

# AUDIO\_SizewellC\_ISH8\_Session1\_25082021

00:05

Good morning, everyone and welcome. It is now time for me to open this issue specific hearing which is being held in connection with an application made by nnb generation company, s c Ltd. For an order for department consent for the construction, operation and maintenance of the size of our seat project. Before I go further, can I confirm with the case team that I can be heard? And then my camera is working? Yes, I confirm. I can see and hear you. And can you also confirm that recording and live streaming has commenced? Yes, both have started. Thank you very much. For those people watching the live stream. Let me explain that if the proceedings are adjourned at any point, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. When the meeting is resumed, you'll need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted live stream. I'll endeavour to remind you again if this should we need to adjourn. Now let me introduce myself and my colleagues. My name is Edwin Moreland and I'm a chartered template. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the panel of examining inspectors that together comprise the examining authority for this application. The other members of the panel wente MCI, Ellen Cassini, Neil Humphrey and David Brock. And now them now introduce themselves to you.

01:39

Good morning, everyone. I'm went in the car. Hi, I'm an examining inspector and lead member for the panel. I now hand over to Mrs. Cassini.

01:51

Good morning, everybody. My name is Helen Cassini. I'm a chartered town planner and also been appointed as a member of the panel. I'll now hand it over to Mr Humphrey.

02:03

Good morning, everyone. My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer and I've been appointed to be a member of this panel. I'll now pass over to Mr. Brock. Good morning, everybody. My name is David Brock.

02:17

I'm retired solicitor and Secretary of State has appointed me as a member of this examining authority and I shall now pass it back to Mr. Moreland. Thank you. Now we assisted at this hearing by the playings Patrick case team. Today we have the case manager Sean Evans, and other colleagues from the inspector who will assist Georgiana Hannigan and Jake Stevens. If you have any questions or queries about the examination, or the technology we are using for virtual events, they should be your first point of contact. their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you have received from us or on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website. Before I get into the main part of the hearing, right now asked Mrs. Cassini to highlight a few housekeeping and background matters for today.

03:12

Thank you. As explained in the examining authorities, we will late later annex D. The issue specific hearings will be live streamed and recorded. Recordings will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible after each hearing closes. To assist viewers and listeners, anyone speaking should introduce themselves each time they speak. As the recordings were obtained and published, they form a public record that can contain personal information to ensure general data protection regulation applies. The rule like that includes a link to the planning inspectorates privacy notice, which provides further information on this topic. If there is a need to refer to information that participants would otherwise wish to be kept private and confidential. It should be in written form which can be redacted before being published. If you prefer not to have your image recorded, you can switch your camera off. I will repeat the request made in the arrangements conference. But in order to minimise background noise, please ensure your microphone or telephone is muted, and that you stay muted unless you're speaking during a physical hearing, we would normally have breaks to avoid fatigue. We'll do the same in this virtual hearing. Our intention is to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minute intervals and a longer break on for lunch periods. I'll now hand up to my colleague Mr. Humphrey, who will explain the purpose and conduct of the issue specific hearing today.

04:40

Thank you Mr. Cassini. The issue specific hearing provides an opportunity for the issues raised by interested parties, and in particular the differences between them to be explored further by the examining authority. The purpose of an issue specific hearing is set out in Section 91 of the Planning Act 2008. is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary for examination to hear oral representations to enable adequate examination of the issues or to ensure that an interested party has a fair chance to put their case. As indicated in the agenda questioning at the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by other panel members, is for the examining authority to determine how hearings are to be conducted, including the amount of time to be allowed at the hearing, for making of a person's representations. Our aim is to use our powers of control over the conduct of hearings to ensure that they are carried out as efficiently as possible. Whilst remaining fair to all parties and threatening our examination of the evidence. We have identified the matters to be considered at this issue specific hearing, and those on which we require further information. These are set out in the agenda published in advance of this hearing. participants should note that written summaries of your oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the planning Inspectorate by deadline seven, that's Friday, the third of September 2021. Finally, I'd like to reassure you that all members of the panel are present and listening carefully to what you have to say at all times during the hearing. However, we are not all remaining on the screen. Throughout this we wish to minimise the demand on the IT systems to ensure the best quality of audio and video for participants. I will now hand back to my colleague, Mr. maund, who will continue with the introductory matters. Thank you.

06:40

I'll now ask the applicant followed by interested parties who were named on the detailed agenda to introduce themselves. Who speaks for the applicant today.

