in the air temperature increasing with increasing height above the ground. Depending on the source to receiver distance relative to the heights of the source and receiver, this situation can lead to sound waves becoming 'trapped' in the layer of air lying closest to the ground. The consequence is that noise levels at receptor locations can increase relative to those experienced under conditions of a neutral temperature gradient or a temperature lapse. The maximum increases compared to neutral conditions are similar to those experienced under downwind conditions of no more than around 3 dB(A). It is also worth noting that temperature lapse conditions, which is the more usual situation where temperature decreases with increasing height, can result in reductions in noise level at receptor locations by 15 dB(A) or more compared with the neutral conditions. The similarity between the magnitude of potential variations in noise levels for wind induced and temperature induced effects is not surprising, as the physical mechanisms behind the variations in level are the same for both situations: both variations result from changes in the speed of sound as a function of height above local ground level.
- A.31 Temperature inversions on very still days can also affect noise propagation over much larger distances of several kilometres. These effects can produce higher than expected noise levels even at these very large distances from the source. A classic example that many people have experienced is the distant, usually inaudible, railway train that suddenly sounds like it is passing within a few hundred metres of a

dwelling. However, these situations must generally be considered as rare exceptions to the usually encountered range of noise propagation conditions, especially in the case of wind farm noise as they rely on calm wind conditions under which wind turbines do not operate.

Effects of Sound on People

- A.32 Except at very high peak acoustic pressures, the energy levels in most environmental sounds are too low to cause any physical disruption in any part of the body, just as they are too low to cause any direct physical damage to the environment. The main effects of environmental sound on people are therefore limited to possible interference with specific activities or to some kind of annoyance response. Some researchers have claimed statistical associations between environmental noise and various long term health effects such as clinical hypertension or mental health problems, although there is no consensus on possible causative mechanisms. Evidence in support of health effects other than annoyance and some indicators of sleep disturbance is weak. However, the theory that psychological stress caused by annoyance might contribute to adverse health effects in otherwise susceptible individuals seems plausible. Health effects in the 'more usual' definition of physiological health therefore remain as a theoretical possibility which has neither been proved nor disproved. However, the World Health Organisation (WHO) defines health in the wider context of:

'a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of infirmity'.

And within this wider context potential health effects of environmental noise are summarised by the World Health Organisation as:

- interference with speech communications;
- sleep disturbance;
- disturbance of concentration;
- annoyance; and
- social and economic effects.

Speech Interference

- A.33 The instantaneous masking effects of unwanted noise on speech communication can be predicted with some accuracy by using specialist methods of calculation, but the overall effect of a small amount of speech interference on everyday life is harder to judge. The significance of speech masking depends on the context in which it occurs. For example, isolated noise events could interfere with telephone conversations by masking out particular words or parts of words but, because of the high redundancy in normal speech, the masking of individual words can often have no significant effect on the intelligibility of the overall message. Notwithstanding the above, noise levels from wind farms at even the closest located dwellings in otherwise quiet environments are usually no more than around 30 dB(A) indoors, even with windows open. This internal noise level is 5 dB(A) below the 35 dB(A) suggested by the World Health Organisation as the lowest potential cut-on level for issues relating to speech intelligibility.

Sleep Disturbance

- A.34 Although sleep seems to be a fundamental requirement for humans, the most significant effect of sleep loss seems to be increased sleepiness the next day. Sleep normally follows a regular cyclic pattern from awake through light sleep to deep sleep and back, this cycle repeating several times during the night at around 90 minute intervals. Most people wake for short periods several times every night as part of the normal sleep cycle without necessarily being aware of this the next day. REM, or rapid eye movement, sleep is associated with dreaming and occurs several times each night during the lighter sleep stages.
- A.35 Electroencephalography (EEG) and similar techniques can be used to detect transient physiological responses to noise at night. Transient responses can be detected by short bursts of activity in the recorded waveforms which often settle back down to the same pattern as immediately before the

event. Sometimes a transient response will be the precursor of a definite lightening of sleep, or even of an awakening, but often no discernible physical event happens at all.

- A.36 These results suggest that at least parts of the auditory system remain fully operational even while the listener is asleep. The main purpose of this seems to be to arouse the listener in case of danger or in case some particular action is required which cannot easily be accomplished whilst remaining asleep. On the other hand, the system appears to be designed to filter out familiar sounds which experience suggests do not require any action. A very loud sound is likely to overcome the filtering mechanism and wake the listener, while intermediate and quieter sounds might only wake a listener who has a particular focus on those specific sounds. There is no evidence that the transient physiological responses to noise whilst asleep are anything other than normal. There is also considerable anecdotal evidence that people habituate to familiar noise at night, although some of the research evidence on this point is contradictory.
- A.37 There is no consensus on how much sleep disturbance is significant. Some authorities take a precautionary approach, under which any kind of physiological response to noise is considered important, irrespective of whether there are any next day effects or not. Other studies suggest that transient physiological responses to unfamiliar stimuli at night are merely an indication of normal function and do not need to be considered as adverse effects unless they contribute to significant next-day effects. Recent World Health Organisation guidelines based mainly on laboratory studies suggest indoor limit values of 30 dB L_{Aeq} and 45 dB $L_{Afm\max}$ to avoid sleep disturbance, while other studies carried out in-situ, where habituation to the noise in question may have occurred, have found that much higher levels can be tolerated without any noticeable ill-effects.

Noise Annoyance

- A.38 Noise annoyance describes the degree of 'unwantedness' of a particular sound in a particular situation. People's subjective response to noise can vary from not being bothered at all, through a state of becoming aware of the noise, right through to the point of becoming annoyed by the noise when it reaches a sufficiently high level. There is no statutory definition of noise annoyance.
- A.39 Numerous noise annoyance surveys carried out over the last three decades have attempted to establish engineering relationships between the amount of noise measured objectively using sound level meters and the amount of community annoyance determined from questionnaires. The chief outcome of 'reported annoyance' has been measured using a very large range of different ideas. Both the wording of any questionnaire used and the context in which the question is put, and the manner in which it is therefore interpreted by respondents, can be very important. Some researchers are developing standardised questionnaire formats to encourage greater comparability between different studies, but this does not address the possibility of different contextual effects.
- A.40 Notwithstanding these problems, there is a general consensus that average reported annoyance increases with aggregate noise level in long term static situations. However, there has been comparatively little research and consequently no real agreement on the effects of change. Some studies have found that even small changes in noise level can have unexpectedly large consequences on reported annoyance, while others have found the opposite. The most likely explanation for these apparent discrepancies is that underlying or true annoyance depends on many non-acoustic factors in addition to noise level alone, and that the extent to which reported annoyance actually represents underlying annoyance can be highly dependent on context. As a consequence, attempts to find a common relationship across all noise sources and listening situations have generally floundered. This task has been complicated by the great range of individual sensitivities to noise observed in the surveys, often affected as much by attitude as by noise level.
- A.41 Whether or not an exposed individual has a personal interest in a given sound often has a significant bearing on their acceptance of it. For example, if recipients gain benefit from an association with the sound producer, or if they accept that the sound is necessary and largely unavoidable, then they are likely to be more tolerant of it. This is often the case even if they don't necessarily consider it desirable.

A good example of this is road traffic noise which is the dominant noise heard by over 90% of the population but results in relatively few complaints.

- A.42 Notwithstanding the fact that attitudes may be as important as overall levels in determining the acceptance of a particular noise, there still remains a need to objectively quantify any changes in noise level. Whilst it may not be possible to attribute a particular degree of annoyance to a given noise level, an objective measure of noise that bears some relationship to annoyance is still useful. This objective measure enables an assessment of the effect of changes to be assessed on the basis that any reduction in overall noise level must be beneficial. Possible noise mitigation measures form a central consideration of any noise assessment, so an appropriate methodology must be adopted for assessing the effectiveness of any noise mitigation measures adopted.
- A.43 When assessing the potential effects of any new source of noise, it is common practice to compare the A-weighted ‘specific’ noise level produced by the new source (usually measured using the $L_{Aeq,T}$ index) against the existing A-weighted ‘background’ noise level measured using the $L_{A90,T}$ index, as this is the typical level of noise that can be reasonably expected to be present the majority of the time to potentially ‘mask’ the new ‘specific’ noise. The assessment is therefore undertaken within the context of the existing noise environment. In some circumstances, it may prove equally instructive to compare the absolute level of a new specific noise against accepted absolute levels defined in standards or other relevant documents. The assessment is therefore undertaken against benchmark values, rather than against the context of the existing noise environment. Whatever approach is actually adopted for final assessment purposes, and often a combination of the two approaches is appropriate, it is important that the relevance of both contextual and benchmark assessments is at least considered in all cases.
- A.44 Table 4.1 of the WHO Guidelines presents guideline benchmark values for environmental noise levels in specific environments. The noise levels relevant to residential dwellings are listed here in Table A1.

