

AUDIO_SizewellC_ISH8_Session2_25082021

00:06

Hello, again, everyone just wanted to resume this issue specific hearing. Can I just first check with the case team that the camera The microphone is functioning properly under the live stream the recording as recommenced? Yes, I can see in here and the live stream and recording are working. Thank you very much, right? Well, if we come on to the next item of the agenda, and this is really an understanding of whether higher standards of protection will be appropriate in light of the length of the construction period. And so concern has been expressed about the standard of protection offered to receptors, who will be subject to noise over potentially prolonged periods? Should the assessment and subsequent levels of protection offered have regard to the length of construction period? And has this been factored into the consideration of effects? So if I can ask a Suffolk Council for their view on that, in the first instance, please?

01:16

Thank you. So I'll ask Mr. Kemp. Just to outline the position. And then I'm going to ask Mr. Joe bear of Aj acoustics to elaborate on the initial points. Thank you.

01:35

Good morning again, sir Mark Kim, a soft Council. So, the question where the highest standard of protection are appropriate in light of the potential length of construction period, we would maintain that, yes, there are some areas where where higher standard protection would be appropriate. Firstly, in terms of the construction noise thresholds in the constructor code construction practice, we maintain they should be aligned with annex e five of bs 52281. Which lower the which allowed than the existing thresholds in rep 50138. Secondly, the thresholds in the noise mitigation scheme for construction construction noise from the main development site should be lower as per our request for information 38 submitted Rep. 6032. And, yeah, I think it'd be appropriate to pass over to Mr. Bear No. Thank you.

02:43

Nice job. So he suffered cancel this time. So yeah, the points on construction noise thresholds. And in relation to the code of construction practice, Mr. Brown's local firm that we have actually had some communication, recently about a suggested revision to the new suggested revising the data construction noise thresholds for the main development site to 55 DBA, which is in line with the annex e five requirement which we've been talking about for daytime periods, but crucially, is not aligned for the evening periods. And our concern is that the, the code of the construction thresholds in the code of construction practice should differentiate between sensitivities of daytime and evening working periods, given that the applicant's daytime working shift hours are do go on into the evening. So they include the evening period. And that's the real driver behind the request for lower construction, lower thresholds in the code of construction practice. I should also point out that I think the proposal was to introduce that threshold is the threshold when bespoke mitigation plans kick in. And I'm not clear what that achieved that is to be addressed. Achieving Yes, another set of construction thresholds I established position is

that they should be they should be adopted in the code of instruction practice rather than kind of tertiary construction noise threshold is yet another kind of sub document. I've managed to defer to my colleagues whether we talked about the other aspects. I've got the list in front of me, should I I still said that's the end point.

04:30

Okay, thank you. Are there any other interested parties who would wish to make any comment now?
Mr. Bedford

04:56

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council So I'm just trying to remove my hand while I remember that it doesn't stay there to confuse you later. So yes, this is an issue which I raise it here because I think it is relevant to your topic higher standards of protection. This is dealing with the standard of protection achieved by the introduction of low noise surfacing, there are different levels of low noise surfacing. I understand that the relevant guidance document that is used for this purpose is in the manual of contract documents for highway works in Volume One, the specification for highways clause 942 gives advice on thin surface core systems and table nine stroke 17 sets out different properties of different types of surfaces. And I think that in the earlier remarks from the applicant, reference was made to as it were a reduction factor of point two five decibel levels, that being achieved by the introduction of low noise surfaces. And that is right, if you are achieving it at what is level two in that table. But there is a higher factor, which is the level three factor which would enable you to achieve a reduction of 3.5 decibels. And our position is and I think we are in dialogue with the applicant about this, that there are some locations where we would be content with the level two load and resurfacing there are other locations where we consider that level three is appropriate. And in relation to locations on the a 12 moles furred and little Glennon, I think have been the subject of discussion thus far, where we think level three is appropriate, the B 1122. In the locations at saboten. And middle two more, we consider level three to be appropriate. Whereas on the size where link road and the to village bypass, I think we consider that level two would be sufficient. So so that that is clearly an area where I say we are seeking higher standards in some locations, and in part because of the sensitivity of those locations, and in part because of the duration of the construction period when those impacts will be affected. So so that's that position. In summary, if you want anything further, obviously I can bring in the specialists to to explain that further to you

08:06

know, that's fine for the moment, but I would just ask that when you come to provide the written summary, you give me clear references to the documents you've

08:14

absolutely I was going to ask would you like an extract from that relevant guidance to be provided with our written summary? Yes, please. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Wilson from task.

08:32

Harrington. Sorry. Hello. Yes, Chris Watson from together events. As you'll see, I just wanted to make the point in terms of higher standards. In terms of the main development site, obviously we are in NA

OMB, which obviously is designated for its tranquillity and other special features, main development sites and so very close to the triple OSI for close to RSPB minsmere. So presumably, we should be looking at the highest standards possible in for those areas. Mr. brownstone earlier seem to be implying that for sound levels we should be do no more than compared to Hinkley Point sees. Restrictions but HPC is not an unknown variant not surrounded by such wildlife sensitive spots. So all I just wanted to make a plea for the highest standards possible. Thank you, Samir extant Next please.

09:35

Yes, hello again. And I'm sort of like thinking about the highest standards of protection but maybe not in the right context. I'm finding statements within the consolidated transport assessment that refers to wicker market and it states that the southern park and ride to the southwest with the market was put there to reduce the amount of traffic generated by the construction workforce on local roads and through local villages. We are the local village and the traffic is going to be increased because of the Southern Park and wide being there, not reduced. And obviously this traffic is going to have an impact. I'm thinking about vibration on the buildings that we have that stand along the main route of the beach and seven as it passes through the lower end of wicker market. Again, we've had, you know, we're going through the aser at the moment with EDF, Suffolk County Council ESC with regards to traffic control proposals, and that should be coming through to consultation with members of the public soon. But it's not addressing these other issues such as vibration, damage to these properties. All of this information will be put in the submission. But I mean, a lot of these properties are listed there in a conservation area, they have limited foundations. So they are at risk of damage caused by vibrations of increased traffic that will come through. So I just not sure if this is the right point to bring it up, or whether it should be at point three, but for if this is going to be 10 to 12 years of traffic coming through through construction, that's possibly going to cause quite significant damage or have significant impact on the buildings that align these streets. So I'm wondering whether this is the point that I should be raising, or you've raised? Exactly. Thank you. Mr. Haley.

11:46

Yes, thanks, sir. I just like to ask Mr. Bedford, what the current sound levels are, after the Saxmundham bypass the a 12. And whether they will be appropriate for the period of the construction. Given the additional number of hgvs, that will be undoubtedly using that route. Thank you.

12:19

Before I come back to the applicant can miss x in your hand now go down, please, assuming you don't have another point. And just ask Mr. Bedford. Do you wish to respond to that point, or should I just go straight to the applicant?

12:39

Sir? No, I think what we will do is outside of the examination, I think we will have contact with Mr. Haile I don't think there's a matter that should detain you.

12:51

That's helpful. I then come back to Mr. Flanagan, please.