06:52

Sir, good morning ID My name is Hugh Flanagan. I'm a barrister instruction on behalf of the applicant. And I have with me various experts who I will bring in at various points in the day. Thank you. Thank you. He suffered counsel please. Good morning, sir. I'm

07:14

Andrew Tate QC, appearing for ees safwat Council on the noise and vibration topic. And I'm going to be accompanied by Mr. Mark camp who's the council's environmental protection officer and two experts from Adrian James acoustics. Mr. Joe bear and Mr. Gary Percival. The county council will be leading on road traffic noise so we will be likely to follow them on those matters. And later on on air quality. This is a better tougher will be appearing for the council. Thank you very much.

07:53

So if I can come next to Suffolk County Council.

08:00

Good morning, sir. Morning panel. My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel. I'm instructed by sharp Pritchard on behalf of the County Council. And today, as Mr. taters indicated Mr. Baer of a J. A consultants has been jointly instructed by the county council as well as the District Council and will deal with matters in relation to road traffic noise. And, if necessary, I may need to also introduce Mr. Steve Mary, the transport policy and development manager who you've already heard from on general highways matters. Thank you.

08:49

I come to Allison downs Next please. Or is it Mr. Collins, and I don't think Carson towns has arrived yet. So if I come to Mr. Collins for stop sighs well see.

09:02

Good morning as demand for inviting me for this. Yes, for both stop sighs while C and seven is bridge parish Council. Thank you. Are you expecting? Alison I'm not expecting Alison at this point now.

09:18

Thank you very much. And Mr. Christopher Wilson from together again. sighs well see please. Good morning this morning. Chris. Watson from together grain size will say thank you. And next on my list. Caroline rinda from leston Town Council.

09:48

Hello, it's Maryam wolf from lichen Town Council. Okay apologies. Karolina is the Clark and she's and she And, and it's different counsellors are speaking on different issues. So, so it's she she does the registration, but it's one of us who, who is here. So, thank you. I may not speak unless what I've got to say seems particularly relevant. That's absolutely fine. Okay, thank you very much.

10:28

Is Mr. Ashton from the Oxford parish council here? don't appear. Don't believe he's arrived yet. If I

10:38

Mr. Moron, this is John Sutton. I'm also from Yorkshire parish Council and I will be covering because Paul Ashton can't attend today. So I'm representing the Oxford parish council as well as myself. Again very much while the previous speaker I won't be specifically commenting in this. I've got something to back. Thank you. Thank you very much.

11:08

Okay, is Nigel Haley with us from Saxmundham Town Council.

11:17

Good morning, sir. town Councillor representing Saxmundham Town Council. I may not be commenting if the points which have already been raised by the Council are covered in sufficient detail. Thank you. Thank you very much.

11:36

come next to us. Sonia Exton from Wigan market. parish Council.

11:44

Yeah. Hello, good morning. And yeah, hi. I'm speaking on behalf of the working group on wicker market parish Council. And there are several points on the agenda that I think we would like to refer to. So I'm assuming that as you come to them, we will then get an opportunity to speak.

12:02

That's right. I mean, I'm likely to go to a sort of cast on the applicant first in most cases, but then I'll invite other interested parties for their views. And obviously, the applicant will have the final say on each item. Right. Okay. That's fine. Thank you. Thank you. And is Mr. Zanna Paul's Anna from Craig consulting here

12:30

are Good morning, sir. Yes, Paul Santa from Craig consulting. We represent a number of landowners along the affected route. I would just like to say if I could bring in my colleague who will be more involved with the acoustic noise aspects, and that's Mr. Jody Blacklock. Unable to introduce himself be fantastic. Thank you. Yeah. Thank you. Is he going to do that? Marilyn? Yes. Yeah, I

12:57

can do that. Now. One. Morning, sir. My name is Jodi Blacklock. And yes, I'm going to be looking after the noise and acoustics for these these parties. Thank you very much.

13:11

And Francis Crone, x, please.

13:20

Good morning. Francis Crowe's resident of East Suffolk. And I would like the opportunity to speak today.