Table A1 Relevant Extracts from Table 4.1 ‘Guideline Values for Community Noise in Specific Environments’

| Specific Environment | Critical Health Effects | $L_{Aeq,T}$ | Time base (hrs) | L_{Amax} (dB) |
|--|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Outdoor living area | Serious annoyance, day time and evening | 55 | 16 | - |
| | Moderate annoyance, day time and evening | 50 | 16 | - |
| Dwelling, indoors | Speech intelligibility and moderate annoyance, day time and evening | 35 | 16 | - |
| | Sleep disturbance, night time | 30 | 8 | 45 |
| Outside bedrooms | Sleep disturbance, window open (outdoors) | 45 | 8 | 60 |
| School class rooms (included for potential effects on concentration) | Speech intelligibility, disturbance of information extraction, message communication | 35 | - | - |

- A.45 The text accompanying the Table in the WHO Guidelines explains that the levels given in the Table are set at the lowest levels at which the onset of any adverse health due to exposure to noise has been identified. The text continues:

‘These are essentially values for the onset of health effects from noise exposure. It would have been preferred to establish guidelines for exposure-response relationships. Such relationships

would indicate the effects to be expected if standards were set above the WHO guideline values and would facilitate the setting of standards for sound pressure levels (noise immission standards).

- A.46 In addition to consideration of the absolute A-weighted level of a new specific source of noise, other properties of the noise can heighten its potential effects when introduced into an existing background noise environment. Such properties of noise are commonly referred to as ‘acoustic features’ or the ‘acoustic character’. These acoustic features can set apart the new source of noise from naturally occurring sounds. Commonly encountered acoustic features associated with transport and machinery sources, for example, can include whistles, whines, thumps, impulses, regular or irregular modulations, high levels of low frequency sound, rumbling, etc.
- A.47 Due to the potential of acoustic features to increase the effects of a noise over and above the effects that would result from an otherwise ‘bland’ broad band noise of the same A-weighted noise level, it is common practice to add a ‘character correction’ to the specific noise level before assessing its potential effects. The resulting character corrected specific noise level is often referred to as the ‘rated’ noise level. Such character corrections usually take the form of adding a number of decibels to the physically measured or calculated noise level of the specific source. Typical character corrections are around +5 dB(A), although the actual correction depends on the subjective significance of the particular feature being accounted for.
- A.48 The objective identification and rating of acoustic features can introduce a requirement to analyse sound in greater detail than has thus far been discussed. To this point all discussion has focussed on the use of the overall A-weighted noise level. This single figure value is derived by summing together all the acoustic energy present in the signal across the entire audible spectrum from around 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz, albeit with the lower and higher frequency contributions down-weighted in accordance with the A-weighting filter characteristics to account for the reduced sensitivity of the human ear at these frequencies.
- A.49 However, in order to identify the presence of tones (which are concentrations of acoustic energy over relatively small bands of frequency), or in order to identify excessive levels of low frequency noise, it may be necessary to determine the acoustic energy present in the noise signal across much smaller frequency bands. This is where the concept of octave band analysis, fractional (e.g. 1/3, 1/12, 1/24) octave band analysis, or even narrow band Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) analysis is introduced. The latter enables signals to be resolved in frequency bandwidths of down to 1 Hz or even less, thereby enabling tonal content to be more easily identified and measured. As standard, noise emission data for wind turbines is supplied as octave band data, with narrow band tests also being undertaken to establish the presence of any tones in the radiated noise spectrum.

Effects of Noise on Wildlife

- A.50 There are large numbers of papers in the literature which describe the effects of noise on birds and animals, both wild and livestock.
- A.51 Just as the assessment of noise effects on humans is made difficult by the variability of responses between different people and between different situations, assessment of noise effects on wildlife is even more problematical, not least due to the problem of monitoring the response of wildlife to noise.
- A.52 For larger species, it may be possible to install telemetry on the body of the animal to relay information about its body systems (e.g. heart rate, temperature etc.). However, the minimum physical sizes of telemetry systems means this is not an option for smaller species. Also, even where it is possible, the fact that the animals must first be captured to have a system installed disturbs them, and the results of the subsequent study may be biased. In the absence of such telemetric data, researchers must rely on observations such as flight from nests, short term departure from usually populated areas and deviations from expected line of travel. However, flock and pack instincts often mean that just one animal changing course or taking flight can result in all the others doing the same.
- A.53 The only truly robust determinant to the effects of noise on wildlife is the long-term desertion of traditionally inhabited areas, or a reduction in breeding numbers. However, even these factors can be brought into question when the noise is a result of some other local activity, such as the passage of

vehicles. In these cases, it is often difficult to establish whether the observed effect is a consequence of the visual disturbance or the noise.

- A.54 Direct comparisons of results between species, or even between different research findings into the same species, are therefore often unclear, and it is difficult to draw firm conclusions as to the effects of noise on wildlife, other than in a highly generalised manner.
- A.55 General features apparent from the literature are that the most sensitive time for animals is during nesting or breeding seasons. Those that take flight whilst sitting on their eggs or tending their young can leave them open to predators, even if they return fairly quickly. However, many species have been shown to habituate to noise of all types, including road traffic noise, aircraft noise or even the decreasing effectiveness with time of impulsive type bird scarers, such as those used around airports.

Low Frequency Noise and Vibration – Wind Farms

- A.56 One issue that has increasingly been raised concerning potential noise effects of operational wind farms relates not to the overall noise levels, but to the specific issue of low frequency sound. However, confusion sometimes arises from the use of the generalised term 'low frequency sound' to describe specific effects that may, or sometimes may not, actually relate to the low frequency character of the sound itself.
- A.57 In this respect, there are three distinct characteristics of sound that should be clearly differentiated between:
- Low frequency sound in the range from around 20 Hz to 200 Hz, which therefore lies within the commonly referenced range of human hearing of around 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz;
 - Very low frequency sound, or infrasound, below 20 Hz, which therefore lies below the commonly referenced lower frequency limit of human hearing;
 - Amplitude modulated sound that characterises the 'swish, swish' sound sometimes heard from rotating wind turbine blades.
- A.58 Looking at the first two of the three types of sound referred to in the preceding bullet points, a distinction is usually made between low frequency sound and very low frequency sound, otherwise termed infrasound. This distinction is based on the fact that the frequency range of audible noise is generally taken to be from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz. Therefore, the range of frequencies from about 20 Hz to 200 Hz is usually taken to cover audible low frequency sound, whereas frequencies below 20 Hz are usually described as infrasound. The implication here is that low frequency sound is audible and infrasound is inaudible. However, this relatively arbitrary distinction between low frequency sound and infrasound can introduce some confusion in that frequencies below 20 Hz can still be heard provided they produce a sound pressure level at the ear of the listener that lies above the threshold of audibility of that listener to sound at that particular frequency.
- A.59 The fact that low frequency sound and infrasound from wind farms has only relatively recently been highlighted as a potential problem by some groups does not mean that the wind energy industry had not previously considered the issue. In fact, the issue of low frequency sound was one of the predominant technical hurdles associated with some of the earliest larger scale wind turbines installed in the USA. These turbines were of the 'downwind' type, 'downwind' referring here to the fact that the rotor blades were located downwind of the turbine tower rather than upwind of it, as is the case for current machines. It was found that the interruption of wind flow past the tower resulted in a region of lower than average wind speed immediately in the wake of the tower. The passage of the blades into this region of lower wind speed in the wake of the tower, then back into the higher wind speed as they emerged from the wake of the tower back into the main wind stream, resulted in the generation of low frequency sound, often in the subjective form of a distinctive impulse, often referred to as a 'thump' or 'tower thump'. It was for this reason that modern day turbine configurations now have the blades upwind of the tower, as research and measurements demonstrated that low frequency

sound radiation is reduced to sub-audible levels once the interaction of downwind tower wake effects with the rotating blades are removed from the design.

