From: Licensing EDDC

Sent: 18 August 2025 11:09

To: Steven Chalkley

Subject: RE: Licence Review - Anchor Inn Sidmouth

Dear Mr Chalkley

Thank you and all noted. I will ensure your comments are passed to the committee.

Regards Lesley Barber

From: Steven Chalkley < Sent: 14 August 2025 08:36

To: Lesley Barber <

Subject: Licence Review - Anchor Inn Sidmouth

Dear Mrs Barber,

I write to let you know that Mr Winter collected the DAT recording equipment last Monday (11th August).

The music levels during the first Friday and Saturday night performances were low enough not to cause a problem and I did not initiate any recordings. I noted that the audience still enjoyed the music. Mr Winter tells me that he actually attended on both those evenings to set music noise levels at the front speakers which would equate to 70dB(A) at the facade of my rear wall.

However, from Sunday 3rd August to the end of Folk Week I had cause to press the record button as it was obvious that music volume levels had been increased.

The afternoon Ceilidhs and acoustic folk related music were no problem throughout the week.

There were no issues with the relocation of the empty beer barrels - it was a pleasure to be able to get to sleep from 11pm.

Could you pass forward this email to Democratic Services so that the committee members are aware?

Thanks & Regards,

Steve Chalkley.

From: Steven Chalkley <

Sent: 18 August 2025 13:37

To: Lesley Barber

Subject: Fw: Anchor Inn Noise Recordings

Categories: Lesley

Dear Mrs Barber,

Thank you for today's email. Please see below content of an email sent to Mr Winter. Again, could you ensure this is sighted by members of the committee.

Many thanks & kind regards,

Steve Chalkley.

---- Forwarded message ----- From: Steven Chalkley

To: Ian Winter

Sent: Monday 18 August 2025 at 13:33:10 BST **Subject:** Re: Anchor Inn Noise Recordings

Dear Mr Winter,

Thank you for your email with the attached noise data from the recent recordings.

The legend on the graph and x/y axis is somewhat difficult to read but the waveforms give a general picture and the table is very useful in showing the averaged noise levels.

In your evidence to the Licence Review Committee you stated that you had, in an advisory capacity, discussed a written MNP with the Anchor that set a noise level of **70dB(A)** at the facade of my boundary wall.

You stated to the Committee that a front of house noise level of **90dB** at the speakers would equate to a distance attenuation of **70dB** at my boundary wall and that with a typical reduction of **33dB** from a closed window would give a level of **37dB** internally, suggesting therefore that this would be acceptable.

As declared in the statement I signed at the bottom of the recording log, my windows were shut at all times during the audio and data recording period. My windows have sound frames and are double glazed.

However when you collected the DAT recording equipment on 11th August you stated that you had attended the venue on the Friday and Saturday and set the music noise levels at the speakers to **96dB** and suggested this would 'distance equate' to **70dB** at my rear windows. This, of course, is an increase of **6dB** at the speakers from what you originally quoted at Committee.

I advised you that for the Friday & Saturday night events, when you attended, the noise levels did not appear to cause a problem so I had no reason to activate the recorder. Other neighbours

also commented the following day that those levels were acceptable. However, I did activate the recorder for the remaining days as the MNLs were increased.

The Music Noise Level data from those nights that you produce in the table indicate internal noise levels consistently in excess of 37dB(A) allowing for 33dB attenuation from my closed windows and indicates an average MNL at my property rear facade of 76dB(A). This is an increase of 6dB(A) from the 70dB(A) level you quoted at the Committee.