13:30

And I think Mr. Lawrence moss is the last name I have for you. able to introduce yourself, although I don't have a camera working today. No, I never have been working today. But I can see you. I'm Lauren smos. I'm interested in the air pollution. Okay, well, I can hear you fine. So that's that's absolutely no problem. So thank you. I note that there are other people in attendance today who have requested to speak in the hearing, but not on the list of invitees set out in the detailed agenda. I won't ask you to introduce yourselves right now. But the first time you're invited to speak, please can you introduce yourself by giving your name and the name or names of the organisation or people that you represent? I hope you've all had a chance to read the detailed agenda for the hearing. During the hearing today, I have a number of questions for the applicant and other invited parties. I am aware that there are a number of interested parties who may wish to speak on some of the agenda items. Once I finished my direct questioning on an agenda item I will ask if interested parties would like to make any submission relating to that item before moving to my direct questioning on the next item. I remind you this is not an open floor hearing on policy. On on noise, and air quality, and submissions made already should relate to the agenda items and particular questions raised by those items that are being discussed. I understand there may be other issues not on the agenda that parties may wish to raise. But these matters should be made in writing a deadline seven, which is the third of September 2021. I do want to get through all the agenda items today and hear from everyone that wishes to speak. So it would assist if you can keep your responses succinct, and to the point, your cooperation with this approach will be much appreciated. I would also remind you that under Section 94 of the Planning Act, the examining authority may determine the amount of time to be allowed at the hearing for the making of a person's representations may refuse to hear evidence which is in its view irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, or related to the merits of policy setting the national policy statement or impedes representations already made. The main documents I'll be referring to have been set out in the detailed agenda for this hearing. So I won't be reporting this now. So before I go on to the main item, I noticed that Mr. Cooper has put his hand up.

16:30

Mr. Q Yes, good morning this morning and I'm an invited party. I'm here on behalf of Mulford parish Council. And I will be wanting to speak on a number of issues.

16:42

Sorry, if I missed you at the beginning there, Mr. Cooper, thank you for letting me now. Okay, thank you. Okay, so before we get into the first time from yesterday at the open floor hearing, issues regarding particulate matter monitoring were raised. And I think it would be helpful to hear from ees of a council and the applicant. Now, if that's all right, so if I can just come to the Civic council first to give me an update, following yesterday's comments, and floor hearing.

17:32

Good morning, says Isabella for here for the Suffolk Council. And I would like to introduce if I may, Dr. Mark brimfield, who's an expert from Ricardo who has been engaged by suffer counsellor respective air quality. Thank you. I think you're muted, Mr. brimfield.

17:58

apologise. Good morning, sir. Yeah, my name is Mark Broomfield advisor to a Suffolk Council. So if I understand correctly, there was some comments yesterday requesting clarification around the monitoring strategy, which focuses on nitrogen dioxide and pm 10. But doesn't focus on Pm 2.5. And that's the point we're trying to understand you wish me to address if that's correct.

18:26

I think it is that but also, I think there's been concern on in a number of representations that he suffered council don't do monitoring of some of the particulate matter at the moment. Confirmation whether that's correct, would be helpful. And also, obviously, in light of your discussions with the applicant, what the future proposals are in, in monitoring these different elements.

18:52

Thank you, sir. So firstly, to explain that, in principle, the monitor air quality monitoring strategy is designed to be a backstop if you like. So we don't expect there to be significant impacts. And the monitoring programme is there as a check on that assessment. So if we do find something, then that shows just that there's a problem upstream with the controls that are being applied. So this is not our primary control mechanism. This is a kind of a check on what's going on. So with that in mind, we then focus on in our discussions with the applicant on monitoring the substances that we expect to be able to detect to provide us with our indication of problems. So for traffic and nonroad Mobile machinery, the main pollutant is oxides of nitrogen, and that's why we're focusing on monitoring NOx and no two in the locations that are potentially affected by those pollutants. Then as regards other sources, particularly fugitive dust sources, the focus there is on monitor During dust deposition, and on the larger fraction of particles, because that will be released in larger quantities than the finer fraction. So that's why we focus on Pm 10, which is the larger fraction of airborne particulate matter, rather than on Pm 2.5. So it's not because Pm 2.5 is not important, it really is important. And it has been the focus of considerable assessment and evaluation. But there's much less value in monitoring that that's much less likely to indicate to be indicative of any problems. We focus on paytech pM 10, because that's more likely to be released from the sources of dust arising from construction activities. So that's the focus of why the the monitoring programme has been designed the way it has. I think my understanding from discussions with the Suffolk council offices is that the council does not currently monitor Pm 2.5 in the borrower, clearly that will be beneficial at a more a more general level. And it may be that some monitoring for Pm 2.5 could be carried out as a as a further extension to the plan monitoring programme. And I'm sure the council would would very much welcome that. But I think in terms of monitoring and mitigating the impact of this development, then nitrogen dioxide, dust deposition and pm 10 are the key pollutants to include in the monitoring programme.

