

Air conditioners / Edenaire Condensers at The Meeting House (OFFICES), Little Mount Sion, Royal Tunbridge Wells

From: VICTOR REYNOLDS – Little Mount Sion, Resident

Sent: 17 July 2010 10:00

To: Katharina Mahler-Bech -- RTW Town Forum improve-rtw@townforum.org.uk

To: Christo Skelton, Secretary – RTW Civic Society

Subject:

Noise Nuisance

Rejected Retrospective Planning Application
- Industrial Fan Units, Meeting House, Little Mount Sion

Dear Sir/ Madam

I thought you may be able to help on what we the residents can do to remove some industrial units placed without planning permission in the conservation area attached to an historic building which make an intermittent and terrible noise. The Planning Department seemed to be paralysed by this situation, even thou the officers know that the sound levels are in excess of regulation limits, and still no action.

I live in the conservation area in Tunbridge Wells, it is a nice place to live mainly residential with a scattering of I offices, just off the old High Street. All was well until the building opposite our houses, The Meeting House (one of the more interesting buildings in Tunbridge Wells as it has a blue plaque to commemorate John Wesley preached at this building in the 1780s) is utilised as office space, we have been living here perfectly in harmony for the last ten years until the start of this year. Unfortunately the building changed hands and the new owners have a very different opinion on both the meaning of a conservation area and also being good neighbours.

Just over six months ago six large industrial fan cooling units on a large concrete plinth were installed by the owners directly opposite our houses and in full view of the road without planning permission. These units are working 24 hours a day and 7 days a week and produce the most incredible noise, where there is no escape. These units function day in, day out, all night and all weekend and can be heard and felt in every room of my house. In addition they look absolutely terrible and more so because of the historic nature of the area. These units are designed for industrial areas and the system is more active at night, where normally there would be no residents to disturb. Even the Environmental Noise Impact Report commissioned by the Meeting House (BG Acoustics Ltd) shows the noise levels are in excess of regulation and are worse at night.

When we enquired what these units were doing there the council informed us that they were going to be subject to a retrospective application. This retrospective planning application was submitted by the owners went part way through the long process and then was mysteriously withdrawn. Great we all thought, they will now be removed, so we enquired to the council again on when they were going to be removed, as you can imagine the stress of the constant noise from these units was taking it toll. Not surprisingly a new retrospective planning application was then submitted and this one went all the way through and at last on the 22nd of June this year we were told of the news we had been waiting for that quite rightly and properly the application was rejected. Both my neighbours and I were jubilant, the units must surely now be removed, we had put our faith in the planning system and believed that faith had been repaid. Unfortunately we were very very wrong. It transpires that this is just the start of another long and protracted nightmare. The Planning Department refer you to the Enforcement Department.

We were then informed by the Enforcement Officer that even though these units were built without permission the process is as follows, the council talks to the planning agent for the owners of The Meeting House regarding the application refusal. They then have 28 days to remove the unauthorised units. If they do not the council can commence enforcement action, this will be in the form of a Notice requiring the removal of the units within a suitable timescale. It could take 2 months for the Notice to be issued. BUT although the Notice is issued, it does not come into effect until the result of any appeal against the planning application is considered. They have up to 6 months to make such an appeal, (which is usually the course of action) then it could take another 2-3 months for the Planning Inspectorate to determine the case!

We were also told in no uncertain term by the Council that Planning Legislation allows persons to make retrospective planning applications in order to attempt to regularise a situation and the Council must negotiate as much as possible in order to gain compliance before the commencement of enforcement action. No matter how much you can play the system to meet your own ends. All the while we have to live with these monstrous units making a huge amount of noise and not allowing us to sleep. However they said that the Environmental Department may be help to help, so they were approached, surprisingly they do not seem able to act in this situation without taking legal advice and refer you back to Planning.

To summarise the Planning Department refer you to the Enforcement Department, the Enforcement Department refer you to the Environmental Services Department and, yes you guessed it, the Environmental Services Department refer you back to the Planning Department!

