

Day Twelve

James Goss

Evidence in Chief

Mr Goss was asked to read from para 5.1 until the end of his proof.

Mr Goss was asked to read para 1.3 of his supplementary proof.

Mr Goss was asked to read paras 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.6 and the two final paragraphs on pg3 of his supplementary proof.

Cross Examination

Not a member of WHA?

-No

Therefore have been instructed to carry out exercise, information result of exercise?

-Correct

When first instructed by WHA?

-Dec 2007

Was that in a written form?

-No, verbal

April 2008, monitoring report. This is a report, not a proof of evidence?

-Agreed

What documents were made available to you in relation to the scheme?

-Background information showing route of proposed scheme, the instructions were that locations were the locations which the alliance wanted to see results from.

Were you shown the ES?

-Yes

-Haven't seen all of it though

Seen planning application?

-Seen outline

-Stress that monitoring exercise was simply that.

Since then have you seen any of the evidence that was before the inquiry?

-Seen noise plan

Have you seen accompanying text?

-Only seen part of text

Nowhere in report or supplementary, is there a mention of Westbury town?

-Correct

FP5.5. A judgement?

-Agreed

Do not analyse effect of scheme itself?

-Analysed in reference to the map

-Concluded that due to background, bound to be an increase

'Bound to be an increase' – judgement, not as a result of looking at the road and its effects?

-Looking at noise map that was supplied and given backgrounds that were obtained, and considering normal road noise that you would get from road of this nature, concluded that there would be an increase at certain sites, which was bound to be replicated on the rest of the scheme.

Asked to produce supplementary proof?

-Yes

FP1.1. Purpose of report. Assist in proper consideration. What mitigation measures have you taken into account?

-The general layout, which is planned to put as much distance between the road and WSB town, and road noise barriers

Where are the noise barriers?

-Imagine they would be alongside the climbing lane

Barriers in form of fencing or something else?

-Could be mounds or burns

Not sought to carry out exercise to measures precise impact, in the same way that Humpherson and Smyth did?

-No, that was not my brief

FP5.5. 'Reasonable'?

-In planning terms, would regard as being somewhere near the WHO's lower limit, certainly below 55DB limit.

Can't say what figures would be after bypass put in place?

-No

Rebuttal proof. 2000 WHO guidelines. Still working to?

-Yes

-New guidelines expected to be in force at some stage

-Existing guidelines might not be sufficient

'Preliminary findings' of working group?

-Have been published, but still preliminary

WHO produces preliminary information for discussion and potential alteration, and those preliminary findings could change?

-Agreed

Once they have been adopted they may take the form of new guidelines. No timetable?

-Once preliminary findings put out, something follows after a couple of years or so.

Transport noise. Drive-by noise levels. Noise level of vehicle driving past given point. Not necessarily noise level people will hear?

-Agreed

-Double distance, halve the noise a rule of thumb

Series of factors would influence how far away one would have to be to hear noise?

-Agreed

Take into account ground attenuation?

-Agreed

-Barriers help

In regards to the scheme, cannot have regard just to maximum drive-by levels?

-No

-Was attempting to give the inquiry an indication of noise

-Experience of monitoring, shows that 80-82DB measurable within 4 metres of carriageway

Refers to motorway?

-Also experienced with bypass

60mph speed limit?

-Yes, fairly rarely

Aware of nature of road surface?

-No, but would imagine that would provide some form of attenuation.

Don't aggregate noise levels when calculating?
-Lower noises subsumed into higher noise

Two equivalent noise levels, 75 engine, 75 tires
-3DB

Just about noticeable?
-Yes

3-4 metres from carriageway?
-Nearest dare approach carriageway

RP3.7. 1973 noise regulators. For the purpose of working out ability to claim for noise insulation.

-Agreed

Based on three elements?

-Agreed

-Several restrictions on grants for noise insulation

-Had to be a one DB noise increase at curb level.

-Had to result from alteration from carriageway

-Few grants paid out

Inspector's Questions?

Mr Yellowley requested that Mr Goss provide more accurate maps showing the location of his monitoring.

Mr Langton asked whether Mr Goss was implying that the noise-reduction benefits of modern road surfaces might diminish with time. Mr Goss said that initially surfaces expected to reduce tyre noise by 2.5DB at best. He said that anecdotal evidence suggests that within 2-3 years this performance might diminish so that there was only a reduction in the region of 1DB.