21:25

Thank you and who is actually going to be undertaking the monitoring.

21:34

That isn't that I believe that's a mixed picture depending on where the monitoring is carried out. So I'd have to check the exact details. But it will be shared between the contractor contractors themselves to carry out monitoring or whether that may be carried out by at a high level within the monitoring company is a question for for Sizewell C, to address. But I believe it was also an undertaking to fund extensions to the council's own monitoring programmes, for example, offsite locations where that's the most cost effective way of carrying out monitoring, for example, at locations close to the A12. Okay, thank you. If I can then come to the applicant, please.

22:21

Yes, thank you, sir. On this matter, I'm going to bring in Dr. Richard Lowe of a calm to set out the applicants position on the justification and necessity of monitoring of particular matters, particularly Pm 2.5 and Pm 10, which you've just heard about. So I'm going to read Dr. Richard Lowe now, please.

22:45

Morning sir. So, we agree with the position of Isa for Council in that we are proposing to undertake Pm 10 monitoring in around the various sites particularly to focus on the construction defects and make sure that the mitigation in place is delivering the control required and dust deposition monitoring will also be undertaken. The monitoring will be undertaken by size will see the contractors and reported to the environment review group. The no to monitoring around the site will similarly be undertaken by the applicant. However, in addition, as identified by DOD revealed the no to monitoring on the road network at identified points that is currently undertaken by a Suffolk council will continue to be supported financially by the applicant, and that's been agreed through the deed.

23:47

Okay, thank you. Okay. We'll come back to that later on in the agenda, but I just wanted to hear from both main parties at the outset following the open floor hearing yesterday. So I won't invite other interested parties in at this stage, but you will have a chance to come in when we deal with that part of the agenda later on. So if I can come now to the noise and vibration impacts of the proposed development, which is agenda item number two, and whether the potential noise and vibration impacts of the development can be satisfactorily assessed from the information submitted by the applicant. Now, he suffered Council and the local impact report sections 18.21 initially, were expressing concern about the alignment of the noise assessment of not being aligned to the national policy statement or the mpSC which is the noise policy statement for England or also expressed concern the noise level noise levels, maybe under estimates. And that was also sets out in the relevant representation number 342. As I understand it, additionally, noise impact from the land east of the Eastland Industrial Estate discussions are also ongoing about their the receptors Park and right science whether they are appropriately identified. So if I can come first to piece of accounts with please, on those aspects, if you can let me know what the latest position is, please.

25:44

Thank you, sir. says, you know, as you indicated, there were a number of issues as to adequacy of information that was set out, particularly in the, as you noted, the Li R, but also in the initial statement of common ground, and in the two requests for information at rep 331 and rep 632. And we've had

responses to the first, and there is dialogue in relation to the second. And so I get to turn to Mr. Mark camp, to address the question to a little too, what is the additional information that we are still seeking and to summarise that if that's, that's helpful, thank you.

26:35

Good morning, sir. Mark camp for a Suffolk Council. We're in discussion with the applicant over a variety of aspects to do with noise and vibration. Broadly separate into rail, construction and operational noise. There's a amount of information that is still outstanding from from our point of view. And that includes in terms of quality of information, which I'll address as well, for rail noise, where we're mainly looking at the rail noise mitigation strategy, the RMS and in terms of the the weather affirm commitments made within it, and the the language of that document, which we regard needs tightening in certain instances. We're also looking for confirmation of deliverability of that document. And all the measures contained within now the measures set out in the crowd noise mitigation strategy. Secondary mitigation, the outcomes of the round noise assessments are relying on on those measures being delivered in full. And at the moment, there's there's no clear confirmation as to whether there's a deliverable by by the applicant or or Network Rail in terms of their recent statement of common ground, which is rep 5095. Also, the scope of the round noise mitigation strategy, we think needs to be increased to include the in track upgrades to the supply chain. And also noise barriers where appropriate, which I'll talk about a bit further shortly. Other information that's outstanding, in terms of round noise with the applicant includes the number of receptors and the groups of receptors that have been defined as adverse and significant adverse impacts and distances, groundball noise along the laced and branch line and the suffered line, which is a question we've asked in RFI 50, which was submitted at rep 6032. We're also waiting to hear whether there are resilient rail pads present along the full length of the Suffolk line. The the assessment has has assumed this and if they're not present along the whole of the seventh line, we need to know what effect that has on the the assessment outcomes and retention to noise barriers. We need to understand better whether there are areas where noise barriers would be worthwhile a feasible form of mitigation against airborne round noise. I know they there was a submission in terms of appendix II It was responses to the written submissions by the applicant, which has identified visual visual immunity as a significant issue to those barriers, we will be submitting a document deadlines seven, which discusses that, we think there is still scope for for further assessment, taking into account the balance of the the acoustic benefits, rather than just discounting them on the basis of visual amenity.