The allocated Environmental Officer has been difficult to contact and seemed evasive, when I finally managed to make contact through emailing the central environmental contact and complaining that I could not get hold of him, his opinion seemed to be that these were merely 'chilling units' and so there was a reasonable likelihood for planning approval if sufficient noise mitigation was installed! Clearly there are two serious issues with this statement, firstly the use of the term 'chilling units' is not correct, his terminology is trying to compare the 'chilling units' that can be seen tucked away on other buildings in this vicinity, they are six large industrial fan cooling units that have to be sited on a large concrete base, directly in front of residential houses in a conservation area. Not the same thing at all. Indeed most 'chillers' are only on when the building is occupied as they tend to be small scale air conditioning. These units are on constantly and are making noise already above the required limit for this area, 24x7. The other issue is the clearly implied statement that you can build without planning permission and that does not matter as you will get permission in the end.

It now transpires that the agents for the Meeting House claim the position of the units was suggested by the Environmental Department, I have asked the question to the Environmental Officer concerned whether this was true and whether the same officer (who has been incredibly difficult to get hold of and slow on providing any action) was the same one to suggest the position. If so I would suggest that his opinion on these units would be severely compromised and should not be involved.

I would also like to add that I was perplexed that the Conservation Officer did not seem to think that these units were detrimental to the area and indeed raised no objections. Strange as they have a very negative (both visual and audible) effect on the area. Can clearly be seen from the street and if I gave him the benefit of the doubt and believed he had approved due to the proposed enclosure was being visualised by him this does not add up as the proposed enclosure made no sense in the application (part of the reason for rejection) and so how and why did he approve this industrial units in a mainly residential area.

It appears if you can build what you like, where you like without planning permission and the council are paralysed and powerless to act if the word 'retrospective' is utilised, no matter the huge stress, sleepless nights, scar on the area and the inconvenience caused to the law abiding council tax paying residents. How can this situation be allowed to continue?

Regards

Victor Reynolds

>>> below CORRESPONDENCE between -

- Residents
- TWBC Building Control | Development Management | Planning Enforcement
- RTW Town Forum

From: Christopher Thomas

To: Andrew Taylor; P Tumbridge; Victor Reynolds

Cc: Alice Bloom, TWBC; John McCullough, TWBC; Gary Stevenson (Head of Street scene & Environment, TWBC); Jim Kehoe (Head of Planning, TWBC)

Sent: Thursday, 29 July, 2010 17:31:25

Subject: Re: Air conditioners at The Meeting House, Little Mount Zion

Dear Mr Taylor

I am pleased to see that all emails will be included on file and that all information sent to date is at hand.

I would advise that as the company in the Meeting House is an expanding Payroll Services Company I would expect matters to get worse, not better.

You will be aware that the size of the "temporary" enclosure, which is not sited correctly, and is not the correct size and will not provide any resolution to the matter, is currently taking up part of a car park. This is therefore a change in use of existing planning granted and should also be investigated. The boxing also acts as a carbuncle to the eye.

This entire situation is quite unsatisfactory and so while the company who should/would have known better continues to work and make profit, residents continue to suffer sleep problems. This noise affects others who live on Mount Sion so the matter is not simple. Industrial Conditioner systems are simply not meant to be in a residential zone which is close knit and prone to echo considering the nature of built environment.

I would ask why these units were put on site in the first place? Why neither Planning or Environmental Health acted sooner and with informed knowledge? Why it is you "appear" not to have known about them, but, if you did why did you allow them in the first instance/give informal advice that such items could be installed. The latter part of this sentence coming from conflicting statements made from parties?

I assume you are aware that it is easy, while inadequate tests on noise are being handled, for the company causing the problem to deliberately keep the noise down by not processing as much work. Pre-informed testing never works.

Kindly advise what ACTUAL time limit there is on the retrospective planning application and why you give the company so much credit in their favour when you balance the needs for both? A company that breaches planning should not be accorded the respect you give and you should be taking planning enforcement action now.

Residents have lost sleep for quite long enough, which is a serious health issue in itself.