- A.60 One of the problems inherent in the assessment of both low frequency sound and infrasound is the variability of hearing sensitivity across human subjects with otherwise healthy hearing. This threshold for sound below 200 Hz varies significantly more between different subjects than does the hearing threshold at higher frequencies. However, what is always true is that the perception threshold to lower frequency noise is much higher than the perception threshold for speech frequencies between around 250 Hz to 4,000 Hz. For example, the average person with healthy hearing is some 70 dB less sensitive to sounds at 20 Hz than to sounds that fall within the range of speech frequencies. An additional factor relevant to the perception of infrasound is that, although audibility remains below 20 Hz, tonality is lost below 16 Hz to 18 Hz, thus losing a key element of perception.
- A.61 Both low frequency sound and infrasound are generally present all around us in modern life. They may be generated by many natural sources, such as thunder, earthquakes, waves and wind. They may also be produced by machinery including household appliances such as washing machines and air conditioning units, all forms of transport and by turbulence. The presence of low frequency sound and infrasound in our everyday lives is heightened by the fact that the attenuation of sound in air is significantly lower at low frequencies than at the mid to high frequencies. As a result, noise which has travelled over long distances is normally biased towards the low frequencies. However, the fact that human hearing naturally down-weights, or filters out, sounds of such low frequencies means we are generally not aware of its presence. It is only under circumstances when it reaches a sufficiently high level, for example in the ‘rumble’ of distant thunder or the sound of large waves crashing on a shore, that we become aware of its presence.

A-Weighting

- A.62 It is because the human ear increasingly filters out sounds of lower frequencies that environmental noise measurements are undertaken as standard using sound level meters that apply the A-weighting curve, as it filters out lower frequency sounds to the same degree as the hearing of a healthy person with unimpaired hearing. The A-weighted sound level is used as a measure of subjective perception of sound unless there exists such a predominance of low frequency sound or infrasound relative to the level of sound at higher frequencies that the use of the A-weighting curve would down-weight the actual source of the problem to such a degree that the resultant objective noise levels do not truly reflect the potential subjective effects of the noise. It is for this reason that a number of alternative weighting curves have been developed, specifically aimed at better accounting for the assessment of low frequency sound and infrasound.

C-Weighting

- A.63 One such curve is denoted C-weighting. Unlike the A weighting curve, which gradually reduces the significance of frequencies below 1000 Hz until at 10 Hz the attenuation is 70 dB, the C-weighting curve is flat to within 1 dB down to about 50 Hz and then drops by 3 dB at 31.5 Hz and 14 dB at 10 Hz. The C weighting curve was originally developed to reflect the fact that, at higher overall noise levels, low frequencies can have a greater subjective effect than at lower overall noise levels.
- A.64 One relatively simple measure of undertaking a first-pass assessment as to whether low frequency sound is likely to be an issue is to determine the difference between the overall C weighted noise level and the overall A weighted noise level. The C weighted level includes contributions from low frequency sound, whereas the A weighted level filters it out. It has been suggested in that a level difference of more than 20 dB indicates that low frequency sound may be subjectively significant, but more detailed investigations are in practice required to determine whether or not this is actually the case.

G-Weighting

- A.65 Another curve, termed the G weighting curve, has been specifically derived to provide a measure of the audibility of infrasound when considered separately from higher frequency noise. The G weighting

curve falls off rapidly above 20 Hz and below 20 Hz it follows assumed hearing contours with a slope of 12 dB per octave down to 2 Hz.

- A.66 Over the past few years there has been considerable attention paid to the possibility that operational wind farms may radiate sufficiently high levels of infrasound to cause health problems. It has, however, been the case that dedicated research investigations have shown this not to be the case.
- A.67 As early as 1997 a report by Snow [2] gave details of a comprehensive study of infrasound and low frequency sound (up to around 100 Hz) and vibration measurements made in the vicinity of a wind farm. Measurements were made both on the wind farm site, and at distances of up to 1 kilometre. During the experiments a wide range of wind speeds and directions were recorded. It was found that the vibration levels at 100 metres from the nearest turbine itself were a factor of 10 lower than those recommended for human exposure in the most critical buildings (i.e. laboratories for precision measurements), and lower again than the limits specified for residential premises. A similar comparison with recognised limits for assessing structural damage showed that the measured vibrations were a factor of 100 below the recommended guidelines at 100 metres from the turbines.
- A.68 Noise and vibration levels were found to comply with recommended residential criteria even on the wind turbine site itself. Although low level infrasonic (i.e. below 20 Hz) periodic noise from the wind farm was detected by instrumentation at distances up to 1 kilometre, the measuring instruments used were much more sensitive than human hearing. Based on his measurements Snow concluded that subjective detection of the wind turbines may be apparent at this distance, but if this is the case it will be due to higher frequency components (which are more readily masked by general ambient environmental noise) and not the low frequency components which lie below the threshold of audibility.
- A.69 In 2003, findings on both low frequency sound and infrasound have been compiled into the previously referenced extensive review report commissioned by DEFRA and prepared by Dr G Leventhall [1]. Dr Leventhall notes that despite the numerous published studies there is little or no agreement about the biological effects of infrasound or low frequency sound on human health. Leventhall notes that direct evidence of adverse effects of exposure to low-intensity levels of infrasound (less than 90 dB) is lacking. He goes on to describe the low frequency hearing threshold i.e. the lowest levels which are audible to an average person with normal hearing. He notes the threshold at 4 Hz is about 107 dB, at 10 Hz it is about 97 dB and at 20 Hz it is 79 dB. As such, high levels of infrasound are required to exceed the hearing thresholds at such low frequencies. Leventhall therefore concluded that most people can be reassured that there will be no serious consequences to peoples' health from infrasound exposure.
- A.70 Indeed, specifically in relation to wind farms and infrasound, Leventhall went further still with his statement of reassurance. This additional reassurance followed the voicing of concerns by some interested parties that, because infrasound and very low frequency vibrations could be measured from wind farms, then it must follow that these were a potential hazard and source of annoyance. In fact what those concerned observers failed to account for is that highly sensitive electronic measuring equipment designed solely to detect such infrasonic sounds and vibrations is orders of magnitude more sensitive than even the most sensitive human. Thus, whilst such measurement systems may be able to detect such low-level phenomena, the same stimuli can have no effect on humans. In the light of this, Leventhall issued an open statement:
- 'I can state quite categorically that there is no significant infrasound from current designs of wind turbines. To say that there is an infrasound problem is one of the hares which objectors to wind farms like to run. There will not be any effects from infrasound from the turbines.'*
- A.71 In 2004/2005 researchers from Keele University investigated the effects of the extremely low levels of vibration resulting from wind farms on the operation of a seismic array installed at Eskdalemuir in Scotland. This is one of the most sensitive ground-borne vibration detection stations in the world. The results of this study have frequently been misinterpreted, as just discussed for the DEFRA/Leventhall report, in that if infrasonic vibrations from wind farms can be measured, then they must

consequentially have some potential effect on humans. In order to clarify their position, the authors have subsequently explained that [3]:

'The levels of vibration from wind turbines are so small that only the most sophisticated instrumentation and data processing can reveal their presence, and they are almost impossible to detect'.

A.72 They then continue:

'Vibrations at this level and in this frequency range will be available from all kinds of sources such as traffic and background noise – they are not confined to wind turbines. To put the level of vibration into context, they are ground vibrations with amplitudes of about one millionth of a millimetre. There is no possibility of humans sensing the vibration and absolutely no risk to human health'.

A.73 In relation to airborne infrasound as opposed to ground-borne vibrations, the researchers are equally robust in their conclusions, stating:

'The infrasound generated by wind turbines can only be detected by the most sensitive equipment, and again this is at levels far below that at which humans will detect low frequency sound. There is no scientific evidence to suggest that infrasound [at such an extremely low level] has an impact on human health'.

A.74 Even more recently, in 2006, the results of a study specifically commissioned by the UK Department of Trade and industry (DTI) to look at the effects of infrasound and low frequency noise (LFN) arising from the operation of wind farms have been published in what is commonly referred to as the DTI LFN Report [4].

A.75 The DTI LFN Report is a comprehensive study containing many pages of detailed results of measurements of both infrasound and low frequency sound around the three wind farms included in the study. These measurements were undertaken using measurement systems capable of detecting noise down to frequencies of 1 Hz, with results being reported up to a frequency of 500 Hz, thus extending beyond the full spectrum of what is normally considered to cover both infrasound (<20 Hz) and low frequency sound (20 Hz to 200 Hz).