12:58

Thank you. So yes, so on those questions, I'm going to deal with them as follows sort of pick up one point which you can deal with without handing over to others in relation to wicker market. The forecast traffic through wicker market has been assessed within the noise assessment. And there are no buses or hgvs routing through wicker market just cars and LG V's since the points of clarification response to miss accidents point. On the points raised I'm going to ask Firstly, Mr. brownstone to deal with and respond to Mr. Joe Bear's point regarding points regarding the construction threshold, the 55 decibel level which so I appreciate the examining authority hasn't seen it yet, but the noise monitoring mitigation plan is being amended to include that lower threshold. And also Mr. Brown's to respond on Mr. Joe, as pointed out the evening period as part of that issue. That's first issue. The second issue for Mr. brownstone is Mr. Bedford to technical points on the low noise road surfacing. And then I'm going to ask Mr. JOHN Rhodes, who earlier gave you an update on the discussions in delivery of potential for delivery of low noise road surfacing for any further comments he may have on that in relation to not the technical aspects, but those discussions in light of what he said earlier. And just before I hand over, Mr. Wilson, made a point about the Hinkley Point C limit and whether that really can be transposed to our context and he suffered to that point as I understand deals with operational noise and the weather whether the operational noise level in their requirement for the Hinkley Point C consent should be translatable to this this project Given its operation rather than dealing with the construction period I'm going to park that if I may and come ask Mr. Brass to come to come back on it under item D on the agenda so that's that and then finally, there was a point raised where regarding road vibration again reluctant wicker market and you haven't heard from him yet but Mr. Rupert Thornley Taylor, another acoustician, who will is dealing with specifically with the row sorry rail noise matters and also vibration can ask him anything he's got to come back on on the vibration point. See if I could ask her head over to Mr. brownstone first please.

15:41

Thank you. Hello, sir. Can you hear me? Okay, thank you. It's Mike brownstone on behalf of the applicant. So just picking up on what Mr. Bear said about the daytime thresholds being lowered in the coder construction practice to 55 decibels. To be clear, that is not what we're proposing to do the thresholds that the contractor must use best practical means to adhere to remain as set out in the code of construction practices 60 decibels for the daytime. That's a 16 hour daytime including evening. What we're proposing and have drafted and sent to a Suffolk Council for their comment is the bespoke mitigation plan element of the noise monitoring and management plan that will be tailored to kick in effectively at 55 decibel. So, when the noise is expected to be above that level, the contractor will be obliged to agree methods of mitigation with the Council which which we feel gives the council a very large amount of influence and control over the works held to be a power of veto. Mr. Bear also mentioned that the bespoke mitigation plan was I think he his words were yet another sub document which which is fair, I think I alluded to the phone myself earlier. But ultimately the council asked for a bespoke process they asked for either a section 61 or equivalent bespoke process. I think that was set out in their submission deadline three at Rep. 3062. And this is our This is our attempt to meet that requirement to give them something that allows them to have influence over the works at an appropriate level. Mr. Baer also mentioned adoption of the annex e five criteria for the evening. He said that the our approach wasn't aligned for the evening. There's no recommendation in the standard for the evening period. The standard quotes what is now a planning practice guidance on minerals. It used

to be an NPS to mpg Levon had also a technical guidance note to the nppf previously, is effectively guidance for minerals extraction works. It does quote what that guidance is for evenings, but it doesn't recommend adopting it. It says quite clearly underneath the quote, Bs five to eight recommends adoption of this level 55 decibels for the daytime, there is no reference to an evening period at all. The quote in annex II five of BS five D is also fairly partial the minerals guidance is quite, quite long. It sets out various circumstances where one may go well above 55 decibels for instance, I think it sets out you can go up to 70 decibels for a period of eight weeks where there are environmental benefits such as the construction of Earth mounds or baffles, none of which is quoted in 5228. But for minerals, extraction sites, all of that in the balance is appropriate. The five to 20 is very specific about the element that it quotes and recommends and it doesn't apply to the evening. We feel the approach using the bespoke mitigation plan. Process set out in the revised newest monitoring and management plan which is assessor is not before yet but will be at deadline seven offer the council exceptional levels of control and influence at the level that they're seeking control at at the 55 decibel level. Mr. Bedford's point regarding quiet road surfaces, I think he said I quoted a reduction of point two five, I may have misheard, but it was a reduction of 2.5 was was what we base it on the numbers he quote the level two level three different types of servicing, they all sound very consistent with what we would expect. We mainly use the data from the back of I think it's Annex A of the design manual roads and bridges section la triple one which recommends a particular correction of 3.5 decibels which is 2.5 less than a standard hot rolled natural surface. So that was where my 2.5 came from. It is 2.5 quieter than a hot road asphalt service in the instance where you don't know the specification of the road subject to the discussions progressing on quite resurface. That's a matter of rather's really to deal with in terms of where it's appropriate and on what standard exactly is appropriate. My point was merely that where we have looked at it on the two village bypass it did appear to be fairly effective.

19:54

Yeah, before you go on to the next point, right, it's going to be important that explain clearly to the examination, what standard of quiet road servicing is likely to be proposed, particularly if it's going to be done in different ways in different locations as appear to be suggested by Mr. Bedford. So it is probably not something that can be answered today. But I would ask that in your conversations with the County Council, that you do provide an update, making the positions clear as to what is proposed. And obviously, if there are slightly different approaches in different locations, why that would be the case.

20:44

Thank you, sir. We will take that away and discuss with the County Council. That is all I had on my list. Mr. Flanagan, is that correct?

20:51

Can I just ask one further point and then your saying that the British Standard 5228 is not recommending a lower noise threshold in the evening. But there does appear to be a general recognition that the evening is a more sensitive time for receptors, and at different level has been accepted? Sort of triggers in terms of noise for construction on Saturday afternoons, for example, and so on. So is it still reasonable to apply the same standard across the day into that evening period? Is there a sort of precedent or guidance that would help the examining authority understand that position that you're taking?

21:47

Thank you, sir. Yes, in general terms, it is appropriate, the evening is potentially more sensitive, and it might be appropriate to lower the limit. But the limit that was applied for the 16 hour period was already much lower than would ordinarily come from, for instance, the ABC method, which is another method in the British Standard for setting noise limits, in recognition of the complexity of the works, the different types of activities that would attract different kinds of control regimes and the problems of disaggregating, the noise to apply different controls for different things in potentially very similar places. And in recognition of the duration of the works. My understanding is that the 60 decibel limit or threshold over a six year period was discussed and agreed. not formally, I think there was no difference between the party but it was discussed with the local authority in the period up to around kind of May June 2019. And it was originally derived in liaison with them.

22:47

Right, but obviously, at the moment, it wouldn't appear there is an agreed position. So, I clearly I'm going to get written submissions from both parties after today and we'll see we'll see where that takes us along with your ongoing discussions with them about the noise monitoring mitigation plan and so on. Okay, thanks. Thank you. Okay, Mr. Flanagan, whether other points you wish to cover,

23:18

Yes, Mr. Rhodes is going to get something to say on low noise road surfacing after which you can ask Mr. Thorn detailer to come in on vibration. Thank you.

23:29

JOHN Rogers, the applicants are sorry to take your time just to say that we find what most of the time so very helpful in terms of the ability to have different quality of quiet road services. There is a meeting tomorrow with the County Council and making sure this is on the agenda and try and get clarification of exactly what is proposed on which sections of road as soon as possible. Thank you

24:03

Thank you then then finally, Mr. Thornley, Taylor vibration and the question was regarding vibration, I think in wicker market and I obviously explained what is going through we can market intensive vehicles with Mr. vibration, Mr. Thornley to be able to assist you with the impacts. Thank you,

24:19

back. Vibration actually causes much less damage than is popularly believed. The issue is that when vibration is felt by people in buildings, they worry about risk of damage and they look for possible signs of damage and all buildings have fine cracks of one kind or another. If you start looking for them, you find them and people worry that vibration causes damage. In fact, it has been extensively studied in the literature and the levels of vibration necessary to damage buildings are remarkably high. This has been studied by the transport research library extensively and in the context of size, we'll see I've looked at all the evidence about vibration from road traffic and also considered rail traffic. It was mentioned earlier on heavy vehicles on roads with good paving, and in no circumstances cause damage to buildings where there are defects in the paving. one kind or another trenches, which haven't been well filled or

raised manhole covers or something like that, that's when feelable vibration occurs, but the only circumstances in which it could possibly reach levels which bottom end of the sensitivity range for building damage are where the formation underneath the road is very soft and the distance from the imperfection in the road to the nearest building is very short. And we are looking very closely at cases on the 1122 and other roads where concern has been raised to see if there are any circumstances where there is soft ground and short distances if there should be any cases and certainly our imperfections in the surface of the road on the B 1122. And where they are causing vibration they can of course be restored and rectified back to a good quality the same general points apply to rail vibration which was raised by Mr. Kemp earlier we have the unusual position on this project where when there is rail vibration that is perceptible it is caused by joints in the rail particularly on the lesson branch which will be track will be relayed so those joints will no longer be there, there is a lesser point of joints and also certain type of well on the east suffered line. And we know that that can be effects primarily actually in terms of noise from wheels going over the joints as much as vibration. But we're in the process of seeking to discover exactly where those features in the rail are so that they can where practicable be taken out of the rail and remove that source of vibration from railway operations. It So in a nutshell, vibration from both road and rail traffic is much less of an issue than is popular, I suppose. But we are alive to the concerns and taking such steps as available to eliminate it. Okay.