Kind regards

Christopher Thomas
Chairman
Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum

From: VICTOR REYNOLDS <victormreynolds@btinternet.com>

To: Andrew Taylor

Cc: Alice Bloom, TWBC; John McCullough, TWBC; Gary Stevenson, TWBC; Jim Kehoe, TWBC; Christopher Thomas ptumbridge;

Sent: Thursday, 29 July, 2010 21:54:21

Subject: Re: Air conditioners at The Meeting House, Little Mount Zion

Dear Mr Taylor

Thank you for your email. I am perplexed as you have stated in your first sentence 'I would bring you up to date with developments on the site and respond to the points raised', I can understand that you have tried to bring us up to date with the council view of developments but you actually have not answered the numerous points raised against this unauthorised development. Could you then please answer these points which have previously been asked (some several times) but not yet answered:

Location: The letter from the Meeting House Agents (Briscoe Architecture Letter 23/06) : 'The revised location was made by Environmental Health'. Mr Bailey from the Meeting House also stated that they believed they had pre-application approval from the Environmental Health Officer, I asked if that was Mr McCullough, he confirmed it was. Also on the latest Planning Application, under the section for Pre-Application Advice Mr McCullough has been recorded. Can you confirm the content of these 'pre-application' discussions and that the same Environmental Officer who was involved with suggesting this site is now also responsible for investigating the suitability of the site after complaints were made?

Noise Levels: Briscoe Architecture Letter (23/06) 'no sound absorption and we are only 3db above the council's limit' and 'the Environmental Officer stated we are 'quite close to getting the levels down to an acceptable limit''. Mr McCullough also sent an internal email to the Planning Officer stating 'at present they are about 3db above our limit'. We all now know that this was simply not accurate, the sound levels are significantly higher than they should have been and in fact on the 20/07 were declared by Mr McCullough as 'unacceptable'. The level 55db is a serious annoyance (outdoor) to 70db hearing impairment (daily noise for 24 hours). These are the sort of levels we have been exposed since this units were installed at the start of this year (even longer for my neighbours). It also goes on to say that greater than 30db is disturbing to sleep and a 10db increase is perceived by the human hear as a doubling of audible noise (source: rockwool.co.uk). We know the levels balance out to around 60db (sometimes much worse, sometimes a little lower) and this corresponds to our own readings, those of the BG Acoustics report and indeed Mr Bailey quoted a 60db level to the Residents Associations. Can you please explain why there was such a difference of opinion on the levels from all other sources and then that of the council?

Noise Nuisance Belated Recognition: Why did it take the Environmental Department finally acknowledging that there is a real noise nuisance for the residents (dispute numerous complaints), 7 months after these units were first installed and working? Why did it take until the 7/07 before the council suggested noise recording equipment to be utilised? What date was the Noise Abatement Notice Issued? Could you send a copy?

Heritage: I would also like to highlight that I still have not received a satisfactory answer on why the Conservation Officer believes that this development does not harm the 'special character of the Conservation area' as we have seen it is a noise nuisance and also was rejected due to the visual aspects. Now with the temporary structure the visual impact is even greater. Could you explain?

Planning Decisions: Mr McCullough stated on the 8/07 'there is reasonable likelihood for planning approval', Mr Cole and Mrs Bloom have also made similar statements. Why are the Environmental Department and Enforcement Department 'second guessing' on a retrospective planning application that was yet to be submitted and the installation had already been refused?

Condenser Installation: As you know I did have contact with the manufacturers/ suppliers of these industrial condenser units and I did send the council the findings, their considered opinion is that these units have not be installed according to the equipment requirements. They require a clearance of 1 metre from the walls and then 1 metre space between each unit. I also raised a concern as to the way the isolating Switches have been left on top of the units, again this is confirmed as incorrect. Also the units did not appear level, this was confirmed as having a detrimental effect on their performance and noise emission. How can the council remain impassive to an unauthorised installation that has been proven to be incorrectly installed and already had retrospective planning application refused and causes a statutory noise nuisance? Why on the numerous visits by Council representatives did no one pick up that these units had not been correctly installed, and indeed due to the poor installation the noise level was increased?

Suggestion of Temporary Enclosure: Mrs Bloom stated it was 'Mr McCullough's alleged plan', Mr McCullough mentions his plan for a temporary enclosure in an email (dated 20/07) 'As a work around I have come up with a plan – I will get the company to put a temporary structure around the fans until the planning application is determined this will reduce the noise levels down in the interim to below nuisance levels.' His suggestion on the enclosure was discussed prior to the Abatement Notice being issued. Is it usual for the council to suggest a solution and then issue a Noise Abatement Notice, encouraging more unauthorised development on top of an already present unauthorised development?