30:33

Moving on to construction noise, construction noise, the outstanding issues with construction noise assessment relate mainly to the thresholds in the csep in the noise mitigation scheme, and other mitigation measures. Our issues are mainly about the outcomes and the practical issues surrounding the the outcomes of the assessments as opposed to the information provided. So we're not at the moment looking for any further information beyond sort of the refreshed assessments and things that they've actually committed to further down the line anyway. And in terms of operational noise, we are looking for an adequate technical justification for why the the same absolute night noise criterion, which includes appropriate consideration, atonality has not been adopted for the operation of power station, as is adopted for all other operational plant noise on the main development site, that being 35 Db Li and summarises our position on outstanding information with the applicant.



31:47

Thank you. Thank you. Can I turn now to other interested parties to see whether there was anyone who wishes to make any comment on this particular item? Mr. Bedford from Suffolk County Council.

32:10

Thank you. So microbead Suffolk County Council just briefly, we echo the issues that have been raised by a Suffolk Council. And many of those matters carry across to information that is further sought in relation to the road traffic noise effects. And as has already been explained, by Mr. Kemp, there is a dialogue ongoing, some information has been provided, some requests for information have been answered, others are still outstanding. So don't cover that further. But then there is also in relation to the road noise, the number of receptors along existing roads, where increases in road noise will trigger the noise mitigation scheme. Information is still sought on that. And then also in terms of mitigation measures, specifically quiet road noise surfaces, and the maintenance arrangements for those both in relation to new and existing roads, and the feasibility of including noise buns as a mitigation measure within the new road proposals and information on what is both being fully intended, what is achievable, and what more could be achieved. In order to bring the noise impacts closer to the local level. I know you've got a separate item to talk about the levels, but we are still seeking further information to satisfy ourselves that as much as practical can be done is being done in relation to mitigating the the road traffic effects of noise.

34:05

Thank you. I turn next to Mr. Collins, please.

34:14

Thank you, Mr. Moore. I would echo some of the points that Mr. Bedford just made about that noise monitoring, particularly along the B 1122. Where in certain areas that are no background values at all, for what is going on there. And especially during the noise impacts and vibration impacts during the early years. I realised that in the next also in the next session in section three. So we'll come back to that but there are certainly evidences is not forthcoming in some of these areas. And we'd like to see that strengthened. Thank you. Okay, son, you're excellent

35:03

Yes, thank you. I think we might stretch into point three as well, actually, I mean, when we, when I first looked at this question, and I agreed to this question, the assessment of the noise and vibration, the impacts of the proposed development, we looked at the environmental statement warning for chapter four noise and vibration and looked at the figures, and actually, the, the receptors and the monitoring locations are all around the southern park and ride for traffic noise, there doesn't appear to have been anything located anywhere around wicker market itself, which, upon which the a 12 obviously runs alongside. And, and the, the amount, the noise level on the A 12 is shown to be significantly high on the actual figure that is given around the southern park and ride. But obviously, that that speed is going to be slow down to 40, I believe, but along the a 12. Prior to that, that speed will be at the normal speed. And I think what we'd really like to see is some monitoring taking place there of how that traffic sound will travel. I mean, as a resident of work at my I can hear the traffic off the 812 attend to five in the

morning already with an extra 1000 plus vehicles that that's obviously going to increase so we would like we don't believe that we have been monitored. Well, we haven't been monitored. There's been no sign of any monitoring taking place. Thank you. Okay. Richard Cooper.