27:41

That's concluded things from your position, Mr. Flag Flanagan. I'll move on to the next item. Yes, it has. Thank you, sir. Thank you. So next item is daily operational noise at the main development side. And I would intend to deal with traffic noise from the new roads under item three. So if we can focus in on the operational noise at the main development side. Now, this has been raised already this morning. But in east of the council's responses, you you set out that your expectation is that operationalize criteria will be secured via a decio requirement or otherwise by the Associated documents now will fall be legally binding. Can you advise me what the current position is of the parties and whether the expectation is rolling through into an actual position? That is agreed. So have it come to a soft council first, please.

28:59

So on that particular matter, there are no controls over the operational noise that present proposed in relation to the MDS. And we think that there do need to be those controls. My understanding is that from recent communications with the applicant, it's agreed that there should be some control whether by requirement or otherwise, we think it may be more straightforward to have a requirement. But the applicant can explain its position. And then secondly, so we we through Mr. Kemp mentioned that there was a difference. We didn't explain our position. So I was going to ask Mr. Percival on the substance to indicate why he considered that the targets of 35 should be turned into a A what we say is target of 40 should be turned into 35 for the main development site and dealing also with additional proposed targets. So I was going to ask Mr. Gary Percival from AGI to summarise opposition.

30:31

Thank you. Good afternoon, sir. So, just Firstly, to summarise Mr. Kemp's comments from earlier, he suffered counsel believe that a fixed noise limit of 35 decibel la ar 15 minutes, which is a rating level in accordance with bs 4142 should be adopted for operational plant noise from the main development sites. Now, it's worth noting first that that has been adopted in the applicants assessment as a design

limit for certain components of the main development site, namely the electrical substation, the combined heat and power CHP plants, and I believe a backup generator as well. Now, our belief is that all of the noise in the main development site will be emitted by all sources in combination including the power station so that that 35 decibels LCR limit should be expanded to include all plants including the power station and should be imposed as a limit. Now firstly to get it before I get onto the reasons for why I believe that's the case I'd like to address two or three of Mr. Brownstones specific points made earlier. Firstly, that a noise limit for operational power station noise is not necessary. And the aim should just be simply to achieve the lowest possible noise levels. Now firstly, the latter point of that is, it should obviously be the case that we should be looking to achieve the lowest possible noise levels. But as for whether a noise limit is necessary, I don't think that's something that you can arbitrarily say. And I think that the residents in the immediate vicinity of the main development site would certainly disagree with that argument. Now, to move on to the 40 decibel L night level, which is adopted and used in the applicants assessment when considering absolute noise levels from the power station in particular, the L night parameter is derived from World Health Organisation guidelines, specifically the night noise guidelines for Europe, which are primarily derived from research into the effects of transportation noise and are most commonly used and applied in the assessment and control of that type of noise. Obviously, in this case, noise from mechanical plant and specifically a power station is distinctly different and this is reflected in the the overarching BS 4142 methodology which is the primary methodology in the applicants assessment. Now, the main comment to make in relation to BS 4142 is it does consider as part of the contextual considerations the influence of particular characteristics which can make the noise more distinctive. In the settlement, they've accepted this and acknowledged that tonality in particular is something which in this case needs to be considered. It's currently present in relation to noise from the Sizewell B power station. And for this reason, the applicant adopted a tonality correction or penalty of four decibels in their BSL one for two assessments. Now, this to us emphasises why a rating level limit for the power station is appropriate, because tonality is inherent in that type of electrical noise, and would be part of what anybody hearing that noise would experience. So that's why it's relevant. As far as the equivalent to the 45 decibel LAeq limit for Hinkley Point C is concerned. There's a couple of points to make on that. Firstly, there's a technical discussion which is ongoing as to whether a level of 40 decibels L night is roughly equivalent to 45 decibels LAeq. We still have misgivings regarding that. But that's something which the applicant is responding to and has done I believe in their current draft response to our queries, although we haven't reviewed that in full at this stage. Secondly, more widely on the adoption of absolute noise emitted 45 decibels LAeq simply because that's what was used at Hinkley Point. We would object to that in principle just because it's a different sites and while they are two power stations which are of equivalent design as far as we're concerned, the two sites themselves are quite different. And as was referred to earlier, we are talking about an area of outstanding natural beauty. And the idea that should just been arbitrarily transferred over is not something that we would

35:14

agree with. The third point to make on that Hinkley Point C limit is that it's an LAeq limits and not a rating level limit. So it does not include any consideration of the tonality, which the applicant is considering their assessment would be a factor in this case. Now, to refer to another Mr. Brownstones comments earlier that a rating level limit would not be enforceable or reasonable. Having discussed this with Mr. Kemp, we disagree that the rating level limit would not be enforceable in principle, I mean,

indeed, rating level limits are commonly commonly applied for the enforcement of mechanical plant noise, whether that's for a small installation or for for much larger infrastructure, plant installations as is the case here. So we would not agree with that as a principle points, whether they are reasonable or not, is obviously the subject of these discussions. So the final point that I'd like to make on this is that there there seems to be, quite clearly, a significant disagreement between if a limit was applied what the appropriate level for that should be. Now it's worth noting that as I said, 45 decibels la cued is not a rating level includes no consideration of tonality. Whereas a 35 decibel la our limits would do. And including the four decibel tonality correction that the applicant has adopted in their assessment that effectively becomes a limit of 31 decibel la q. So the point to make is that there's currently a effectively a 14 decibel disagreement between the the limit levels at which we believe that operational plant noise should be controlled and what seems to be the applicants current position. Now, during discussions the applicant has jested that the reason why they haven't targeted at lower level for the power station is for what they initially refer to as health and safety constraints, but which we more recently understand to be engineering considerations. And the fact that a power station is largely a fixed design, it includes many, potentially hundreds of individual items of plant and the process involved in reducing all of those in order to achieve a lower level is potentially challenging, if not entirely impractical. Now that just to clarify is what we meant in Mr. Kemp's earlier points about an adequate technical justification. If there is a practical engineering reason why there is a set limit at which or a lower limit at which power station was can be controlled, then that is something that we would be open to and that we would have to consider. But as yet, we've not really seen any kind of detailed explanation for why that is. The applicants more detailed operational plant noise assessment suggests that there are individual items of plant for example, rooftop compressors, and chimney stacks, which are likely to dominate or dictate the overall noise emissions. Now, it may be the case that there are engineering measures or specific engineering controls that could be applied to reduce that noise. Or it may be that that's impractical. But that's the level of detail that I believe that we're asking for in terms of them justifying the level that can be achieved in terms of operational noise from the power station. It is something which is still open to discussion. And if it ended up being that for that reason. The limit that was adopted is somewhere between what we are currently looking for and what the applicant seems to be proposing, based on Hinkley Point C, then that's something that we would be open to, but we've we feel that there is much more technical discussion or justification that needs to be provided in order to reach that point. Thank you.

39:26

Okay, are there any other interested parties who wish to make any response?

39:34

Mr. Wilson?