Practicalities of 'Temp' Enclosure: We did raise our reservations before this enclosure was erected on the ability to perform the required maintenance, the ability to have access to the Isolator Switches etc. The 'temporary' enclosure that is being built (has been completed?) around these incorrectly and wrongly installed units. The structure appears to be being built abutted to the units - once again ignoring the required clearance of 1mt. As Eaton Williams confirmed the enclosure will need to allow air in on the sides and allow free air discharge at the top. Also visually the temp installation is appalling, how can this happen in a conservation area? How temporary is temporary? Eaton Williams recommended an acoustic enclosure company should be consulted. Has this been done?

Eaton Williams also highlighted some very pertinent questions, has the fire brigade been informed, has the fire hazard increased? Does the structure conform to national and local building regulations? Is this structure safe? I presume as the council was involved with the agreement to this structure that these actions have been addressed, have they?

Balance: I have been lectured by several members of the council about balance. The balance appears extremely one sided. Mr Cole informed me on the 5/07 that the Meeting House would re-submit within 14 days. Of course this time came and went and still no re-submission. Ms Elliott in her recent letter to the agents of the Meeting House offered to review the revised application enclosure information prior to re-submission. I do not believe this has been done either (it had not when I last checked with Ms Elliott). Can I please remind you that these units were placed in that location in January a belated retrospective application was submitted then withdrawn, when we asked what was happening we were told another application was being submitted so to wait. We waited and yes eventually another retrospective application was submitted this went through the whole process and finally on the 22/06 was rejected. From that point it seems that everything has been done to ensure that these units are not removed. The Enforcement Department were told that another application was coming so would not start enforcement action (see above), the Environmental Officer did not initially respond to emails and finally confirmed the 'unacceptable'

noise limit after 7 months and now we are at the 29th July and still no re-submission and still no end in sight. We have proved beyond all doubt these industrial units are installed incorrectly and there are still severe reservations about a temporary structure that has also ignored the required clearances around the units (not to mention the other points referenced above) Could you please explain again the balance you mention?

Alternative suggestions: Mrs Bloom, and I quote directly: 'I will contact the developer with them for their consideration' on the suggestions made by Mr Tumbridge (located on your website dated 15/07). Has this been performed by Mrs Bloom? If so on what date? What is the recorded outcome?

Resubmission: Once the required clearances are adhered to, the units will have to be a minimum one metre in from both walls, then each unit will have to be a metre between them, and then an enclosure will have to be a further metre from the units and so these units will almost reach our front doors. Not only noise but the visual impact will be enormous. As we the residents have been saying all along these units are not suitable for this environment and once again we have proved it. I have not seen any evidence from the Meeting House, their Agents or the Council that shows these units are in any way suitable for this environment. When is the re-submission now expected? Could you explain your reasoning for referral to another body and the timescales involved with that referral?

Mr Taylor, just a small final point, we live on Little Mount Zion, the only reason I confirm this as the title shows 'zion', if an address search is performed it may confuse.

Regards
Victor Reynolds

From: Andrew Taylor , TWBC
To: p tumbridge; victor reynolds; chris thomas
Cc: Alice Bloom; John McCullough; Gary Stevenson; Jim Kehoe
Sent: Thursday, 29 July, 2010 15:32:31
Subject: Air conditioners at The Meeting House, Little Mount Zion

Dear Mr Tumbridge, Mr Reynolds and Mr Thomas

I refer to your various emails of this week regarding the air conditioners. I thought I would bring you up to date with developments on the site and respond to the points raised.

As you will no doubt be aware the temporary housing for the units has been constructed this week. The site owners and agent are aware that this structure does not have planning permission and they are proceeding with works at their own risk. They have acted after being served with a Noise Abatement Notice by John McCullough from the Environmental Health Team. Alice Bloom from the Planning Enforcement Team has advised them that consent is needed and that the work is at their own risk. However, the works are designed to reduce noise levels around the units. Given this we have decided not to stop the works but have requested the submission of a retrospective application which we expect within the next three weeks. The Enforcement Team are monitoring this to ensure one is submitted promptly.

I have spoken to John McCullough regarding the siting/installation of the air conditioning units. Whilst I acknowledge the technical information which has been submitted, it is for the site owners/applicants to ensure the siting is correct. If the siting is less than ideal then this will mean that any noise reduction

measures will have to be improved to ensure a satisfactory reduction. Once an application is submitted I will ensure we receive comments from John McCullough on the technical issues of noise and noise reduction so that we can consider this issue fully.