A.76 The measurement locations at the three wind farms were selected to be at residential properties where occupants had raised concerns relating to low frequency sound disturbance. Noise immission measurements are reported both externally to and internally to the properties in question. In addition to these noise immission measurements, the results of noise emission measurements undertaken on a number of wind turbines are also reported with the aim of quantifying the level of infrasound actually emitted from individual wind turbines and wind farms.

A.77 Before summarising the findings of the DTI LFN Report, it is noted that the prevalence of the perceived problem of infrasound and/or low frequency sound is not a widespread one. Quoting from the Executive Summary to the DTI LFN Report:

'of the 126 wind farms operating in the UK, 5 have reports of low frequency sound problems which attract adverse comment concerning the noise. Therefore, such complaints are the exception rather than a general problem which exists for all wind farms'.

A.78 The DTI LFN Report was actually commissioned primarily to investigate the effects of infrasound. This investigation was commissioned as a direct result of the claims made in the press concerning health problems arising from noise of such a low frequency 'that it is beyond the audible range, such that you

can't hear it but you can feel it as a resonance'. For this reason the results pertaining to infrasound are reported separately from those pertaining to audible low frequency sound above 20 Hz.

- A.79 In respect of infrasound, the DTI LFN Report is quite categorical in its findings: infrasound is not the perceived health threat suggested by some observers, nor should it even be considered a potential source of disturbance. Quoting from the Executive Summary to the DTI LFN Report:

'Infrasound noise emissions from wind turbines are significantly below the recognised threshold of perception for acoustic energy within this frequency range. Even assuming that the most sensitive members of the population have a hearing threshold which is 12 dB lower than the median hearing threshold, measured infrasound levels are well below this criterion.

The document "Community Noise" prepared for the World Health Organisation, states that "there is no reliable evidence that infrasound below the hearing threshold produce physiological or psychological effects". Other detection mechanisms of infrasound only occur at levels well above the threshold of audibility.

It may therefore be concluded that infrasound associated with modern wind turbines is not a source which will result in noise levels which may be injurious to the health of a wind farm neighbour'.

- A.80 In conclusion, whilst it is known that infrasound can have an adverse effect on people (potential adverse health impacts are listed by the World Health Organisation as stress, irritation, unease, fatigue, headache, possible nausea and disturbed sleep), these effects can only come into play when the infrasound reaches a sufficiently high level. This is a level above the threshold of audibility. However, all available information from measurements on current wind turbines reveals that the level of infrasound emitted by these wind turbines lies below the threshold of human perception.
- A.81 Indeed, in the face of the apparent misunderstanding of the conclusions reached in the various reports on infrasound, and how these conclusions should be applied to consideration of the radiation of such noise from wind farms, the British Wind Energy Association have issued a fact sheet relating to the subject [5]. This fact sheet concludes:

'With regard to effects of noise from wind turbines, the main effect depends on the listener's reaction to what they may hear. There are no direct health effects from noise at the level of noise generated by wind turbines. It has been repeatedly shown by measurements of wind turbine noise undertaken in the UK, Denmark, Germany and the USA over the past decade, and accepted by experienced noise professionals, that the levels of infrasonic noise and vibration radiated from modern, upwind configuration wind turbines are at a very low level; so low that they lie below the threshold of perception, even for those people who are particularly sensitive to such noise, and even on an actual wind turbine site'.

Low Frequency Sound

- A.82 A report prepared for DEFRA by Casella Stanger [6] lists wind farms as a possible source of audible low frequency sound (20 Hz to 200 Hz). However, this is one possible source in a list of many commonly encountered sources such as pumps, boilers, fans, road, sea and rail traffic, the wind, thunder, the sea, etc. The report only considers the general issues associated with low frequency sound and makes no attempt to quantify the potential problem associated with each of these sources. This is in contrast to other reports which have considered the specific situation associated with wind farms.
- A.83 In respect of low frequency sound as opposed to infrasound, the DTI LFN Report identified that wind farm noise levels at the studied properties were, under certain conditions, measured at a level just above the threshold of audibility. The report therefore concluded that 'for a low frequency sensitive person, this may mean that low frequency sound associated with the operation of the three wind farms could be audible within a dwelling'. This conclusion was, however, placed into some context with the qualifying statement that 'at all measurement sites, low frequency sound associated with traffic movements along local roads has been found to be greater than that from the neighbouring wind farm'. In particular, it was concluded that, although measurable and under some conditions may be audible,

levels of low frequency sound were below permitted night time low frequency sound criteria, including the latest UK criteria resulting from the 2003 DEFRA study into the effects of low frequency sound.

A.84 Based on the findings of the DTI LFN Report, low frequency sound in the greater than 20 Hz frequency range may, under some circumstances, be measured to be of a comparable or higher level than the threshold of audibility. On such occasions this low frequency sound may become audible to low frequency sensitive persons who may already be awake inside nearby properties, but not to the degree that it will cause awakenings. However, such noise should still be assessed for its potential subjective effects in the conventional manner in which environmental noise is generally assessed. In particular, the subjective effects of this audible low frequency sound should not be confused with the claimed adverse health effect arguments concerning infrasound which, in any event, have now been shown from the results of the DTI LFN Report to be wholly unsubstantiated.

A.85 In November 2006, the UK Government released a statement [7] concerning low frequency sound, reiterating the conclusion of the DTI LFN report that:

‘there is no evidence of health effects arising from infrasound or low frequency sound generated by wind turbines’.

A.86 The Government statement concluded the position regarding low frequency sound from wind farms with the definitive advice to all English Local Planning Authorities and the Planning Inspectorate that PPS22 and ETSU-R-97 should continue to be followed for the assessment of noise from wind farms.

Blade Swish (Amplitude Modulation)

A.87 The noise assessment methodology presented in ETSU-R-97, sets out noise limits which already account for typically encountered levels of blade swish. Notwithstanding the conclusions and advice presented in the preceding paragraphs concerning both infrasound and low frequency sound, the DTI LFN Report went on to suggest that, where complaints of noise at night had occurred, these had most likely resulted from an increased amplitude modulation of the blade passing noise, making the ‘swish, swish, swish’ sound (often referred to as ‘blade swish’) more prominent than normal. Whilst it was therefore acknowledged that this effect of enhanced amplitude modulation of blade aerodynamic noise may occur, it was also concluded that there were a number of factors that should be borne in mind when considering the importance to be placed on the issue when considering present and proposed wind farm installations:

- it appeared that the effect had only been reported as a problem at a very limited number of sites (the DTI report looked at the 3 out of 5 U.K. sites where it has been reported to be an issue out of the 126 onshore wind farms reported to be operational at the time in 2006);
- the effect occurred only under certain conditions at these sites (the DTI LFN Report was significantly delayed while those involved in taking the measurements waited for the situation to occur at each location);
- at one of the sites concerned it had been demonstrated that the effect can be reduced to an acceptable level by the introduction of a Noise Reduction Management System (NRMS) which controls the operation of the necessary turbines under the relevant wind conditions (this NRMS had to be switched off in order to gain the data necessary to inform the DTI LFN Report);
- whilst still under review, it appeared that the most likely cause of the increased amplitude modulation was related to an increase in the stability of the atmosphere during evening and night time periods, hence the increased occurrence of such an effect at these times, but this effect had been shown by measurement of wind speed profiles to be extremely site specific;
- internal noise levels were below all accepted night time criteria limits and insufficient to wake residents, it was only when woken by other sources of a higher level (such as local road traffic) that there were self-reported difficulties in returning to sleep.

A.88 The Government then commissioned an independent research project to further investigate the prevalence of the impact of enhanced levels of amplitude modulation across UK wind farms. This research work was awarded to the University of Salford who reported on their findings in July 2007 [8]. The Salford study concluded that that the occurrence of increased levels of ‘blade swish’ was

infrequent, but suggested it would be useful to undertake further work to understand and assess this feature of wind turbine noise.

- A.89 As a consequence of the findings of the report by the University of Salford, the UK Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR formerly the DTI) issued a statement in August 2007 [9] which concluded:

'A comprehensive study by Salford University has concluded that the noise phenomenon known as aerodynamic modulation (AM) is not an issue for the UK's wind farm fleet.

AM indicates aerodynamic noise from wind turbines that is greater than the normal degree of regular fluctuation of blade swoosh. It is sometimes described as sounding like a distant train or distant piling operation.

The Government commissioned work assessed 133 operational wind projects across Britain and found that although the occurrence of AM cannot be fully predicted, the incidence of it from operational turbines is low'.