39:39

Thank you, Mr. Sloan, Chris Carson from task. It's just obviously I raised the issue earlier with regard to the difference between Hinkley Point and size for sight. And I just wanted to because from what Mr. Percival was saying, he mentioned the cumulative effect size will be and I was just wondering if there had been any assessment with the noise levels during the recent size will be outage. I know it's not as high as your seat size will be. Because we are aware a number of residents have been very concerned

over the last couple of weeks at the noise level during the outage. And the potential cumulative effect, if there's an overlapping our two sides will be in size, we'll see going forward particularly with the sensitive nature of the site, I think a number of residents are concerned about that. One actually said that she lived next to site will be for 32 years, and basically says that the loudest and worst noise that she's experienced, and she had raised the issue with ADF, but not really had a satisfactory explanation as to why it was so noisy this time, apparently, was he heard sort of upper damage. So it has been quite intolerable for a lot of local residents. Thank you.

41:02

There are no other hand up. So if I can come to the applicant to respond, please.

41:12

Yes, thank you, sir. I'm going to deal with the overarching points before heading over to Mr. Brown on the technical ones. And the question of whether such requirement has sought by ESC would be justified and meet the policy tests for imposition of a requirement. The applicant has accepted limits for noise operational limits, for example, for associated element plant those sites, and, for instance, on the CHP at the campus and, and it's appropriate, we accept there. And it's justified in terms of policy because the limit by influence your choice of plants, and it's something that can be a change can be made to achieve that limit. The power station itself is different. It is a huge assemblage of plant machinery and processes. It is highly regulated and state design is complex and sophisticated. And it is, in general terms not possible to redesign it for operational and regulatory reasons and not reasonable to require an applicant to do so. And its policy requirement would not satisfy the policy test in that respect. We've assessed the noise from the operational power station, we say it is acceptable. And on that basis, because that is what we're constructing, we don't say a requirement is necessary because that is the noise that it will produce. It's also relevant. Dealing with the sort of the justification for requirement as being sought is that we say we do say that it is not possible to materially get the noise level lower from the power station. And on that basis, what would be the purpose of a requirement are ERC suggesting that if their limit was imposed, and it wasn't met, that the power station would have to shut down, notwithstanding that this is the noise that the power station makes. So on that basis, also imposing a requirement, which doesn't relate to what actually the noise the power station is going to make is not reasonable and simply doesn't relate to what's being applied for it. Mr. personales final point, well, seeking more adequate suggesting is there adequate technical justification, we have sought to justify the noise that will come from the operational power station in terms of that is what it produces. There have been discussions and attempts to provide further information, obviously, we will maintain that dialogue. But the simple point is that we don't we feel that we have we have justified it and on that basis, it can't be reasonable to impose a requirement and certainly not reasonable to impose requirement below that we're at a limit below that which the power station is going the noise the power stations going to make. So that's the overarching position, sir. I'm going to ask Mr. brownstone to come back on the technical point. He spoke a little bit about earlier between the three I think levels you've been told about the council's preferred 35 decibel rating level, a 40 decibel night level and also at the 45. Level from Hinckley as imposed there. And I've been asked Mr. brass and at the same time, as I promised earlier to respond to Mr. Wilson's point about the applicability of the threshold from Hinkley in the context of a Suffolk so I'll hand over to Mr. Branson, please.

45:01

Hello, sir, can you hear me? All right Mike Brown stone on behalf of the applicant.

45:08

I will try not to get too bogged down in in very technical detail in my responses to Mr. personals point. The first point I wanted to respond to was Mr. Percival referred to his noise limit of 35 decibels at a rating level as a fixed noise limit. The point about the rating level that we have are concerned about is it is not a fixed limit, one has to take account of the acoustic character in the context of the receptor. So, that's not something that can be determined in absolute terms from the source itself, it is to be assessed in the context of the background sound levels, the acoustic character at the receptor point. And that is something that we say is a is not not a fixed number, Mr. Pierce was correct, we used a correction of four decibels based on our judgement as to what it might be. And the British Standard sets out several methods of quantifying this acoustic character correction, one of which is a subjective test. And for something that's proposed, a subjective test is all that can be applied. But it also sets out objective tests that involve measurement. And there is a considerable risk that if one went out and measured the power station, depending on the background, sound levels and the acoustic character on any given day, you get a different answer. So you would get a different quantum of rating level correction to be applied to the fixed toys from the from the power station. And we say that's an unreasonable approach. In terms of our recommendation for using the same limit for certain smaller items or plant, the CHP plants, backup generators, the substation, it is fair, we have recommended that as an approach, and it's because those are small pieces of plant that if there are issues, if they turn out to be more tonal than than was expected in advance, they can be changed for something else, you there are lots of options for controlling noise for a small piece of plant, you can screen it, you can put different noise attenuation on it, ultimately, you can change it for something else. So we will come for that's an appropriate approach for those smaller items or plant, but not for something large and complex as a power station. In terms of noise reduction that could be applied to the power station. We have further information that we've been discussing with EDF engineers over the past two weeks that we will draft into a note for deadline seven, setting out the position. But essentially, the power station is designed to achieve the lowest noise levels it can that's not to say it can't be made quieter there. There is an instance at Hinkley Point that i'll come on through in a moment where some betterment has been achieved through some detailed design measures. But in general terms, the items or plant the cause the most noise are likely to cause the most noise. There's simply nothing that can be done with them without radically redesigning the power station. So there's the turbine Hall vents at the top of the building are one of the more prominent sources on the building, to attenuate those with a require attenuation of some mass, which would change the loading on the building, it could potentially require the fans to be upgraded to a larger fan to overcome the pressure induced in the system by that attenuation. Again, that would be more mass. And as I understand it, that there simply isn't the scope within the structural design of the building to change its loading in that way. So Mr. First of all, kind of refer to our opposition being kind of health and safety type grounds. It was a very general catch all phrase for the kind of implications for the safety and inherent structural stability of the power station. Once one starts bolting on large pieces of noise attenuation equipment. I understand that Hinkley Point which does have a limit as we discussed earlier, they did find they needed to reduce some noise from some vents on the side of the turbine Hall, which they were able to accommodate within the structural loading capacity of the building and have achieved a small reduction in the noise levels. As a result, I

think it's in the order of a couple of decibels overall, it's that kind of order of magnitude. So there are elements that can be tweaked, if you like but wholesale reduction to choose something that's as Mr. Personal put it in 14 decibels lower. It's simply not feasible. The noise levels we've set out as Mr. Flanagan said, we have assessed the noise levels from the power station we set out why we think those are acceptable. And the scope for reducing those by the order of magnitude of 14 decibels is not feasible.

49:44

In terms of the 40 decibel L night value. To be clear, we haven't suggested that should be a noise limit. We use it in the contextual consideration as part of the British Standard for one for two assessment whereby we say It below that level, there is no prospect of an adverse effect. We accept that the night noise guidelines were not drafted in relation to industrial noise, it was more of a transportation based process as a document. We say that you get a very similar noise limits if you use the World Health Organization's 1999 community's guidelines for community noise. you derive a noise level from that a 45 decibel le q over the night time period, which is broadly equivalent, that's a Facade Facade level that's the point I'll come to in a second. It is broadly equivalent to the 40 decibel L night because of the way you're measuring it in the location you're measuring it. So the 40 decibels L night is a free field level. So that's measured, or quantified at least three and a half metres away from any vertical surface are no reflections, or facade level is generally measured a metre in front of a vertical surface, such as a building facade is generally three decibels higher. So that immediately means there's a three decibel difference just in terms of where it's quantified nevermind how it's quantified in terms of the noise index. we contend that a 45 decibel le q facade level is equivalent to the 40 decibel night value that we say there is no prospect of an adverse effect below that. And if the secretary state was minded to apply a noise limit, which as Mr. Flanagan summarised, we say there is there's no purpose to it. Because the power station is designed to achieve the lowest levels it can be designed to achieve, subject to small tweaks here or there. We say that 45 decibels le q facade level would be a suitable value.