I have decided that it is currently not expedient to take Planning Enforcement action but to wait for a new application to be submitted. I have had to balance the needs of the business and the harm to the amenities of local residents and the fact that the temporary sound reduction measures are nearly complete. Once a new application is submitted there will be a period of public consultation during which time you are welcome to make any comments you feel are appropriate. Given the level of public concern I consider that the new application is likely to be reported to the Western Area Planning Committee for determination.

I can confirm that all your emails form part of both the Enforcement File and recently refused planning file.

Andrew Taylor
Development Manager

Building Control | Development Management | Planning Enforcement

Planning Services
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
Town Hall
Royal Tunbridge Wells
Kent
TN1 1RS

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Christopher Thomas
To: Gary Stevenson, TWBC; Jim Kehoe, TWBC
Cc: William Benson, TWBC
Sent: Monday, 26 July, 2010 20:52:01
Subject: Fw: Edenaire Consensers - Meeting House

Hello Gary and Jim

Mr Reynolds has certainly been forced to do his homework and has shown a certain wanting within the Environmental Health Department.

Should it be up to a resident to have to find out how such units should have been installed? Even to the layman like myself the siting of such "noise monsters" was inappropriate - by a wall and too close to each other etc. This I noted on visiting. The area is also uneven - see PDF file.

I also reflect upon the temporary enclosure which is expected to be such a wonder in technology so as to temporarily reduce the noise being emitted from these things. Is Alice Bloom really believing that such a temporary enclosure would be in line with planning itself? Is the Environmental Health Department really thinking this is a safe or even adequate temporary solution when reading the information below?

Is it really the case that an IT literate company using these things did not know of these problems?

Importantly there appears to be a training need for all staff to become aware of such modern technology and what it demands. If there had been awareness then Mr Reynolds and his neighbours would not have been deprived of sleep for so many months.

It seems quite clear that these units are not in the right place and should NOT be granted retrospective planning permission in no matter what shape or size or form. If the units had been installed correctly the noise insulation surround would have been vast. Once again I would advise that the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum objects to these units and opposes any retrospective planning application for them to be installed. I would appreciate that this objection be noted and that you confirm the objection is lodged on the retrospective planning application file. I have yet to receive such confirmation.

With the coming of the Town Regeneration project there needs to be much more knowledge of such units and modern technology. The communication in such matters between Planning and Environmental Health would appear to need to be tightened up quite considerably and the concerns of sleep deprived residents to be acknowledged and investigated properly from both sides. Planning officers should be able to look at environmental concerns as part of their remit and thus save time and money by liaising with colleagues rather than saying it is not my department you need to talk to

I look forward to confirmation that you have logged the objection placed. Please note the pdf file needs to be opened separately from the slide show.

Kind regards

Christopher Thomas
Chairman
Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: VICTOR REYNOLDS

To: Alice Bloom; Rachael Elliott <Rachael.Elliott

Cc: Christopher Thomas; Jim Kehoe, TWBC; Andrew Taylor, TWBC; Gary Stevenson, TWBC; JohnKaye, TWBC; p tumbridge

Sent: Monday, 26 July, 2010 12:30:42

Subject: Fw: Edenaire Consensers - Meeting House

Dear Mrs Bloom/ Ms Elliott

Further to my email dated 27/07, the industrial condenser units this weekend were making a really terrible noise and so I thought it best to contact the manufacturer/ supplier (Eaton Williams), as I was looking at their website and it seemed to show that these units had not even been installed correctly! Their considered response is attached below and clearly shows these units have not be installed according to the equipment requirements.

As you can clearly see they have confirmed that the clearance needed from the **walls and other units needs to be 1mt**, their manual confirms this; Page 3 - Location.

I raised a concern as to the way the isolating Switches have been left on top of the units, again this is confirmed as incorrect. Dangerous?

The manufacturers own technical documents do state that that these units (when probably installed) produce 58-64 db of noise, measured per condenser at a distance of 3mt from the unit in free field conditions. As they have been installed against the manufacturers instructions the proximity of the walls has lead to an increased noise level as these hard services reflect noise from the condensers (i.e. not free field conditions). In addition the close proximity of the other units (as stated below), this level is further increased by 5-6db! Can I politely remind you that these units run mainly at night.