- A.90 The statement then concludes with the advice:

'Government continues to support the approach set out in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 22 – Renewable Energy. This approach is for local planning authorities to "ensure that renewable energy developments have been located and designed in such a way to minimise increases in ambient noise levels", through the use of the 1997 report by ETSU to assess and rate noise from wind energy development'.

- A.91 This represents an aspect of wind turbine noise which has become the subject of considerable research in the UK and abroad in the past years and the state of knowledge on the subject is rapidly evolving. An extensive research programme entitled 'Wind Turbine Amplitude Modulation: Research to Improve Understanding as to its Cause and Effect' was published in 2013. This research, commissioned by RenewableUK (ReUK) was specifically aimed at identifying and explaining some of the key features of wind turbine AM noise.
- A.92 Claims have emerged from different researchers that wind turbines were capable of generating noise with characteristics outwith that expected of them. This characteristic was an enhanced level of modulated aerodynamic noise that resulted in the blade swish becoming more impulsive in character, such that those exposed to it would describe it more as a 'whoomp' or 'thump' than a 'swish'. It could also become audible at distances from the wind turbines that were considerably greater than the distances at which blade swish could ordinarily be perceived. It has since emerged that this may be similar to the character of the noise identified in the DTI LFN study. Hence for the purposes of the ReUK project, any such AM phenomena with characteristics falling outside those expected of this "normal" AM (NAM) were therefore termed 'Other AM' (OAM).
- A.93 The research identified the most likely cause of OAM noise is transient stall on the wind turbine blade (i.e. stall which occurs over a small area of each turbine blade in one part of the blade's rotation only). The occurrence of transient stall will be dependent on a combination of factors, including the air inflow conditions onto the individual blades, how these inflow conditions may vary across the rotor disc, the design of the wind turbine blades and the manner in which the wind turbine is operated. Variable inflow conditions may arise, for example, from any combination of wind shear, wind veer, yaw errors, turbine wake effects, topographic effects, large scale turbulence, etc. However, the occurrence of OAM on any particular site cannot be predicted at this stage.
- A.94 As a consequence of the combined results of the ReUK research, and most notably the development of objective techniques for identifying and quantifying AM noise and the ability to relate such an objective measure to the subjective response to AM noise, ReUK has proposed an AM test [11] for implementation as a planning condition, although this was subject to discussion.
- A.95 The Institute of Acoustics (IOA) published in 2016 a standardised methodology [12] for the assessment and rating of AM magnitude. The method provides a decibel level each 10 minute which represents the magnitude of the modulation in the noise, and minimises the influence of sources not related to wind

turbines. The proposed method, unlike other methods that have previously been proposed, utilises as the core of its detection capability the fact that AM noise from wind turbines, by definition, exhibits periodicity at a rate that is directly related to the rotational speed of the source wind turbine. The IOA document does not however provide any thresholds or criteria methodology for using the resulting AM values.

- A.96 The UK Government (DECC or Department of Energy and Climate Change, now obsolete) commissioned a review focused on the subjective response to AM with a view to recommend how this feature may be controlled. The outcome of this research has been published [13] in October 2016 by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (DBEIS). This report recommends the use of a “character penalty” approach, in which a correction is applied to the overall A-weighted noise level to account for AM in the noise in a manner similar to that used to assess tonality in the noise according to ETSU-R-97. This penalty is based on the above IOA methodology for detecting AM. The researchers make a number of recommendations for local authorities to consider and qualifications for the use of such controls, and note that the current state of knowledge on the subject and the implications of their proposed control is limited and that a period of testing and review over the next few years would be beneficial. The authors were however unable to provide clarity on how exactly the recommendations would operate in practice for any particular wind farm. On publication of the report, DBEIS encouraged local authorities in England to consider the research but provided limited guidance on how the outcomes were to be accounted for within the planning system. The Scottish Government is currently reviewing this report in the context of the Scottish planning system.

References for LFN and AM Section

- [1] ‘A review of published research on low frequency noise and its effects’, G. Leventhall, report for DEFRA, 2003
- [2] ‘Low frequency noise and vibration measurements at a modern wind farm’, D. Snow, ETSU Report ETSU W/13/00392/REP, 1997
- [3] ‘Wind farm noise’, P. Styles, letter by Prof P Styles and S Toon printed in The Scotsman, August 2005.
- [4] ‘The measurement of low frequency noise at three UK wind farms’, M. Hayes, DTI Report W/45/00656/00, 2006
- [5] ‘Low frequency noise and wind turbines’, BWEA Briefing Sheet, 2005
- [6] ‘Low frequency noise’, Report by Casella Stanger for DEFRA, 2001
- [7] ‘Advice on Findings of the Hayes McKenzie Report on Noise Arising from Wind Farms’, URN 06/2162 (November 2006)
- [8] ‘Research into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise’, Report by University of Salford, URN 07/1235 (July 2007)
- [9] ‘Government statement regarding the findings of the Salford University report into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise’, BERR, Ref: 2007/033 (1st August 2007)
- [10] Wind Turbine Amplitude Modulation: Research to Improve Understanding as to its Cause and Effect, Renewable UK, December 2013.
- [11] Template Planning Condition on Amplitude Modulation (guidance notes), RenewableUK, December 2013.
- [12] Institute of Acoustics (IOA) Amplitude Modulation Working Group, Final Report, A Method for Rating Amplitude Modulation in Wind Turbine Noise, June 2016.
- [13] Review of the evidence on the response to amplitude modulation from wind turbines, WSP for Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-the-evidence-on-the-response-to-amplitude-modulation-from-wind-turbines>

Glossary of Acoustics Terminology

| Terminology | Description |
|--|--|
| A-weighting | a filter that down-weights low frequency and high frequency sound to better represent the frequency response of the human ear when assessing the likely effects of noise on humans |
| acoustic character | one or more distinctive features of a sound (e.g. tones, whines, whistles, impulses) that set it apart from the background noise against which it is being judged, possibly leading to a greater subjective effect than the level of the sound alone might suggest |
| acoustic screening | the presence of a solid barrier (natural landform or manmade) between a source of sound and a receiver that interrupts the direct line of sight between the two, thus reducing the sound level at the receiver compared to that in the absence of the barrier |
| ambient noise | All-encompassing noise associated with a given environment, usually a composite of sounds from many sources both far and near, often with no particular sound being dominant |
| annoyance | a feeling of displeasure in this case evoked by noise |
| attenuation | the reduction in level of a sound between the source and a receiver due to any combination of effects including: distance, atmospheric absorption, acoustic screening, the presence of a building façade, etc. |
| audio frequency | any frequency of a sound wave that lies within the frequency limits of audibility of a healthy human ear, generally accepted as being from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz |
| background noise | the noise level rarely fallen below in any given location over any given time period, often classed according to day time, evening or night time periods (for the majority of the population of the UK the lower limiting noise level is usually controlled by noise emanating from distant road, rail or air traffic) |
| dB | abbreviation for 'decibel' |
| dB(A) | abbreviation for the decibel level of a sound that has been A-weighted |
| decibel | the unit normally employed to measure the magnitude of sound |
| directivity | the property of a sound source that causes more sound to be radiated in one direction than another |
| equivalent continuous sound pressure level | the steady sound level which has the same energy as a time varying sound signal when averaged over the same time interval, T, denoted by $L_{Aeq,T}$ |
| external noise level | the noise level, in decibels, measured outside a building |
| filter | a device for separating components of an acoustic signal on the basis of their frequencies |
| frequency | the number of acoustic pressure fluctuations per second occurring about the atmospheric mean pressure (also known as the 'pitch' of a sound) |
| frequency analysis | the analysis of a sound into its frequency components |