51:38

Just checking through my notes to see what else Mr. Personal picked up on. I think that's caught off most of his points as Mr. Wilson's point regarding the applicability of the thresholds. It's a reasonable point that they're not identical locations, are they very similar locations, their rural locations, coastal locations, Hinkley Point doesn't have the same sensitivities and designations perhaps that that sizewell does, but it comes back to the power station is designed to achieve the lowest possible limits, or the lowest possible noise levels. And it is a set design with with very little room for variation within that. And what we can achieve is what's been set out in the assessment. Thank you.

52:33

Mr. Fleming. And then is there any further points was that concluding your responses? nothing further on that point? Thank you. Okay, I shall move on, then. I think we are now on to item three traffic noise from development during construction and operation. If I go focus initially on the early years, now, the applicant provided rep 2112 a response to some of the written questions. And then in paragraph 3.1 point one of that document applicant accepted that it would not be acceptable for the whole period of construction for the adverse effects that had been identified for the construction traffic to carry on using the A B 1122. So my question really is what guidance Do you rely upon the next Blaine's hairier

differentiated the adverse effects that you agree are unacceptable for the whole period, but is acceptable in advance with the provision of the size? Well, in need another mitigation? So if I can come to the African first, please. Yes, a

54:04

way of context that I'm not entirely sure that the when we said that we were relying on specific guidance as opposed to a more broad contextual point that those impacts such as they were should not continue for any longer than they needed to. But with that context, I'm going to ask Mr. Rhodes, to come in on that point, at an introductory sacred

54:40

John Rhodes for the applicant. So it's not so much a question of guidance in relation to noise. I think examining authority would have understood opposition that policy in relation to urgency is particularly important in this case. And we think that the way in which that translates into the appropriate thing to do is to not defer the development of the power station for two years or, or more. But to try and ensure that we limit our impacts were practical by doing several things. One is to try to get the mitigation in place the size holding road in place as soon as it can be. The second is to reduce the use of the BLM 22 through HTV limits, as far as we can practical with the construction programme. And the third is to develop mitigation proposals for the BLM 22. In the meantime, discussing those mitigation proposals with the County Council. But for example, we've advised the local authorities our intention to extend the noise mitigation scheme to all properties, fronting to be 1122. For the early years, and to have that those undulation in place before the impacts arise, whether or not they reach the thresholds within the noise mitigation schemes, as an exception to the noise mitigation scheme, recognising that the change in the use of the V 1122 is a particular characteristic of the proposals different in principle to, for instance, the change on the a 12. And we think that's a fair and appropriate thing to do. So our overall approach is to try and find the right thing to do to minimise the impact, but not to defer the development of the power station. And in that context, we think we're not far apart. I mean, I'm sure you'll hear from the authorities, but the authorities have not suggested to us that it would be proportionate to delay the development of the project to have the link road in place. First, they want to make sure we get the link road in place as soon as we can. And so do we and we're discussing the way in which that's delivered and insured through the implementation plan. But otherwise, our positioners, as I've described, to try and do the right thing for those communities, but at the same time to deliver what the government advice is an urgent priority.

57:21

Thank you. I understand that. I don't know whether it'll be you Mr. Reagan's response. But as you're on screen output, the question sort of follow up questions here. And if it needs to be answered by someone else, by all means, so that you're not relying on a particular piece of guidance that differentiates between the first three years and the next seven or eight years. It's It's merely a practical solution to the problem that you face in terms of, as you see it, the urgency of the need. And you know, if I'm speaking out of turn, please tell me, but that's, I think, my understanding. So going on from that is my understanding also correct that you don't consider it acceptable for HD traffic, HDTV traffic to be travelling through saboten along there be 1122 at night. You've obviously got no time restrictions, drop my time restrictions are built into the construction construction traffic management plan. And they're

referred to in that document, which I mentioned earlier. Rep. 2112. And in the construction traffic management plan. So is that is that correct?

58:47

So on the first point, you're absolutely right, there's no specific guidance that we can point to that tells us what the answer is, in this case, it's it's a judgement. That was a similar judgement that had to be made at angley. In relation to cannington, I know you visited you will have seen that the cannington bypass there was a question there about whether traffic through the centre of the village in the early years was acceptable in the context that the applicant would get on and build a bypass as quickly as they could. And in that case, of course, every case needs to be looked at on his own merits. But in that case, the solution was similar to that which we've proposed here, which was to get on with the bypass as quickly as possible, but not to defer the entire development but again, to look at limits and mitigation of what could be achieved. And as I age, each case is different, but the principles are, are similar. It's a balanced judgement that needs to be made. There's no absolute rules about this. We think we've arrived at the right balanced judgement, but that's better for you to to consider whether it follows that there shouldn't be HDTV movements at night and in between To say that, and we've said this directly in our, I think the documents called the SLR response paper that we've submitted, we call it as rep 2108. The way except that the using of 1122 for the full construction period would not be acceptable, it's not the right thing to do. And that would include long term daytime and nighttime movements. And our plan, our proposal is to limit the impact on the BLM 22. As far as practical, whether that extends into any nighttime movements, I'll ask Mr. Brian stone. But we did, for instance, as you would have seen in that paper, offer to offer proposed of a back the start time in the morning to 715, from seven o'clock during the early years in order to try to recognise the sensitivity of the B 1122. So whether it's an absolute principle or not, and what's practically achievable, I don't know. But our intention is to limit the impact as far as practical.

1:01:08

Okay, well, Mr. bramston is concerned he follow up? I'm going to come back in a moment, see what he says. Thank you.

1:01:28

Yeah, sorry. So I get asked Mr. browser to come in. And if he can dress the point about the extent to which the will be hgb movements, HGV movements on the B 1122. At night, so far as you can answer that and their acceptability in terms of noise impacts, obviously, you know, our position says that we are avoiding sold and policy compliance in that respect. seabees. Got anything to add on that. Thank

1:01:55

you. Second, me, Thank you, Mike Brown on behalf of the applicant. The assessment of traffic noise impacts, along with 1122 takes account of the traffic patterns as per the traffic data provided by the traffic consultants. The extent to which changing the gate hours for instance, assists, it will clearly push the traffic back 15 minutes or so. So there'll be fewer hgvs, potentially on the 1122 in the morning, and that way should reduce the noise levels and the noise impact as a consequence.

1:02:36

Yes, but the way I read it, you're saying no hgvs would leave the main development site after 2300 hours. Yeah, during those early years. So is it the intention that no hgvs? Because they won't be coming onto the site, ie that prior to 715? There will be no HGV traffic going to or from that main development site after 2300 hours or prior to 715? And has your noise assessment and the mitigation you've identified as being appropriate relied upon that position.

1:03:19

So I'm not sure I'm the best person to answer whether or not there will be any traffic on the 1120 or HTV traffic outside of those times. I think that is more of a traffic point. But in terms of how that noise assessment is being undertaken, it doesn't rely on that. So we've assessed the worst case insofar as we didn't have those. Those times in the in the traffic data that was supplied for the noise assessments, the noise assessment includes traffic HTV traffic specifically in that nighttime period, potentially, that won't be there with the altered gate times. Right. All right.

1:03:55

Well, I think from my perspective, I am and for the examining authority, I think we do need clarity on whether it is the intention for hgvs to be using the BLM 22 at night. And the reason I say that is because I don't think as written, you're prevented from doing that. Because whilst it says you wouldn't be leaving the site after 2300 You have one minute past midnight, you could leave the way I read it, and that gives me some cause for concern as to whether that has been assessed or whether it would have an adverse effect on residents at night. So hopefully you'll be able to resolve that point either from yourself all from your traffic colleagues or between you well so

1:04:53

I can hopefully do better and resolve it now because it's Kirsty McMartin who you heard from in the transport Specific hearing is is available to answer that, give an answer now if that's that's going to be useful. Yeah, that's helpful. Thank you. So I bring this Kirstie melanin who I understand is on the line.