I also have been looking into noise and according to Rockwool (makers of the sound proofing that it appears the meeting house is currently trying to install) the levels 55db is a serious annoyance (outdoor) to 70db hearing impairment (daily noise for 24 hours). These are the sort of levels we have been exposed since this units were installed at the start of this year (even longer for my neighbours). It also goes on to say that greater than 30db is disturbing to sleep and a 10db increase is perceived by the human hear as a doubling of audible noise (source: rockwool.co.uk). I have not even touched on the negative visual aspects of these units or even the wooden 'temp' enclosure that is currently being erected.

This then brings me onto the 'temporary' enclosure that is currently being built around these incorrectly and wrongly installed units. The structure appears to be being built abutted to the units - **once again ignoring the required clearance of 1mt**. As Eaton Williams also confirm the enclosure will need to allow air in on the sides and allow free air discharge at the top. So there is a very real potential that far from actually helping the noise issue because they have been incorrectly installed without the required clearances, and require to be open anyway, the situation is as bad as ever.

Can you now please review this case again, not only were these units installed without Planning Permission, they were installed incorrectly with inadequate clearances and against the manufacturers requirements, the noise pollution they have been causing has been 'unacceptable' ever since they were installed and the enclosure being currently built is also being built incorrectly.

Once the required clearances are adhered to the units will have to be a minimum one metre in from both walls, then each unit will have to be a metre between them, and then an enclosure will have to be a further metre from the units and so these units will almost reach our front doors. Not only noise but the visual impact will be enormous. As we the residents have been saying all along these units are not suitable for this environment and this absolutely proves it.

I am sure you are now as concerned as we are and I would like to know the enforcement action the council now intends to undertake.

Regards

Victor Reynolds

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Paul Fletcher <paul.fletcher@Eaton-Williams.com>

To: VICTOR REYNOLDS <victormreynolds@btinternet.com>; Maz Coker <maz.coker@Eaton-Williams.com>

Sent: Monday, 26 July, 2010 10:13:44

Subject: RE: Edenaire Consensers

Victor,

I attach the manual.

You are correct the recommended distance between walls and other units is 1000 mm.

Photo 083. This indicates no clearance between wall and first unit and no clearance between first and second units. The effect of no clearance will mean the condenser fans will have to run faster and thus generate more noise due to the airflow restrictions and the recirculation of the condenser discharge air due to the confines of the installation.

Photo 028. This indicates the isolators have been located loose on the top of the condensers this is not correct. Photo 022 indicates the correct location for the isolator on the end of the ICV1-18 condenser.

Photo 022. This again indicates the lack of clearance between all four condensing units.

Recommendations

The units needed to be spaced out further as indicated in our manual.

Any acoustic enclosure will need to allow the air in on the sides and allow free air discharge at the top. You will need to consult a acoustic enclosure company on this aspect for design and supply to meet your needs.

The noise generated from one ICV2-40 (2 fans) will be increased by 5 to 6 dBA due to the other 4 fans on other condensing units in close proximity.

Regards

Paul. F.

From: Maz Coker <maz.coker@Eaton-Williams.com>
To: VICTOR REYNOLDS <victormreynolds@btinternet.com>
Cc: Paul Fletcher <paul.fletcher@Eaton-Williams.com>
Sent: Monday, 26 July, 2010 9:18:51
Subject: RE: Edenaire Consensers

Victor

Thank you for your enquiry. I have forwarded this on to our engineer Paul Fletcher who should be able to assist you and who will contact you shortly.

Regards

Maz Coker

From: VICTOR REYNOLDS **Sent:** 24 July 2010 15:33
To: Info Eaton-Williams
Subject: Edenaire Consensers

Hello

Sorry to disturb you but I wondered if I could ask for some advice. A Company has installed three twin fan condenser units (I believe two units are ICV2-40P, and one unit is a ICV1-18P). I have attached some pictures. I must say I was surprised to see the Isolating Switches next to the fans, I presume this is not recommended?

They have been in a corner against two walls and the noise they emit (especially at night) has been dreadful. I notice that on one of your diagrams it appears to suggest that they should be placed at least a metre from a wall, is this correct? Would that help with the noise as we are just in front of them? They are now also talking about an enclosure - I am concerned about access for maintenance and isolation, and I presume any enclosure would still need to be open? We are a mainly residential area with a scattering of offices.

Any suggestions I can pass on would be very gratefully received.

Thanks

Victor