36:43

Thank you, Mr. Moulton, Richard Cooper, multiple parish Council. Can I just specifically addressed to a two, I think a Suffolk Council have already picked up that they would like to see an extra receptor noise receptor included for the southern park and ride. We agree with that. We flagged it on several occasions it's the Ford gate house. In Ford road. miles furred. We believe that should be included. We also believe that miles would hold should be included. It's further away than the gate house. But the geography of the area of the topography of the area is such that miles with holes hits on the other side of the valley to the park and ride and the prevailing wind is southwesterly and will carry noise across the valley to both miles food itself and to miles and haul. So we'd like to see that see those two included as additional noise receptors. Okay, thank you. Simon malad.

38:00

Good morning. I'd just like to say about the choice of the monitoring location for the green railroads which I don't think satisfactory, the one used on the element from you know, for the route used to give the baseline nighttime level readings. Okay.

38:31

My next speaker is Nigel Haile.

38:41

Thank you, sir. I'd like to express the same concerns it's on your ex donut, we can market the a 12 runs next to two estates on the edge of Saxmundham at the moment. And, as has been stated, with the prevailing wind conditions, the road noise can sometimes be quite significant. With the hundreds of additional HDTV movements that noise is likely to increase. Additionally, of course, we've got the proposed Saxmundham get garden neighbourhood to the south of the town which will also be impacted by that road noise and request if not already been monitored, that monitors are put in place for that noise. Additionally, I don't know whether it's covered to this point, but there is the question of rail noise through the middle of Saxmundham. If the proposal for the nighttime rail goes ahead, I would like to stress that will there will be a significant impact of course on residents of the town. So I'd like to confirm That monitoring will be in place for that also. Thank you. Thank you. Jody blacklock, please. Good morning, sir. Yeah, I'd just like to point out that we've had some monitoring ourselves on behalf of our clients. And we were concerned primarily with with the quality and the duration of their monitoring, which had been undertaken for the baseline levels. In certain aspects, it was for two periods of 30 minute measurements during the daytime, and similarly for nighttime levels. So we've actually gone through that we've done a week's worth of noise monitoring, and the the measurements we have measured there were significantly different, sort of seven to eight decibels lower than 10, has been reported in the baseline report. And then also talking, as Mr. Kemp's pointed out about the threshold levels, which have been using the assessments, excuse me, the construction calculations, which were also used in the assessment, they appear to be for a single elements of plant, which realistically should should be done on a cumulative basis. And, again, when we go through using the same calculations as

these guys, we've come out with, again, sort of six decibels different in in so much as the construction calculation for the noise levels. I've also got concerns about the mitigation which has been proposed from the borrow pits, and also the working hours, which is going to be potentially causing a bit more of a nuisance for the residents.

41:50

Can I just clarify when you're talking about working hours, you're talking about the main development side or the associated development sites because they're different.

42:00

The working hours for the borrow pit so that's, that's comes on? I believe it comes under the main construction phase. Yes. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. And mystery and Galloway, please.

42:20

Good morning, Mr. Moreland. Ian Galloway, a private resident of counsel Come come to small points that I'd like to raise. I've been doing reviewing the rail noise mitigation strategy as to five, eight. And at the moment, I don't seem to be able to conclude anything other than the Rondo provisions to mitigate minimise railway noise and vibration that might arise during the sacrament interlaced, and branch line uplift works within the noise mitigation strategy. The second point is that in the same document, it would appear that there will be no real noise mitigation strategy in place until sometime during the early years or even longer than that. But in that sense, there is no temporal information that enables us to get a full understanding of the potential nuisance, and noise from the railway. And the final last point in the same vein, is I've been reviewing the draft noise monitoring and management plan, Rep. 6029. And I've been unable to locate the associated plans for the SLR and saxman interlaced and branch line upgrade works. So again, in terms of the information that's made available so far, I don't believe I'm able to understand the full likely impacts.

43:47

Thank you. Okay, thank you. And, Chancellor, I think he's trying to come up.

43:57

Thank you, Mr. Moore. And john several parish Council for Yorkshire parish Council. If I could just echo the point made by Mr. Haley at Saxmundham. Your Oxford we are very concerned about the 812 leading up to the B 112 Junction, particularly early years will be heavy traffic there have just had to be joined. I would like to have confirmation that the will be set is in that location. noise at the moment.

44:38

So I'm getting some background conversation overlapping with you. And I hope everyone was able to hear you. I understand the point. But I wonder if you're able to resolve that prior to coming on next. I think it's a conversation coming from you.

44:57

I'm sorry, I think in fact, Miss Galloway. He sort of came in at the same time. There, are you have you got my point or you do it?