1:05:17

with other people are having the same issue with Mr. Brown stones images frozen on my screen, I'm wonder whether they might be my end or yours. Okay, my end. Right. Okay. So, right, well, I can hear you, as well. And so if you can provide the answer, and then we'll see how we get on.

1:05:41

So customer on and on behalf of the applicant, you're correct in saying that it's not the intention for hgvs to be travelling on the 1120 to come after 11 o'clock in the early years and before or for the not to be arriving before senator Steen we're in discussions is something also that's been raised with Suffolk County Council as part of the progression of the construction traffic management plan, the ctmp in order to reach agreement with them on the controls and monitoring so that it's watertight, that there would be no HCV champions. That's the intention. There may be some redrafting of the ctmp. In order to reach agreement with Safaricom, this and to ensure that that's the case, and we haven't assessed those hgvs travelling during those times, the intention is to control it through the ctmp.

1:06:39

Yeah, no, that's very helpful. Thank you. I look forward to seeing the revision that effectively would control that scenario. Thank you. I think bearing in mind, I've still got Mr. Brown stone frozen on my ice cream. And it perhaps is not an issue for everyone else. I'm going to just briefly pass it over to my colleague, Mr. Humphrey. And he will then hopefully be able to just pick up on the next point whilst I try and log out and re log in again. But perhaps it's fair on him if I asked the question. Following on from what we've heard, could we hear from Suffolk County Council and in the first instance, and then a Suffolk Council in light of the responses from the applicant? So I'm just going to disappear for a moment, put it in the capable hands of Mr. Offering. And then hopefully we join you in a moment.

1:07:52

Thank you, Mr. maund. So Suffolk County Council first please.

1:08:00

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I think probably the best way to deal with this. First of all, just in overall terms. It's it's right that we have not asked for, for example, for a Grampian condition to prevent any of the works to the main development site until the size while link road has been provided. Obviously, that would have been the ideal position to avoid impacts on the B 1122. We haven't asked for that, because we've accepted the practicalities in terms of timescale and delivery, as put by the applicant. But the as it were, the corollary of that is that it is therefore absolutely critical that the controls that are in place to regulate what happens both in terms of when the SLR is actually provided through the implementation plan. And the controls that apply during the early years before it is provided off to us Miss Mullins terminology watertight. And we do not think that they are there yet. Albeit we are in dialogue with the applicant to see if we can reach a common position. So in a sense without introduction, what I was going to do so if this is helpful to you, is first of all to bring in Mr. There specifically on what the technical concerns are in relation to noise during the early years relative to The be 1122. And secondly then Mr. Mary, the highways manager in relation to an overview of the controls what we're seeking, and where we are, or at least where we think we are, in terms of the dialogue with the applicants. So So firstly then if I just asked me to, if he's got any specific comments on the the noise implications during the early years, and particularly hgvs on the BLM 22, particularly nighttime, nighttime and so on. Thank you. Thank you.

1:10:33

Thank you, Hello, sir Joba on behalf of Solon county council. As Mr. Bedford said that the concern really is not to frustrate the delay the the work on the power station, it's to make sure that the controls that the mitigation is in place on the existing roads is effective for the early years. And that's specifically we've we're awaiting confirmation of the number of receptors along the existing roads where the increase in traffic noise will trigger the noise mitigation scheme, which is the applicants, one of the applicants tertiary mitigation. And this is the query is based on the original and the recently revised thresholds for that. Because our understanding is that there's potentially large number of properties along the B 1122, but also along the a 12, and the villages and only a 12, which would have previously triggered the noise mitigation scheme, which recent changes suggest they're not triggered now that we're waiting for confirmation on that. But with that in mind, the focus from Suffolk County Council's point of view is on the question of quiet road services, which is obviously touched on already. And as I understand that there are some proposals in the pipeline for quiet road services at miles furred, and

little clemen. And I'm not clear, perhaps Steve Murray will be able to confirm this. What's proposed at 710 a minute more on the b1 one to two. But I think the decision has to be the once the number of properties which do exceed thresholds have been confirmed. The crucial question on a noise front is what other what other mitigation is proposed. And really apart from the noise mitigation scheme, which is obviously insulating houses. The only other really practical option on existing roads is looking at quiet road surfaces and where they will be adopted and how that will impact that what that will do to minimise and mitigate noise impacts along existing roads. I think Nash pretty passed on to Steve Mary from Suffolk County Council, he probably has a better understanding of the technical aspects.

1:12:55

Thank you. I just want to be clear, because I know that Mr. Murray had an internet problem and had to drop out that just wants to chat Mr. Mary's comfortable that he's he's sufficiently apprised of what it is that he's asked to address in order to be able to help you, sir.

1:13:13

Yes. Good afternoon, Steve Murray from Suffolk County Council. Yes, probably as the internet's being a bit awkward this morning. If you'd be so good as to repeat the question, I'll do my best to answer at

1:13:26

the issue that we release, I would ask you to help the examining authority on in the context of the B 1122. And the early years period before obviously, the delivery of the SL our terms of the controls that the county council would wish to see to reduce the impacts on the communities who are affected by the use of the B 1122. Mr. Beer has just referred to low noise surfacing for the B 11. French to road surface. He's also referred to what is envisaged in the noise mitigation scheme. In terms of other controls, hours of operation in terms of when the B 1122 may be available for use by ATVs. There's been some discussion about that and Mr. Morgan's asked some questions about how those controls will work. And so can you just explain from the county Council's perspective? What is it that the county council is looking for to provide that reassurance during the early years that there are adequate controls in place?

1:14:46

Okay, thank you. In terms of controls, the first one is and this was discussed at the previous hearing is to make sure that the caps are adequate to control the numbers of HGTV or HGTV Within the models and assume limits, that is agreed with the applicant as far as I'm aware. So that's been changed to HTV HDV limits to include the buses from the park and ride in the awkward little interval between the park and ride sites coming on the stream and the size will encroach being finished. That's the primary one. The second one is, there's been mentioned about position in terms of timing of HTV movements to and from the site. Now, in a local impact report, which is rep 1045. We made a case that we consider that it should be a control on movements on the local highway network, not just to and from the main site gate. The part the control was firstly, the communities along the a 12 and the B 1122. But also concerns about hgvs in particular lying up in lay bys overnight and then moving during the night and disturbing communities. And the third part of that is within the deed of obligation, there are two, two lines for want of a better word. One is to do with the BLM 22. Early as mitigation, that the conversations have been predominantly around road safety and pedestrian safety. But there has also been some as

yet unsubstantiated conversation about loads, noise surfacing. And then there is also a an item there, which is the B 1122. is a maintenance clause in there for maintenance of the 1122, both in the early years. And then the late years. And taken on board. The comments about vibration that made earlier on is that obviously new road surfaces or lifelight kraid noise and vibration compared to the wall. And once we have that we maintain. So we strongly support that. And from our perspective, we would also consider that that should be applied to the evolved roads on the both be 1122. So beyond the limits of the size of link road. And also the a 12 where they are evolved roads and bivalve roads, I'm talking about the single carriageway areas, which have been effectively built up by layers of Asheville added over the years rather than designed to any standard and they tend to obviously deteriorate quicker than ordinary roads. So I'm hoping that explains our position. But if you have any questions, please ask me.

1:17:33

Thank Thank you, Mr. Murray. that I think will suffice. But now as Mr. Morgan is clearly back with us, I'll pass back to Mr. Morgan.

1:17:43

Thank you very much. I think I do have a question. Mr. Murray, in terms of what you said about the HDTV numbers, as opposed to HGTV numbers is that now an agreed position that it's limited to the 300 in the early years, and it's hgvs and ATVs combined.

1:18:05

That is my understanding is is ATVs and buses inclusive. And it also includes the HTV movements to and from the size will link road ad site. And with the changes coming forward, it also include the water tankers shipping water into the main site as well. So it's an all inclusive, large vehicle measure. Thank you.

