

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [SizewellC](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fisher Farm - Noise pollution from proposed train link  
**Date:** 05 July 2021 12:08:20

---

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am the owner and resident of [REDACTED] - a Grade-II listed farmhouse set in 2 acres of quiet countryside a couple of miles inland from Sizewell Beach.

Recently, I have been an active participant in the anti-Sizewell C movement - both as a speaker in the Open Sessions and financial supporter of the Stop Sizewell C campaign. Like many others, I am philosophically against new large-scale nuclear infrastructure when there are clearly cheaper, greener, more effective, less damaging alternatives available currently or in the very near future.

During last month's Open Session, I explicitly registered my dissatisfaction with EDF's lack of consultation with local home owners, whose property is likely to be dramatically affected by the proposed development. Having heard nothing for a year despite several emails, I was eventually visited on June 1st by EDF's planning representatives 'Dalcour MacLaren' (clearly, the Open Session worked...!).

During this visit, I expressed my deep concern regarding levels of noise pollution implicit in the planned construction of the rail link which, if accepted, will be routed to the rear of my property. The planning agents agreed to provide me with a set of assumptions regarding noise levels based on the findings of EDF's noise consultants (attached below for completeness). Upon receipt, I forwarded them to MAS Environmental Ltd (<https://www.masenv.co.uk>) - a reputable, independent noise consultancy who offered me their point of view gratis. MAS Environmental have now supplied me with this 'second opinion' based on the Revised Planning Proposals and the conclusions of EDF's noise consultants.

It will come as no surprise that there is a difference of opinion; but more importantly, large gaps in information by which either noise consultancy would be able to draw accurate conclusions.

Firstly, and I appreciate that this presumes a level of technical understanding, there is the matter of how the noise averages are calculated. According to MAS, Reliance on the LAeq (see definition below) averages used by EDF for the entire night and day is seriously misleading as it is not a regular source of noise i.e. many times and hour. This sort of reporting is highly misleading but widely done as they (ie. EDF) are averaging a short period of noise over the entire 8 hour night which is deceptive albeit commonly applied. MAS advise that EDF's approach to weighted averages is in no way an accurate reflection of the situation.

Then we come to the information gaps...

I have as yet been unable to establish what type of train will be used for these 8-times-a-night journeys past my back window; its likely load, speed or possible incline. All these factors and many others will make a significant impact to the noise pollution.

I can only presume that EDF either a) have this information but have chosen not to share

as yet; or, b) they don't have such information and are guessing according to what best suits the planning application.

Either way, I am taking this opportunity to register my strongest objection to the rail link. MAS Environmental Ltd have assured me that I am likely to suffer noise pollution. As a recording artist who relies on a peaceful environment, the proposed rail link is a disaster. Please make it stop.

Thank you

Alex Johnston.

**LAeq definition** - Equivalent Continuous Sound Pressure Level, or Leq/LAeq, is the constant noise level that would result in the same total sound energy being produced over a given period. LAeq is a fundamental measurement parameter designed to represent a varying sound source over a given time as a single number.

From Dalcour MacLaren: June 15th 2021

Dear Mr. Johnston,

Further to our meeting I am pleased to say that our noise consultant has looked into the noise levels. He has confirmed that the noise levels for [REDACTED] have been assessed within the ES documents.

Table 1.8 in Volume 9, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-546] contains the daytime noise levels, and Table 9.3.C.5 in Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-257] contains the updated night-time values. The stated noise levels are all external values, i.e. noise levels outside the property; we would expect them to be approximately 10dB lower inside the property if the windows are open. If windows are closed, we would expect the noise levels inside the property to be a further 15dB lower (i.e. 25dB lower than the values stated in the submission).

We can't comment on whether you will hear the trains, nor whether it will interfere with the enjoyment of your property; these are highly subjective. We can say that the noise levels are all below the thresholds where we would expect an adverse effect. As the noise levels are below the threshold at which we would expect an adverse effect, there is little justification for additional mitigation beyond what has been identified in the land plans.

I can confirm that the plans, which can be found [here](#) and on the PINS website, show a landscape bund on the northern side of the proposed rail line, with cross sections indicating the anticipated height.

I trust this has been able to answer some of your questions, should you have any more, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Kind Regards