What are your thoughts on setting a front of house speaker level to the suggested 90dB which would, from the above evidence, give a level of **70dB(A)** at the outside wall which is what you told the committee? You should also accept that the surrounding buildings of the Anchor beer garden, g t.

especially the rear structure of the pub itself which is in direct line of the speakers and stage, is giving rise to in-phase reflection of the sound causing an increase of the MNL at my property not reducing it.
The Noise Council Guidelines, which remain in force at this time , are clear. A 65dB(A) MNL at the facade of NSRs is recommended for the type of venue at the Anchor (i.e. Urban non-Stadia) albeit for 1-3 performances a year. The monitored 76dB(A) is over 10dB higher than Noise Council guidelines and is not acceptable.
Kind Regards,
Steve Chalkley.
On Friday 15 August 2025 at 14:16:38 BST, Ian Winter wrote:
Dear Mr Chalkley,
Please find attached the noise data from the recordings made within your property during Folk Week.
The first graph shows the entire period following by the 6 graphs showing the recordings made by you. In the table the details of the six recordings are shown together with one 15min LAeq measurement for each recording period.
Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Regards
lan
Ian Winter MSc, REnvH MCIEH, AMIOA
Environmental Health Officer
Environmental Protection Team

nvironmental Protection Team

Environmental Health

East Devon District Council

Switchboard: 01404 515616

My usual working hours are Monday- Friday 9am-5pm although I may work flexible hours during this time.



www.eastdevon.gov.uk

Blackdown House, Border Road,

Heathpark Industrial Estate,

Honiton. EX14 1EJ

INVESTORS IN PEOPLE®

We invest in people Gold



Follow us on Facebook and Twitter

<u>Subscribe to your East Devon Update</u> for regular news and information about what's happening at East Devon District Council. Choose which topics you're interested in to get a personalised update.

Email disclaimer



From: Sent: To: Subject:	Steven Chalkley < > 01 September 2025 13:48 Lesley Barber Fw: Licence Review Committee - Anchor Inn			
Categories:	Lesley			
Dear Mrs Barber,				
Please seen below email sent to Mr Winter regarding setting of speaker noise levels to ensure a maximum level of 70dB(A) at the rear of noise sensitive properties. You will see that I am seeking the front of stage speaker levels to be set so as to ensure a level of 70dB(A) at the rear facade windows of which is my neighbours property that is 5 metres closer to the stage speakers. Mrs Watson is a complainant and has made a statement in this matter.				
Would you ensure this is sighted by the committee members.				
Do you know when the Review Committee intend to meet to resolve this matter?				
Thanks & Regards,				
Steve Chalkley.	Steve Chalkley.			
Forwarded message From: Steven Chalkley To: Ian Winter Sent: Monday 1 September 2025 at 13:31:21 BST Subject: Licence Review Committee - Anchor Inn				
Dear Mr Winter,				
Thank you for your email. T scenario appear correct.	he calculations have been checked and for a sterile laboratory			
itself onto my rear facade? measurements from the fro	culation for the reflection of noise level waveform from the pub building You appear to be basing your conclusion on theoretical nt of stage speakers and avoid relying on measurements at my rear ers have taken readings outside of my rear windows. Can you explain			
facade of neighbour, who also made complainant. Her rear facade	f stage speakers would be required to ensure 70dB(A) at the rear? This is the residence of Mrs Cynthia Watson, my immediate a statement submitted to the committee and is therefore a valid de windows (downstairs and upstairs) are 5 meters closer to the front e. Could you let me have the calculations for this as her residence is property?			

Regards,

Steve Chalkley.

From:

2 September 2025 13:39 an Winter esley Barber e: Licence Review Committee - Anchor Inn
ollow up lagged
g measurements taken were not theoretical and, of course, were ents taken on site. My description of a sterile laboratory scenario ise but, looking back over events you had not, until your previous surements were taken at my rear window to confirm the 70dB(A). Swed only the calculation flow from measurements at the front of ous formulae to arrive at 70dB(A) at the rear window. When you nent you only quoted measurements at the front of house speakers by to 70dB(A) at my window. Thank you for attesting to the fact that also by measurement at my rear window.
the area between the udience members as that area is kept clear for access. There will be nd. Had you taken the opportunity to visit my property at the time excessive noise levels at the front of my property caused by soundings within
levels at the rear of (residence of Mrs Cynthia a set during your attendance, have been 72dB(A). This is, of course, idence.
vels appeared acceptable on the first Friday and Saturday and some ement. I also advised you that from the Sunday onwards the noise sufficient annoyance to cause me to commence recordings.
22:16 BST, lan Winter > wrote:

Steven Chalkley

In response to your email, I can confirm that the calculations undertaken for this assessment were based on real-time outdoor sound measurements taken on-site during live amplified music performances. These were not derived from a theoretical or "sterile laboratory" scenario. The propagation model used reflects direct-path outdoor sound transmission from the front-of-stage loudspeakers and applies a free-field outdoor propagation model, consistent with standard acoustic assessment practice.
Regarding your query about reflected sound energy from the public house structure onto your rear façade, a small increase in sound levels is expected due to reflection however, it is important to note that the rear elevation of the public house does not face squarely towards your property. Furthermore, the form of the building includes multiple sloping and non-parallel surfaces, which will result in a greater proportion of diffuse reflections rather than concentrated, directional reflections.
An additional mitigating factor is the sound absorption capacity of the audience during the events. At the time of peak performances, the outdoor audience area was at or near full capacity. A densely packed audience typically presents a broadband sound absorption coefficient of approximately 0.7. This level of absorption significantly reduces reflected sound energy within the immediate direct sound field.
To clarify further, the sound level measurements used in the assessment were not theoretical.
Sound level readings were taken directly outside the rear façade of your property.
A reduction in distance attenuation of 5m would increase the decibel levels by 2 dB(A).
I am recommending the same levels that I have already detailed to you. This level would ensure the minimising of any Public Nuisance from live music events. Plus, as you have pointed out 'for the Friday & Saturday night events, when you attended, the noise levels did not appear to cause a problem' and that 'other neighbours also commented the following day that those levels were acceptable'.
Please let me know if you require any further details or clarification on the methodology or findings.
Regards
lan
Ian Winter MSc, REnvH MCIEH, AMIOA
Environmental Health Officer

Environmental Protection Team

Environmental Health

East Devon District Council

Switchboard: 01404 515616

My usual working hours are Monday- Friday 9am-5pm although I may work flexible hours during this time.



www.eastdevon.gov.uk

Blackdown House, Border Road,

Heathpark Industrial Estate,

Honiton. EX14 1EJ





From: Steven Chalkley < Sent: 04 September 2025 21:10
To: lan Winter > Cc: Lesley Barber > Subject: Fw: Licence Review Committee - Anchor Inn
De co Ma Maria
Dear Mr Winter,
Further to my email of 1st September, shown below, can you tell me if any measurements were taken at the rear facade of my property during the setting of front stage speaker levels on the Friday and Saturday night performances or do you simply rely on the predictions from your calculations?
Could you respond to my suggestion that MNLs should be set at the facade of the nearest NSR - ie which is some 5 metres nearer the stage?
Regards,
Steve Chalkley.
Forwarded message
From: Steven Chalkley
To: Ian Winter
Sent: Monday 1 September 2025 at 13:31:21 BST
Subject: Licence Review Committee - Anchor Inn
Dear Mr Winter,
Thank you for your email. The calculations have been checked and for a sterile laboratory scenario appear correct.

Have you included any calculation for the reflection of noise level waveform from the pub building itself onto my rear facade? You appear to be basing your conclusion on theoretical measurements from the front of stage speakers and avoid relying on measurements at my rear window. Previous EH Officers have taken readings outside of my rear windows. Can you explain this?

What settings at the front of stage speakers would be required to ensure 70dB(A) at the rear facade of ? This is the residence of Mrs Cynthia Watson, my immediate neighbour, who also made a statement submitted to the committee and is therefore a valid complainant. Her rear facade windows (downstairs and upstairs) are 5 meters closer to the front of stage speakers than mine. Could you let me have the calculations for this as her residence is the nearest noise sensitive property?

Regards,

Steve Chalkley.

Follow us on Facebook and Twitter

<u>Subscribe to your East Devon Update</u> for regular news and information about what's happening at East Devon District Council. Choose which topics you're interested in to get a personalised update.

Email disclaimer