1:18:34

To the Suffolk Council have any additional comments they would wish to add?

1:18:40

No, thank you, sir, except to say that what's been said for Suffolk encompasses our position as well.

1:18:46

Thank you. So I'll come to any other interested parties whether there's any final points for you before I return to the applicant.

1:19:00

has new hands going up as far as I can see. So if I can return to the applicant, please for your response. Mr. Collins has put his hand up. Oh, has he right. Sorry. I didn't see you there. Mr. Flanagan. If I can just ask us to pause for a second and I'll hear from Mr. Collins.

1:19:21

thank thank you for that. I understand these things are not always as easy as it seems. Just to go back to the whole issue about noise in the early years. When you look at the assessments that have been

done through saboten in particular, they seem to be completely absent. When you look at the noise along lovers lane there's there are figures and numbers for it up to the point at which you get to the third and village and then if you look from the Oxford roundabout all the way to the B 1125. These these figures are there And the information is there. But when you look for something to do with their button, it seems to be completely absent unless it's in another document I have yet to find an indeed in us in the statement of common ground between stop sighs we'll see and EDF even in the latest proposed altered change, there has not been an answer to this question. So I presume and nothing is there otherwise, I'd have seen it. And that's worrying because we can't actually tell what it is that we're expected to see in terms of noise throughout saboten village, although we assume it's going to be fairly horrendous. It's interesting that the the applicant is now saying that they're going to apply noise mitigation, no matter what anybody who actually faces onto the BLM 22. But in the other hand, we still have an issue about vibration. And whilst I do understand what the applicant is saying about figuring out whether vibration will be an issue, we don't see any particular evidence of assessments being done throughout the villages about whether there is soft ground or not. And therefore, whether vibration is an issue or not. So we really still are in the dark about this, it's also interesting to see that when you look at the tables of the numbers of hgvs, that are in their assessment, they are higher than the 300 that we are talking about as a limit. So there seems to be some misunderstanding as to exactly what it is that we're expected to put up with. So always round, I think the early years are an issue as was brought out in the last transport. Hearing. in iOS, h2, we don't actually know what sort of vehicles are going to be travelling down to B 1122. And with the whole issue about the use of the SLR during construction as some sort of haul road, there's no clear indication of what is going down where and where it's coming from. So I think the whole issue of early years transport and HGTV HDV numbers is still somewhat opaque. And I think we really need to get to the bottom of that.

1:22:28

Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Cooper, I noticed your hand has now gone up.

1:22:36

Yes, thank you Mr. Ward, Richard Cooper malford. parish Council. I'm pleased to hear the discussion on quiet road surfacing and particularly pleased that in relation to miles wooden, little glenburn, the level three low ROI noise surfacing. treatment is proposed for for the two villages. So that's good news. But of course, low noise servicing doesn't eliminate the noise that you get from HGV engines and from Baldy rattling of empty, particularly empty vehicles. So I don't think that the low noise servicing fully addresses all our concerns on noise. And NPS and one guidance for mitigation says that it should be through quiet surfacing that's fine road noise barriers and landscaping as first options. But if for noise insulation is offered to residents now clearly in the in the situation, that little Gremlin and multimeter in noise barriers and landscaping are completely impractical. So we would be looking to make sure that in addition to the quad noise servicing, the applicant is going to commit to some form of noise insulation for those properties, immediately fronting the a 12 in the two villages. And I think just to go on from there. rather like Mr. Collins previously, we're very concerned that there doesn't appear to be a full suite of data that we we as laypeople can fully understand and what I will be asking the applicant to provide is a suite of baseline data for noise, air quality, and vibration. So before the construct Option stars. We know exactly what the base position is. Because only once we've got that, are we going to be able to

make any judgments once construction starts. And I think that's very important for our two villages. Thank you, Mr.

1:25:18

Moon. Thank you if I can return to the applicant and for your response.

1:25:28

Thank you. Yes, sir. So if I start with the comments from Suffolk and Suffolk, obviously, it's useful to hear the acceptance from Suffolk as high world Highway Authority that they accept the project should not be delayed pending the SLR. And also for Mr. Mary, the acceptance regarding the revised caps after the issues, transport issues, specific hearings, to be thing, Mr. Mary, explained it all inclusive, large vehicle caps. So that's helpful on the V 1122. And what is being done there in respect of mitigation. So you heard from Mr. Rhodes earlier, and it will, you'll see it in the revised version of well, either the deed and or the revised version of that noise mitigation scheme, that the offer will be extended to insulate all properties on the 1122 regardless of the thresholds in recognition of the factors that Mr. Rhodes referred to, and also to do it, perhaps explain a little more detail. We do already have in the deed of obligation. It was referred to as a couple of lines, but it's a substantive obligation, which is the B 1122, highway condition survey and contributions. And that is before commencement, SSE co have to undertake a condition survey of the B 1122. And then pay the contribution to Suffolk County Council. And that is to maintain in good repair prior to the opening of the sysvol link road to be 1122 precisely because of those concerns and to deal with imperfections and matters of that sort. So that that is already there and substance and there's an obligation on us to do that. Just before I hand over there's Mr. Collins and Mr. Kupo are asked made some comments regarding sufficiency of information regarding noise impacts in their respective communities. Surbiton and miles foods could ask Mr. brownstone to come back on that. Just one point. I want to clear up now in respective Mr. Collins, suggesting it was unclear what would be happening on the B 1122. So I don't accept that is the position particularly after the further information has been provided after the transport issue? files?

1:28:02

I lost you there I was getting constant feedback of a boss. I apologise. It may not be you it could be it could be somewhere between. But are you able to hear me now? It's just at the point you were responding to Mr. Collins. So if perhaps you could recommends from from there.

1:28:19

So yes, I'll rewind. So Mr. Collins and Mr. Cooper made some remarks about the sufficiency of information regarding if noise impacts in their respective communities. Grace, Mr. Branston to respond on that on the technical matters but identical to what Mr. Collins was suggesting about insufficient information regarding what's going down the 1122, particularly after the federal information, refer the examining authority to it provided after the transport issues specific hearings, and the very detailed HGV profiles that you had hgb profit profiles already and further ones have been provided. And you've heard also about the extended HCV caps to use the geo fence, which will include the B 1122. Mr. Collins noted that some of the profiles show vehicle ACV figures higher than the caps. That has been explained. But just in response, Miss Collins explains again, the Mr. I've lost Mr. Flanagan again, as Sorry, I'm aware that I cut out there. I've just have I returned. Can you hear me? Yeah. Thank you. So

I'll just go back and be brief that the issue about the vehicle figures exceeding the caps in the profiles that as as was explained the vehicles will be smoothed out to comply with the cap. So the caps they're binding, we can't exceed them. So it won't be the case that there will be vehicles in excess of those caps. So those are the points I wanted to deal with. I'm not going to ask. Firstly, Mr. brownstone to deal with the points about sufficiency of information about impacts on the B 1122. In terms of noise, and also into in miles food sponsored, Mr. Cooper. And then after that, Mr. Rhodes, in response to the further points raised in respect of quiet road surfaces, it's already come up a couple of times, but some further points made by Suffolk County Council and Mr. Baer about road services and what might be reasonable in that respect. So firstly, Mr. brownstone please.