| Terminology | Description |
|---------------------------------|--|
| ground effects | the modification of sound at a receiver location due to the interaction of the sound wave with the ground along its propagation path from source to receiver |
| hertz | the unit normally employed to measure the frequency of a sound, equal to cycles per second of acoustic pressure fluctuations about the atmospheric mean pressure |
| impulsive sound | a sound having all its energy concentrated in a very short time period |
| instantaneous sound pressure | at a given point in space and at a given instant in time, the difference between the instantaneous pressure and the mean atmospheric pressure |
| internal noise level | the noise level, in decibels, measured inside a building |
| L_{Aeq} | the abbreviation of the A-weighted equivalent continuous sound pressure level |
| L_{A10} | the abbreviation of the 10 percentile noise indicator, often used for the measurement of road traffic noise |
| L_{A90} | the abbreviation of the 90 percentile noise indicator, often used for the measurement of background noise |
| level | the general term used to describe a sound once it has been converted into decibels |
| loudness | the attribute of human auditory response in which sound may be ordered on a subjective scale that typically extends from barely audible to painfully loud |
| noise | physically: a regular and ordered oscillation of air molecules that travels away from the source of vibration and creates fluctuating positive and negative acoustic pressure above and below atmospheric pressure. Subjectively: sound that evokes a feeling of displeasure in the environment in which it is heard, and is therefore unwelcomed by the receiver |
| noise emission | the noise emitted by a source of sound |
| noise immission | the noise to which a receiver is exposed |
| noise nuisance | an unlawful interference with a person's use or enjoyment of land, or of some right over, or in connection with it |
| octave band frequency analysis | a frequency analysis using a filter that is an octave wide (the upper limit of the filter's frequency band is exactly twice that of its lower frequency limit) |
| percentile exceeded sound level | the noise level exceeded for n% of the time over a given time period, T, denoted by $L_{An,T}$ |
| receiver | a person or property exposed to the noise being considered |
| residual noise | the ambient noise that remains in the absence of the specific noise whose effects are being assessed |
| sound | physically: a regular and ordered oscillation of air molecules that travels away from the source of vibration and creates fluctuating positive and negative acoustic pressure above and below atmospheric pressure |

| Terminology | Description |
|--------------------------|--|
| | subjectively: the sensation of hearing excited by the acoustic oscillations described above (see also 'noise') |
| sound level meter | an instrument for measuring sound pressure level |
| sound pressure amplitude | the root mean square of the amplitude of the acoustic pressure fluctuations in a sound wave around the atmospheric mean pressure, usually measured in Pascals (Pa) |
| sound pressure level | a measure of the sound pressure at a point, in decibels |
| sound power level | the total sound power radiated by a source, in decibels |
| spectrum | a description of the amplitude of a sound as a function of frequency |
| Standardised wind speed | Values of wind speed at hub height corrected to a standardised height of ten metres using the same procedure as used in wind turbine emission testing |
| threshold of hearing | the lowest amplitude sound capable of evoking the sensation of hearing in the average healthy human ear (0.00002 Pa) |
| tone | the concentration of acoustic energy into a very narrow frequency range |

Annex B – Location maps and calculation details

Figure B1 Map showing the layout of the proposed turbines (red circles), the noise assessment locations (black/white circles) and the noise monitoring locations (blue circles).




Table B1 – turbine coordinates for the Development

| Turbine | Easting | Northing |
|---------|---------|----------|
| 1 | 235462 | 867812 |
| 2 | 235872 | 868005 |
| 3 | 236288 | 868428 |
| 4 | 235808 | 867559 |
| 5 | 236279 | 867953 |
| 6 | 236776 | 868364 |
| 7 | 235908 | 867197 |
| 8 | 236272 | 867532 |
| 9 | 236692 | 867870 |
| 10 | 237095 | 868304 |
| 11 | 236197 | 867046 |
| 12 | 236642 | 867392 |
| 13 | 237156 | 867947 |
| 14 | 236477 | 866794 |
| 15 | 236864 | 867151 |
| 16 | 237068 | 867559 |
| 17 | 236738 | 866676 |

Table B2-Propagation attenuation effects due to terrain (dB) – Positive numbers are due to terrain shielding barrier effects (e.g. 2), representing a decrease in noise levels, and negative numbers (e.g. -3) represent an increase in predicted noise levels due to concave ground effects. Where there is a zero shown, neither terrain shielding nor concave ground were found.

| Turbine number | Property | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| | Aultguish Inn | Black Bridge | Hydro House | Lubfearn |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | -3 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Turbine number | Property | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| | Aultguish Inn | Black Bridge | Hydro House | Lubfearn |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B3 – Predicted noise levels for Corriemoillie Wind Farm in isolation – prior to application of uplifts described in Section 5.4 – includes predictions at Corriemoillie Farm (easting/northing 235627 / 863959) – the locations at which predictions are closest to consented noise limits highlighted in bold and demonstrating a 3.5 dB predicted margin below the 35 dB day-time noise limit. The margin below the night-time noise limits is greater than the day-time.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 22.4 | 25.9 | 29.1 | 31.0 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.5 |
| Black Bridge | 17.9 | 21.4 | 24.6 | 26.5 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 27.0 |
| Hydro House | 17.6 | 21.1 | 24.3 | 26.2 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 26.7 |
| Lubfearn | 17.0 | 20.5 | 23.7 | 25.6 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 26.1 |
| Corriemoillie Farm | 21.4 | 24.9 | 28.1 | 30.0 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 |

Table B4 – Predicted noise levels for Lochluichart Wind Farm and Extension in isolation – prior to application of uplifts described in Section 5.4 – includes predictions at Forest Hill (easting/northing 233388 / 863667) – the location at which predictions are closest to consented noise limits highlighted in bold and demonstrating a 4 dB predicted margin below the 38 dB lower night-time lower limit. The margin below the day-time noise limits is greater than the night-time.

| Property | Standardised 10 m Wind Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Aultguish Inn | 16.9 | 21.7 | 26.8 | 28.7 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.5 |
| Black Bridge | 13.7 | 18.5 | 23.6 | 25.5 | 26.3 | 26.3 | 26.3 | 26.3 | 26.3 |
| Hydro House | 13.4 | 18.2 | 23.3 | 25.2 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
| Lubfearn | 10.6 | 15.4 | 20.5 | 22.4 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.2 |
| Forest Hill | 21.4 | 26.2 | 31.3 | 33.2 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 |

Annex C – Noise Monitoring Information Sheets

Table C1 – Information on the measurement location, equipment and noise data at Aultguish Inn.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Measurement Location Name | Aultguish Inn |
| Measurement Location Description | <p>Inn on the A835 with rooms and caravan in relatively isolated location east of Loch Glascarnoch. To the south, the operating Corriemoillie wind farm is visible. A stream from the Loch runs to the back of the Inn but is not very audible even in calm conditions except to the east of the buildings. Traffic on the A835 is not of especially high volume but has several HGVs travelling and audible for a long time when passing. Noise from wind in vegetation also audible on west side as well as faint noise from the wind farm during some of the site visits.</p> <p>The chosen location was in a courtyard area at the rear of the main building, which was shielded from a central heating plant and the stream noise, not excessively close to tall vegetation and relatively secure. The measurement location had a view of the existing turbines to the south.</p> <p>SLM Location: 235094 / 870470</p> |

| Equipment | Type | Serial Number | Last Calibrated (UKAS) |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Sound Level Meter | Rion NL-31 | 00910453 | 14/03/2018 |
| Pre-amplifier | Rion UC-53A | 101799 | 14/03/2018 |
| Microphone | Rion NH-21 | 02294 | 14/03/2018 |
| Calibrator | Rion NC-74 | 34172705 | 10/05/2017 |
| SLM Range | 20 – 110 dB(A) | | |

| File | Time Start (GMT) | Time End (GMT) | Cal Start | Cal End | Drift | Notes |
|------|------------------|------------------|-----------|---------|-------|----------------------|
| 1 | 09/05/2018 07:10 | 22/05/2018 09:40 | 94.0 | 94.1 | +0.1 | No significant drift |
| 2 | 22/05/2018 10:10 | 07/06/2018 03:40 | 94.0 | 93.8 | -0.2 | No significant drift |

| Data Exclusions |
|--|
| <p>All periods during an indication of rainfall, and the periods immediately before and after, were excluded from the analysis.</p> <p>Periods with southerly winds (90 to 270 degrees from north) were excluded from the analysis to minimise the potential of an influence from operational turbines to the south.</p> <p>Periods with noise levels above L_{A90} 40 dB were excluded during quiet day-time periods as atypical, as well as the following periods (all times GMT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Periods during 06:00 to 07:00 due to a regular noise increase most mornings; – 10/05/2018 19:50-20:00 and 20:40 to 20:50; 12/05/2018 05:00- 06:00, 15:20-15:50. 22:40-23:30, 13/05/2018 04:50-06:00, 19/05/2018 17:30-17:50, 21/05/2018 00:20-05:00, 23/05/2018 21:10-22:20, 03/06/2018 08:40-10:40 |