45:07

No, I you're confirming your concerns are parallel to some of the other parishes in terms of monitoring,

45:16

particularly, particularly a 12 112 in the early years in particular. Thank you very much, Mr. Moon.  
Thank you.

45:22

Thank you. Okay, so if there's no other speakers, can I come to the applicant, please?

45:33

Yes, thank you. There's obviously a lot there. And what I'm going to ask various relevant people in the room here is to respond on those matters, but respond on in respect of additional information, because obviously, some of the points they're raised range across the rest of the agenda into the substantive matters as to the acceptability of impacts and so forth. By way of outline, as as you've essentially heard from a Suffolk Council, there has been a very significant engagement between the applicant and he suffered Council and its appointed consultants, a number of requests for information, all of which have been responded to it in final draft version in respect of the latest one, as I understand, so there's been significant flow of information there and that will continue. So in respect of the detailed points, I'm going to ask Firstly, Mr. JOHN Rhodes to respond on the questions regarding rail deliverability or derivative, unnecessary mitigation. So that included the delivery of the rail noise mitigation scheme, the commitment to it, the scope of that strategy, and also a couple of further points which I think he might be able to best address which is barriers, any further information on that both for rail and also for roads as raised by Mr. Bedford. And then finally, the final matter of further information which he might be able to best address is quiet road surface. So can I ask Mr. Rose to address that? I will then turn to if I may bring in Mr. Mike brownstone, an acoustician of resound acoustics who has been leading a lot of the acoustic work for the applicants and ask him to address the more technical matters raised by the various parties on where information they say, is needed. And, as in broad outline those matters, I'm going to ask him to address our receptors regarding the the roads existing or new, any additional the number of groups of receptors. Secondly, operational noise. He suffered councils query regarding further information, adequate technical justification for why we can't have 35 decibels as the limit. Thirdly, construction noise and update on thresholds in the code of construction practice. Fourthly, monitoring locations raised by a number of the parties suggesting that additional monitoring locations required and then fifthly. Points raised by Mr. blacklock, of create on behalf of his various clients in respect of their suggested areas of limited, insufficient information in what's been provided. And no doubt Mr. Brosnan might have picked up other matters. So firstly, can I then turn to Mr. Rhodes, of quality you've heard from before in this examination, and you can introduce himself now. Thank you.

48:53

Thank you, john Rhodes on behalf of the applicant in relation Good morning, in relation to the points raised by Mr. Kemp, about the rail noise mitigation strategy. And just to say, I'm not sure that this necessarily falls into the category of information missing in the sense that the draft rail noise mitigation strategies been provided for some time, as you know, we've not had detailed feedback on that what we

do understand is how important it is. And Mr. Kim's continued emphasis to us which we'd completely accept, but the rail noise mitigation scheme strategies already has to be fully delivered and deliverable. But in terms of information, we would say that the assessment is full in relation to the impact on overall noise. And we share information as openly as we as we possibly can with your authority. We have a fortnightly meeting with the authorities on Network Rail, which is a kind of open forum to discuss all of the issues and we try and keep everybody completely up to date with the progress that we're making with Network Rail on the construction and operational side. Under the rail noise mitigation scheme, but but just to say in terms of its deliverability. And I've recently corresponded with Mr. Kennedy about this and very happy to put this in writing in response to the question are rising today, requirement 25 of the draft decio requires us to agree submit and agree, the final version of the rail noise mitigation strategy with the authority before we can start the rail works into an absolute commitment. And it's a demonstration of our confidence. But it also should give confidence to Mr. Kempin colleagues, that there's no doubt or difficulty about the rail noise mitigation strategy. Firstly, we're fully committed to it. And secondly, we can't proceed until it's approved to the satisfaction of the authority. So if they have detailed comments, and we haven't received these comments back on end, but if they do have detailed comments back on it, either those can be addressed over the next couple of weeks or the authority have the absolute control. And they need to be satisfied with the final version and its enforceability and deliverability. But in response to any questions from the examining authority, and in discussions with the council, we've identified the ways in which it would be committed to and enforced. So first of all, through the requirement and obviously as much detail as is necessary to satisfy the authorities about that would need to be submitted and approved to their satisfaction. We've identified how the track access contracts with Network Rail will provide for the special, if you'd like the reinforcement to the special conditions, which are necessary over the control of the speed of trains, for example, and how contracts between ourselves and the freight operating company would reinforce those controls. So we we don't think there's any shortage of an ability to enforce thrill noise mitigation strategy. And we're, we're fully committed to it. It relies in part obviously, on works with Network Rail, so for insulating the branch line and the green round route, but also the junction at Saxmundham. And we've reported on that, through the responses to questions, but also the two statements are coming around with Network Rail. And you've heard in the most recent statement of common ground with Network Rail, both sides working to the programme, both sides confirming that we are on track in relation to that programme. There are two particular issues raised by Mr. Kemp that are the subject of continuing work and discussion in relation to the strategy. So the first is the relaying of the East Suffolk line. And that isn't at the moment written into the draft rail noise mitigation strategy. And there are two reasons for that. The first is that we don't know yet that it's deliverable. And the second is that are cases that it's not necessary, but it's certainly desirable. And we share the same objective as the authority to see the track enhancement enhancement to the quality of the drag through noise sensitive locations on the east Suffolk line. And we're working with Network Rail to try to achieve that. And we provided some update to that in the more recent statement of common ground and very happy to try and explain a bit more about the details of that now or, or subsequently. But it's our objective to deliver it. But it's not what we would regard as a necessity in policy terms to meet the policy requirement, it's certainly desirable, certainly something that we want to do certainly something we're working towards. And we're keeping the authorities updated on the progress in relation to that.

