

ExQ2: 03 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
NV.2 Noise and Vibration		
NV.2.0	The Applicant	<p>Construction Noise Thresholds</p> <p>(i) In light of the ongoing difference of view between you and ESC as to the appropriate standard that should be applied please explain what the justification is for having lower standards than BS 5228 Annex E5 recommends for the 19:00-23:00 time period.</p> <p>(ii) What justification do you consider there to be for the current approach and is this supported by previous precedents for projects with similar length construction programmes?</p>
NV.2.1	The Applicant	<p>Saturday Afternoon working at the Associated Development Sites</p> <p>It would appear from the assessments undertaken that there is a risk that the SOAELs could be exceeded during Saturday afternoons. The ES indicates that in most cases this could be managed and delivered through the CoCP to avoid exceedances of the SOAEL, but where this would not be the case the Noise Mitigation Scheme (NMS) would safeguard the sensitive receptors.</p> <p>This does not appear to actually be the case.</p> <p>(i) The NMS would only be triggered and be applicable under certain scenarios which may well mean that those adversely affected by construction during these times would not qualify for the NMS and therefore the mitigation would not be there. In these circumstances how could either the working pattern or the NMS be said to meet both the NPSE and NPS EN1 expectations of avoiding the SOAEL.</p> <p>(ii) If the understanding above is correct, can the working in the Saturday afternoons be justified?</p> <p>(iii) What would the implications be for the delivery of each of the associated development sites delivery programmes if Saturday afternoon working was not accepted?</p>
NV.2.2	Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Quiet Road Surfacing</p> <p>(i) What additional acoustic benefit might be expected if this surface were to be used for the Sizewell Link Road and the Two Village Bypass?</p> <p>(ii) Would a different maintenance regime from a standard road be required in the event this surface were to be adopted to maintain the acoustic benefits it may bring?</p> <p>(iii) Is this now being factored into the discussions?</p>

ExQ2: 03 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		(iv) In the event that quiet road surfacing were to be offered how would this be secured?
NV.2.3	Applicant, Network Rail	Rail Noise Mitigation Scheme (i) Please advise the latest position regards to the likely deliverability of this scheme in light of it being identified as primary mitigation. (ii) If it is not all delivered, what is the back-up position to safeguard receptors that might consequently be subject to adverse noise conditions, particularly for those receptors which would be subject to noise above SOAEL? (iii) Are there any elements which have not been agreed? (iv) It would appear that all of the noise mitigations identified in the rail noise assessment should be secured through the requirements in the DCO. If this is not agreed please explain your position.
NV.2.4	Applicant	Rail Noise (i) Requirement 25 of the draft DCO would appear to apply to works No. 4 only. Is this understanding correct? (ii) If so, how is the noise mitigation being offered in respect of the main line to be secured?
NV.2.5	Applicant, ESC	Operational Noise (i) The Main Development Site (MDS) night-time noise threshold is not yet agreed with ESC. Should the ExA consider the Council view more appropriate as a safeguard for the future noise levels, would there be implications for the operation of the station at the MDS? (ii) Would there be alternative or different mitigations available which may be able to be applied which could safeguard the night-time noise environment in the event the noise threshold is not agreed? Are there implications for the operation of the plant?
NV.2.6	Applicant, ESC	Noise Mitigation Scheme (NMS) As things currently stand the NMS is a draft with further assessments to be undertaken and to be agreed with ESC, potentially to be undertaken in phases. There are then a series of additional stages to be gone through. Stage 3 gives the owner 28 days to respond.

ExQ2: 03 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Stage 4 gives no commitment or time period for the Applicant to organise the survey and to provide the specification to the owner. Why should there not be an obligation on the Applicant to respond in a timely manner?</p> <p>(ii) What happens in the event the property is not found to be suitable for adaption?</p> <p>(iii) Should the property be suitable and the property owner progresses to receive two quotes, what happens if they are not received within 28 days?</p> <p>(iv) At stage 5 the Applicant makes a formal offer, but there is no obvious commitment to honour either of the quotes received, is this specified somewhere?</p> <p>(v) If a formal offer is made to the owner at this point, this appears to trigger a three month embargo on the works that have been identified as triggering the need for the insulation/mitigation scheme. Is this correct?</p> <p>(vi) It is understood that at stage 6 following works being undertaken, that this would need to be verified as being carried out prior to any payment being made. What time frame would this be undertaken within and what timeframe would be in place to make the payment?</p> <p>(vii) Please provide an update to the NMS to provide clarity on the above points.</p>
NV.2.7	Applicant, ESC	<p>Noise Mitigation Scheme</p> <p>(i) Please provide an indication of over what time frame you consider a receptor who qualified for noise mitigation under the scheme could reasonably expect to undertake the necessary works and receive payment for them from the beginning to the end of the process.</p> <p>(ii) How does this fit with the latest implementation plan which indicates works on the rail line would commence in Q2 2023? [REP2-044]</p>
NV.2.8	Applicant, Network Rail	<p>Rail Noise Mitigation</p> <p>Paragraph 5.11.13 of NPS EN-1 states that improved sound insulation may be appropriate, but only "in certain situations, and only when all other forms of noise mitigation have been exhausted".</p> <p>(i) Have all other forms of mitigation been exhausted?</p> <p>(ii) What progress has been made in the consideration of barriers as an alternative to insulation of people's homes?</p>
NV.2.9	Applicant, Network Rail, ESC	Rail Noise Mitigation

ExQ2: 03 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Additional assessments of rail noise were undertaken in Woodbridge and Saxmundham to consider the implications of the rail strategy in respect of house boats and park homes.</p> <p>(i) Please provide an update on what the noise mitigation proposed is to be and how this would be secured.</p> <p>(ii) In the event screening in these locations would facilitate an improved noise environment for these receptors, has a similar option been considered for other receptors along the line?</p> <p>(iii) Could this be secured in the event it was considered appropriate?</p>
NV.2.10	Applicant, Network Rail, ESC	<p>Noise and Vibration from Rail Freight</p> <p>ESC have sought additional clarification in respect of the uncertainties of the predictions of noise and ground borne vibration from rail activities.</p> <p>Can the ExA be updated on the current position regarding this updated information and whether the parties are agreed now as to the suitability of its forecasting, and the consequential assessments of noise and vibration and the consequential suitability of any mitigation.</p>
NV.2.11	ESC, Applicant (ii only)	<p>Operational Noise at Leiston Leisure Centre</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that page 63 section 165 20j of the Deadline 5 Response to Deadline 3 and 4 submissions from the Applicant the noise level should be 55 dB $L_{Aeq(T)}$.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain how the installation of the noise barrier at the necessary point in the programme is secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism?</p>