Figure C1 View of the monitoring location at Aultguish Inn looking west



Figure C2 View of the monitoring location at Aultguish Inn looking south



Figure C3 View of the monitoring location at Aultguish Inn looking east



Table C2 – Information on the measurement location, equipment and noise data at Lubfearn.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Measurement Location Name | Lubfearn |
| Measurement Location Description | <p>Currently unoccupied property alongside the A835 to the east of the Wind Farm site. Apart from the noise of traffic on the road, vegetation noise was also audible.</p> <p>The chosen location was at the rear of the property, relatively sheltered from the road and on the side facing the proposed turbines. Furthermore, this location was relatively distant from the trees located on the north side of the property.</p> <p>A rain gauge was</p> <p>SLM Location: 238465 / 870203</p> |

| Equipment | Type | Serial Number | Last Calibrated (UKAS) |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Sound Level Meter | Rion NL-52 | 00331833 | 15/08/2017 |
| Pre-amplifier | Rion UC-59 | 04900 | 15/08/2017 |
| Microphone | Rion NH-25 | 21784 | 15/08/2017 |
| Calibrator | Rion NC-74 | 34172705 | 10/05/2017 |
| SLM Range | 20 – 120 dB(A) | | |

| File | Time Start (GMT) | Time End (GMT) | Cal Start | Cal End | Drift | Notes |
|------|------------------|------------------|-----------|---------|-------|----------------------|
| 1 | 09/05/2018 07:20 | 22/05/2018 10:10 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 0.0 | No significant drift |
| 2 | 22/05/2018 10:30 | 07/06/2018 05:20 | 94.0 | 94.1 | 0.1 | No significant drift |

| Data Exclusions |
|--|
| <p>All periods during an indication of rainfall, and the periods immediately before and after, were excluded from the analysis.</p> <p>The following periods were excluded as atypical (all times GMT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 21/05/2018 01:30-02:10, 27/05/2018 08:00- 09:10, 10:20-12:00, 14:50-15:30, 02/06/2018 14:10 to 03/06/2018 00:20. |

Figure C4 View of the monitoring location at Lubfearn looking south-east



Figure C5 View of the monitoring location at Lubfearn looking north-west



Figure C6 View of the monitoring location at Lubfearn looking south-west



Table C3 – Information on the measurement location, equipment and noise data at Hydro house.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Measurement Location Name | Hydro house |
| Measurement Location Description | <p>One of group of two isolated house at Black Bridge: Hydro house is located on the east side and has more vegetation but is further away from the Black Water river and weir to the west which dominated the background at the other dwelling. It was therefore chosen in preference. Road traffic noise from vehicles on the A835 was also audible, as well as birds and vegetation noise. The resident noted that the existing turbines to the south-west were sometimes audible in some wind conditions but this was not the case during the site visits.</p> <p>The chosen location was on the east side of the property, away from the larger trees and relatively sheltered from the vegetation and river noise, as well as a central heating outlet on the other side of the property.</p> <p>SLM Location: 237318 / 871100</p> |

| Equipment | Type | Serial Number | Last Calibrated (UKAS) |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Sound Level Meter | Rion NL-52 | 00632044 | 10/10/2017 |
| Pre-amplifier | Rion UC-59 | 05211 | 10/10/2017 |
| Microphone | Rion NH-25 | 32072 | 10/10/2017 |
| Calibrator | Rion NC-74 | 34172705 | 10/05/2017 |
| SLM Range | 20 – 120 dB(A) | | |

| File | Time Start (GMT) | Time End (GMT) | Cal Start | Cal End | Drift | Notes |
|------|------------------|------------------|-----------|---------|-------|----------------------|
| 1 | 09/05/2018 07:20 | 22/05/2018 09:20 | 94.0 | 93.6 | -0.4 | No significant drift |
| 2 | 22/05/2018 09:50 | 07/06/2018 05:00 | 94.0 | 93.9 | -0.1 | No significant drift |

| Data Exclusions |
|---|
| <p>All periods during an indication of rainfall, and the periods immediately before and after, were excluded from the analysis.</p> <p>Although the resident noted that the wind farm may be audible at times in some southerly wind conditions, the analysis showed that excluding south-west winds resulted in increased limits overall and this was therefore not done in the analysis to result in a more conservative analysis.</p> <p>The following periods were excluded as atypical (all times GMT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 11/05/2018 17:30-17:40, 13/05/2018 06:40-06:50 <p>On the last visit to the property, it was observed that the sound level meter had been moved to another location by the resident but it was unclear when this was done: therefore, the second measurement period (22/05/2018 09:50 onwards) was excluded from the analysis as a precautionary measure.</p> |

Figure C7 View of the monitoring location at Hydro House looking north-west



Figure C8 View of the monitoring location at Hydro House looking south-east



Figure C9 View of the monitoring location at Hydro House looking south



Annex D – Wind Speeds and Directions

Figure D1 Wind speed and direction range during all quiet day-time periods (Lubfearn data shown; representative of measurements at Aultguish Inn but with other periods excluded).




Figure D2 Wind speed and direction range during all night-time periods (Lubfearn data shown; representative of measurements at Aultguish Inn but with other periods excluded).




Figure D3 Wind speed and direction range during all quiet day-time periods (Hydro House data shown, with excluded period).





Figure D4 Wind speed and direction range during all night-time periods (Hydro House data shown, with excluded period).



Annex E – Background Noise and Noise Limits

Figure E1 Chart of background noise levels against wind speeds, the best fit curve to the data, the derived noise limit curve for Aultguish Inn during quiet day time periods. Predicted immission noise levels are also shown for the Development, the other wind farms considered and the cumulative total. Both the ETSU-R-97 and the preferred Council noise limits are shown.

Assessment and baseline data at Aultguish Inn during day-time periods
(Some baseline data excluded)




Figure E2 Chart of background noise levels against wind speeds, the best fit curve to the data, the derived noise limit curve for Aultguish Inn during night time periods. Predicted immission noise levels are also shown for the Development, the other wind farms considered and the cumulative total. Both the ETSU-R-97 and the preferred Council noise limits are shown.

Assessment and baseline data at Aultguish Inn during night-time periods
(Some baseline data excluded)




Figure E3 Chart of background noise levels against wind speeds, the best fit curve to the data, the derived noise limit curve for Hydro House during quiet day time periods. Predicted immission noise levels are also shown for the Development, the other wind farms considered and the cumulative total. Both the ETSU-R-97 and the preferred Council noise limits are shown.

Assessment and baseline data at Hydro House during day-time periods
(Some baseline data excluded)




Figure E4 Chart of background noise levels against wind speeds, the best fit curve to the data, the derived noise limit curve for Hydro House during night time periods. Predicted immission noise levels are also shown for the Development, the other wind farms considered and the cumulative total. Both the ETSU-R-97 and the preferred Council noise limits are shown.

Assessment and baseline data at Hydro House during night-time periods
(Some baseline data excluded)




Figure E5 Chart of background noise levels against wind speeds, the best fit curve to the data, the derived noise limit curve for Lubfearn during quiet day time periods. Predicted immission noise levels are also shown for the Development, the other wind farms considered and the cumulative total. Both the ETSU-R-97 and the preferred Council noise limits are shown.

Assessment and baseline data at Lubfearn during day-time periods
(Some baseline data excluded)




Figure E6 Chart of background noise levels against wind speeds, the best fit curve to the data, the derived noise limit curve for Lubfearn during night time periods. Predicted immission noise levels are also shown for the Development, the other wind farms considered and the cumulative total. Both the ETSU-R-97 and the preferred Council noise limits are shown.