1:30:58

Hello, Mike Brown on behalf of the applicant. Just before I answer the point that Mr. Feigin asked me to I just want to chat with Mr. Flanagan, whether he wants me to respond or Mr. Bear's more technical points. Yes. Okay. So I'll address Mr. Bear's technical points to start with. Mr. Bear suggested that they were waiting for confirmation of a number of properties that may fall either within or without of the noise mitigation scheme, given the change in the criterion. So to be clear, the original approach in the noise mitigation scheme for existing roads was to roll out the same set of criteria, as replied to new roads. So that's exceeding a daytime facade level of 68 decibels and nighttime facades level of 58 decibels and to be a change of at least one decibel. And there's also a third test, which has to do with the contribution of the new road have a decibel as well, that's simply trance transferred straight from the noise insulation regulations. on reviewing that approach for existing roads, because the thresholds for the assessment of existing roads or resisting roads are different. So the design manual roads and bridges requires the existing roads, the treatment effects of use good construction traffic on existing roads, is a different set of tests, it is just purely a change in level test. And the significant effect occurs at plus three decibels. So we've realigned the noise mitigation scheme for existing roads, so it matches that so it still has the same two tests against the 68 decibels, daytime and 58 decibels nighttime, but it now is triggered at plus three decibels not plus one. So that's that's the question. Mr. Bear has asked. Just the reasons why that has changed. We consider that to be a fair, reasonable and compliant, policy compliant approach. There's no entitlement or statutory provision to insulation from noise from existing roads. To the best of our knowledge, there's no equivalent installation scheme associated with an insert that makes an offer to address the effects of traffic on roads that are not new or altered, whatever the change in noise level. So we believe that the noise mitigation scheme is a significant generous offer, which goes well beyond a simple transposition of the statutory provision and avoid the noise mitigation, importantly, addressing issues not related to the project. So we say that those impacts that are below three decibels are not significant effects from the project, they're an existing issue. So we have responded to Mr. Bear's request for details a number of properties. And that is say that we we have not supplied a number of properties because the assessment method doesn't require us to count them is simply a change in noise level along the road link is what is required by the the assessment method. So that is what has been done. We acknowledged in our, in our correspondence with Mr. Baer, that there are sections of the a 12, that are predicted to have an increase of around one and a half decibels. Under the original criteria, they may well have fallen under the noise mitigation scheme, they may have been eligible if they met the absolute noise thresholds as well. And under the revised approach, they won't. So Mr. Bear's underlying point is correct, and that there is a difference in the number of properties that will be eligible, but we don't quantify it, because it's not required from the assessment

method. So far. I believe the quite resurfaces point to Mr. Rhodes in respect of MOSFET and little klemen and bm 22. Just to pick up the points for Mr. Collins and Mr. Cooper regarding the sufficiency of the assessments. As far as we're concerned, we have considered all relevant road links and that includes right the way along the 1122 through saboten, through the middle to more right up to the Oxford, and they're all set out in the in the cemetery assessments, we're not aware that we've missed any road links. It is all set out as a change in noise level as is consistent with the required assessment method. We're not aware that anything has been missed. perfectly happy to discuss that outside of the examination of Mr. According to Mr. Cooper can pointed to where we've missed something, but we contend that we've covered all relevant roads. I'm sorry, I will pass over to Mr. Rhodes now. Sorry, thanks for the prompt.

1:35:20

Thank you, John Rhodes, the applicant, and I don't have a great deal board certified and quiet road services. But just one or two points that that arose. It was suggested, I think that, you know, apart from quiet rate services, there's not very much you can do. But I think it would be fair to reflect quite how much we are doing in order to reduce noise impact from road traffic. And of course, it starts with the freight management strategy and massive investment in rail and sea infrastructure in order to reduce HGV movements and allow us to limit them in the way that we have. It also includes investment in the park and rides and the freight management facility for operational reasons, but also with the consequences that allows us to regulate and reduce and control in time, the movement of vehicles to and from the main site. And then, of course, we're proposing to build bypasses as well, to those communities most affected bypasses in the case of the two villages, which have been sought for decades in which there is no prospect without this development, and the size will link road which is a response to recognition of the issues affecting the video 1122 but something which we are committed to and something which brings very significant benefit in the short ish term, certainly the medium term and definitely the long term to those communities. On the question of numbers of properties, Mr. Brian stones explained the technical position, I can just compliment what he said to some extent, by saying that the number of properties on the B 1122, that we think would be covered by the extended noise mitigation scheme offers 84 properties that we understand front, the VA 1122, Mr. bridenstine will correct me if I'm wrong, but if we were to provide, simply apply the thresholds in the noise mitigation scheme, to the B 1122, it would be about a quarter of that number. He's nodding at me across the table. So under the criteria for this scheme, about a quarter would qualify, we think is right to extend that to all properties facing the B 1122. We've done the referencing and we have a list of properties, which we think is 8484 properties. And then the question of whether we should do something from outside and it'll go and we are, we're very happy to do that. And in detailed discussions with the parish councils there and the county council in order to arrive at the appropriate mitigation scheme to limit the impact. And we want to discuss quite road surfacing with the County Council including the detail of that tomorrow, there comes a point at which I don't think we're being expected to resurface the whole of the a 12. But we do think we're responding appropriately to the concerns that have been raised. And we continue to want to have those discussions with the County Council and the District Council to arrive at appropriate package mitigation. But I think all of the headings that have been raised today in this context are being addressed, including the condition surveys, Mr. Brown stone stares at the V 1122 in order to address mitigation, as well as noise issues. So we do think that this represents a fair and substantial mitigation package, not suggesting that it's yet complete in terms of the discussions we're

having. But I think it'd be fair to recognise that we've responded very positively to the issues that have been raised. Okay, thank you.

1:39:04

Mr. Flanagan. Does that conclude the responses you wish to me? It does. Thank you, sir. I can bring in my colleague Mr. Humphrey. He has a question in light of some of the comments that have been made via Tom Ferry.

1:39:20

Thank you, Mr. Moreland. Mr. Flanagan, I heard what you said about the caps, the HTV caps and the profiles submitted and the fact that will be smoothed out but by the cap. What, correct me if I'm wrong, but you haven't provided a smoothed out profile, you just provided the raw operational, this is how we model it without any caps. Now my concern is does the cap end smoothing it out? Do you move it? Move the HDV movement more HDV movements at quieter times. So I suppose what I'm asking could you provide a profile with the caps in place

1:40:02

So in response to the loss, Mr. Rose to come in a bit in response to about whether we move it to the less sensitive times, we'd still be bound by the limit time limit caps, which you find in the ctmp, the 7:15am to 11pm. So it couldn't be that, beyond that, in as to whether we could provide a smoothed out HGTV profile, I can certainly go back to the team and find out whether that is possible. So I'll certainly take that point away what you say there. And then if I could just hand over to Mr. Rhodes, who is

1:40:42

a John Rhodes an applicant? Sorry, I can't add very much to that I just wanted to explaining in case. Others have been confused by what we showed, I think. So you will understand that the profile that we presented, identify what we thought the profile would be without the cap. That's why we exceeded the cap, there's no, obviously no intention to exceed the cap, we have to manage the traffic to stay within the cap. And as you say, so that means that the traffic will, the profile will have to change. And we'll certainly talk to the team about how we can do that. But so you'll probably remember from the issue specific hearing that when we presented the profile, and showed the line of the cap, there was some what you might call white area, under these, the cap were areas where we wouldn't reach the cap. So the consequence of the two things to say about that. One is that has enabled us to recognise that we could commit also to provide to include buses within because the buses kick in in that second of the early years, where there was some I don't know, it's very helpful to say white area underneath the the cap, but I think you'll understand what I mean, our profile wasn't suggesting we're going to meet the cap every day, there was some spare capacity there within the cap. And we thought, Well, that certainly allows us to commit to cap the HDV movements at that time, as well. And it will mean as you identify that some which would have occurred above the capital, the busiest days will have to come below the cap, but an absolute guarantee that they would be within the cap. And we'll do what we can to try and see what the profile could look like on that basis. But it will, I think require the transport coordinators, the time to manage traffic on a day to day basis through the delivery management system just to make sure the cap is always observed. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Bond.

1:42:43

Thanks, Mr. Humphrey. Thank you, Mr. Rose. I'm just conscious of the time it's just approaching half past one. It's probably appropriate that we take a break. And so if we can resume at quarter past two, please. And again, a reminder to those of you on live stream, you will need to refresh your browsers upon your return. So we can adjourn for the moment and resume at quarter past two. Thank you very much.