

# NOISE

March 2012 Issue 60

## BULLETIN

### NUISANCE

# Wind slashes 16% off value?

Subscribe to Noise Bulletin to read full story below and other top noise news:

[www.noise-bulletin.org.uk](http://www.noise-bulletin.org.uk)  
Subscriptions: 01737 642283

wind industry. Fenland Windfarms built the turbines

available records of the Land Registry which reveal that the

Zoopla.com with the house valued at £165k in 2007.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT

## Durham council rapped for allowing nuisance

Durham County Council has been found to be incompetent and neglectful by granting planning permission for cattle buildings next to housing.

The Local Government Ombudsman found against the Durham – although most errors were committed by Teesdale District Council which was absorbed into Durham as part of the recent local authority reorganisation.

The Ombudsman said Teesdale granted planning permission for two agricultural buildings housing 120 veal calves in a rural hamlet: “The officers had no authority to give the permissions and did not impose any conditions to protect the amenity of nearby homes.

“Local residents, who live between 60 and 100 metres from the site, complained

repeatedly for years about the noise and smell from the animals and associated activities, but the council failed to respond or to evaluate the evidence of nuisance. The Ombudsman found clear and incontrovertible evidence that the council did not keep adequate records of contacts from residents – the residents recorded more than 140 contacts, the council only five.

“The residents complained formally in March 2010 to Durham County Council. A senior manager became involved but he did not investigate the lack of response to their previous complaints. He arranged noise monitoring, but by this time the number of cattle housed in the buildings had been reduced dramatically and the site owner had begun to mix feed behind the buildings,

reducing the noise reaching the residents’ homes. The monitoring showed a “borderline possible nuisance” and the Environmental Health Service decided not to take any further action.

“The residents continued to press the case that the noise and other nuisance with 15 or so cattle on the site, the monitoring was taking place was very different from what they had experienced when up to 170 cattle were being housed. The senior manager and the head of planning knew of these concerns directly from the residents and from their local councillors. One councillor said that these officers “seemed to dismiss the evidence out of hand”.

In July 2010 Durham Council’s Area Planning

● continued page two

### IN BRIEF

#### Complaints ignored

Many noise complaints are not investigated by councils, Noisedirect believes.

The Noisedirect service, run by Sanctum Consultants, offers fixed price noise advice to the public for nuisance complaints.

The firm asked its ‘noise tsar’ (Val Weedon of UK Noise Association) to carry out research into the problem: “We are receiving more and more enquiries and calls so we asked councils about psychological hazards and laminated floor complaints – two of the issues that are most numerous and also the two that we have found most councils refuse to even log or record – let alone investigate.

“This report is of no surprise to Sanctum. In the last two years we have increasingly seen councils outsourcing issues project by project, whilst we continue to receive more and more calls about traditional simple nuisance cases, which callers tell us that councils no longer deal with.

“Sanctum’s view is that if the coalition government is truly committed to localism, then there should be a policy of ‘use it or lose it’. Simply if councils want to opt out of complying with statutory duties, then private individuals should be allowed to use public funding to authorise their own environmental health professionals to serve noise abatement or housing act notices on their behalf. Councils may well find that the Ombudsman is the least of their worries, as they are faced with multiple judicial reviews.”

Last month *Noise Bulletin* reported that Salford had agreed in committee that it would not investigate many noise nuisances and would take the risk of being referred to the Ombudsman (*Jan/Feb p1*).

● <http://noisedirect.co.uk>

### HIGHLIGHTS INSIDE...

#### NEWS

- 2 Royal Parks wins Hyde Park battle
- 3 Wales consults on quiet places

- 4 Speedway case redefines planning?

#### FEATURES

- 5-7 How much are quiet places worth?

- 8-9 Health effects of noise once again probed

#### 10 COMING EVENTS

- 10 SOUND BITES  
Salford aftershocks