Assessment and baseline data at Lubfearn during day-time periods
(Some baseline data excluded)




Figure E7 Aultguish Inn - day-time - same as Figure E1 but including predictions for the Lochluichart Wind Farm Extension II




Figure E8 Aultguish Inn - night-time - same as Figure E2 but including predictions for the Lochluichart Wind Farm Extension II




Figure E9 Hydro House – day-time - same as Figure E3 but including predictions for the Lochluichart Wind Farm Extension II





Figure E10 Hydro House – night-time - same as Figure E4 but including predictions for the Lochluichart Wind Farm Extension II



Annex F – Wind Speed Calculations


- F.1 An important consideration when specifying the sound power outputs of wind turbines is the fact that wind speed varies with height above the ground. This effect is commonly termed ‘wind shear’. Therefore, if the wind speed on a site is characterised in terms of, say, the wind speed measured at ten metres above ground level, then some means must be available for converting this ten-metre height wind speed to whatever the hub height of the proposed turbine will be. This is important because it is this hub height wind speed (i.e. the wind speed seen by the rotor of the wind turbine) that determines the actual sound power radiated by that turbine.
- F.2 The example of a ten-metre height wind speed is selected here because this height is frequently adopted as a ‘reference’. For example, in ETSU-R-97 [1] the wind speed dependent background noise levels are specified as a function of ten metre height site wind speeds. Likewise, the declared sound power data measured in accordance with the internationally adopted standard for the measurement of wind turbine sound power output, IEC61400-11 [2], is also referenced to a ten-metre height wind speed.
- F.3 The ground roughness length, z , indicates the degree to which wind is slowed down by friction as it passes close to the ground: the rougher the ground, the more the wind is slowed down and the larger the roughness length. Table 11 of ETSU-R-97 gives examples of roughness lengths, as repeated here in Table F.1. Figure F.1 shows the wind speed profiles corresponding to the four ground roughness lengths given in Table F1.
- F.4 However, it has been found from measurements that the influence of the ground may not be the only factor affecting the variation of wind speed as a function of height above the ground. Another key factor can be the amount of turbulence in the atmosphere itself.
- F.5 Generally speaking, under a typical day time meteorological scenario, the atmosphere lying above the ground will exhibit what is termed ‘neutral’ characteristics. In such cases the atmosphere itself has little effect on the wind speed profile which is then controlled primarily by ground roughness. However, under certain conditions, typically on a summer’s evening following a warm day, the radiative effects of the ground can cool the air lying close to the earth at a rate faster than the convective cooling of the air lying above. This can result in a highly stable atmosphere, one of the characteristics of which is a pronounced wind shear effect. This means that the relative difference between the wind speed at ten metres height and that at hub height during affected evening/night time periods may be significantly greater than the difference which typically exists during day time periods or other ‘neutral’ conditions.

Table F1 Table 11 of ETSU-R-97 showing the typical roughness lengths associated with different terrain types

| Type of Terrain | Roughness Length, z (metres) |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Water, snow or sand surfaces | 0.0001 |
| Open, flat land, mown grass, bare soil | 0.01 |
| Farmland with some vegetation (reference) | 0.05 |
| Suburbs, towns, forests, many trees and bushes | 0.3 |

- F.6 When undertaking noise certification measurements of wind turbine sound power outputs, the relevant procedure applies a standard means of converting between hub height and ten metres height wind speeds. This involves using a ‘standard’ roughness length of 0.05 metres in Equation F1, regardless of what the actual roughness length seen on the test site may have been. This ‘normalisation’ procedure is adopted to ensure direct comparability between test results for different turbines. However, when this standardised data is subsequently used to calculate the sound power radiated from an installed turbine on an actual wind farm site, it is important to convert between ten metres height wind speeds and hub height wind speeds using the actual wind speed differences experienced on the site itself. These hub height wind speeds may well be different from those calculated by assuming the standard 0.05 metres ground roughness length.

Figure F1 Wind speed profiles calculated for the four different ground roughness lengths listed in Table F.1. The figure adopts a fixed wind speed at ten metres height of $v_{10}=5$ ms⁻¹ then presents the calculated wind speeds at other heights as the curved lines. The calculated wind speeds at 80 metres height corresponding to the assumed $U_{10}=5$ ms⁻¹ are also presented as numerical values, ranging from $U_{80}=6.1$ ms⁻¹ for a ground roughness length of $z=0.001$ metres to $U_{80}=8.0$ ms⁻¹ for ground roughness length of $z=0.3$ metres.



- F.7 The relevance of this conversion between wind speeds at ten metres height and wind speeds at hub height has come under increasing scrutiny with the acknowledgement that, on some sites, the wind shear (i.e. the increase in wind speed with increasing height above ground level) can vary significantly between day time and evening/night time periods. This difference occurs for the reasons discussed above concerning the radiative cooling effects of the earth on the lower levels of air. When this effect occurs, the wind speed seen by the turbine blades at night can be significantly higher than that derived using either a 'standard' assumed roughness length based on the characteristics of the general terrain, or from using on a roughness length or shear factor based on longer term averaged measurements of the difference in wind speeds measured at two different heights. This issue, and the manner in which it has been accounted for in the case of the Development, is discussed in the following section.

Approach

- F.8 The site of the Development has a temporary 80 metre meteorological (met) mast installed which measured wind conditions at various heights as follows:
- 80 metre Wind speed (2 anemometers)
 - 75 metre Wind direction
 - 60 metre Wind speed (2 anemometers)
 - 45 metre Wind direction
- F.9 Wind speeds are needed at a height of ten metres for correlation with measured noise data as specified in ETSU-R-97. ETSU-R-97 also requires the noise assessment be performed with a wind speed maximum of no more than 12 m/s at ten metres height. Whilst it would be possible to use the direct measurement of wind speeds at a height of ten metres, this approach has been questioned due to potential differences in the wind shear profile during the evenings and night times when compared to the day time. In accordance with the preferred methodology set out in the Institute of Acoustic Bulletin Good Practice Guide [3], all ten metre wind speed data is calculated from those which will be directly experienced by the wind turbines. Wind speeds are therefore related directly to those at hub height and calculated to be at ten metres height assuming reference conditions. Reference conditions are those used when reporting the measured and/or

warranted sound power levels of the wind turbines and assume a ground roughness length of 0.05 metre. The process used to calculate the ten metres height wind speeds is therefore described below.

Methodology

- F.10 ETSU-R-97 specifies that where measurements are not made using a ten-metre met mast, measurements at other heights may be used to provide ten metre height wind speeds by calculation. Equation F1 is given in ETSU-R-97 for this purpose.

$$U_1 = U_2 \cdot \frac{\ln\left(\frac{H_1}{z}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{H_2}{z}\right)} \quad [F1]$$

Where:

- H_1 The height of the wind speed to be calculated (10 metres)
- H_2 The height of the measured wind speed
- U_1 The wind speed to be calculated
- U_2 The measured wind speed
- z The roughness length (0.05 metres in the case of reference conditions)

- F.11 Equation F1 is of the same form as that given in BS EN 61400 11:2003 [2] for calculating ten metre wind speeds related to hub height wind speeds when providing source noise emission data for wind turbines. ETSU-R-97 suggests that the roughness length may be calculated from wind speed measurements at two heights, by inverting equation F1. Alternatively, wind shear can be described by the wind shear exponent according to equation F2 as follows:

$$U = U_{ref} \cdot \left[\frac{H}{H_{ref}} \right]^m \quad [F2]$$

Where:

- U calculated wind speed.
- U_{ref} measured wind speed
- H height at which the wind speed will be calculated
- H_{ref} height at which the wind speed is measured
- m shear exponent

- F.12 In this case as well, the wind shear exponent may be calculated from wind speed measurements at two heights, by inverting equation F2.
- F.13 Data from the met. Mast were available for the duration of the survey. These data were used to perform a calculation of the shear exponent found between the highest two wind speed measurements of 80 and 60 metres for every ten-minute period. Where wind speeds were the same at both heights or lower at greater height, the shear exponent was assumed to be zero. The shear exponent so calculated for every ten-minute period were then used to calculate wind speed from that measured at 80 metres at a height of 110 m, representative of potential hub heights for the proposed turbines, using equation F2. Equation F1 was then used to calculate a ten-metre height wind speed from the hub height wind speed every ten minutes assuming the reference roughness length of 0.05 metres.

Conclusions

- F.14 By using this method, measured background noise levels were correlated to ten metre wind speeds calculated from wind speeds at hub height. Any likely difference in the shear profile during the 24 hours of

the day will be accounted for within the method and be reflected in the resulting ten metre wind speed data.

- F.15 The method used to calculate ten metre wind speeds from those at hub height is the same as that used when deriving noise emission data for the turbines. Because the same method has been used, direct comparison of background noise levels, noise limits and predicted turbine noise immission levels may be undertaken. This method is consistent with guidance published in the Institute of Acoustic Bulletin Good Practice Guide [3].

References for Wind Speed Calculations

- [1] ETSU-R-97, The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms, Final Report for the Department of Trade & Industry, September 1996. The Working Group on Noise from Wind Turbines.
- [2] IEC 61400 11:2003 Wind turbine generator systems - Part 11: Acoustic noise measurement techniques.
- [3] A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise, M. Cand, R. Davis, C. Jordan, M. Hayes, R. Perkins, Institute of Acoustics, May 2013.



MATTHEW CAND
SENIOR ASSOCIATE

+44 1454 806 620
matthewcand@hoarelea.com

HOARELEA.COM

155 Aztec West
Almondsbury
Bristol
BS32 4UB
England