53:48

Okay, thank you. I mean, I was just gonna say, we've got an item on the agenda dealing with the round noise later on. So it may be appropriate at that point, to give more detail on that rather than now. Yeah, please carry on.

54:05

Thank you very much for the other principle issue raised by Mr. Kemp related to noise barriers. And these are acoustic noise barriers adjacent to the rail line. And that's been the subject of as Mr. Kemp said recent work and discussion between the parties. And as you know, we submitted a document at the last deadline which reviewed the planning implications of four and a half metre high barriers and suggesting that in immunity terms, perhaps they weren't the best solution in a number of locations. We have since and we've shared this with the authorities we've since heard back from Network Rail that they would not support the provision of acoustic noise barriers on Network Rail property. We had that confirmed directly by Network Rail to the authorities in the joint meeting last week. And I received an email from Network Rail yesterday confirmed I mean that that was their position and that they would put that more formally in writing, that we have been asking Network Rail about the ability to provide acoustic barriers on the rail line for a little while now, and they've come back in absolute terms to say that it's not something that they would support. And good we can discuss possibly the reasons and implications for that. We have as a result of that, asked our own land team to look at the potential for providing acoustic barriers in particular locations on private property. In discussion with with landowners, there are two particular locations where we think it's worth exploring, and where the balance between noise and planning may suggest that there's a central discussion we had about acoustic barriers. And that's at the white arch caravan park, and also Campsie ash. So from the planning assessment, we did have the potential for noise barriers, we reach the view that, for instance, to put a large noise barrier through the middle of Woodbridge wouldn't be a sensible thing to do. But there might be some locations where it would be sensible to look in more detail at the potential. We've had that discussion with Mr. Kemp and his colleagues. And he's engaged his planning colleagues to come to a planning view about that. And we look forward to receiving that planning view to see whether there are one or two locations where it's sensible for us to continue to explore that possibility and see what can be delivered on land that is not Network Rail land. So that's the latest position in relation to acoustic barriers. There was also raised this morning that the rail noise mitigation scheme doesn't deal with the construction of the rail works, and that's correct. So the construction of the rail works is covered by cicp. And other controls within the within the application. The mitigation scheme is to deal with the physical works that are necessary for the rail noise mitigation scheme and the operational controls. There are other controls over the construction activity.

57:11

So that supposition in relation to real noise mitigation strategy. And so I don't think there's information missing but there are certainly ongoing discussions regarding whether other things could be added to the strategy, particularly track relying on the acoustic barriers. And then there are, I think, outstanding concerns relating to the enforceability of the strategy, which we say are absolutely committed within the decio. But on which we clearly need to satisfy the authorities then the scheme can be delivered. And that's been the purpose of our reporting our engagement with Network Rail, but the decio is structured in such a way that unless they are delivered, there is no, there is no sizewell C, there is no way in which the project can be constructed without the use of rail. And there is no operation of rail until the

mitigation strategy is, is committed to an agreed with the authority under requirement 25. So that's absolute control. And then there was one of the points of principle raised by Mr. Bedford was related to quiet road surfaces, and the ability to provide acoustic screens or bonding or landscaping in relation to road noise for the new road schemes. And just to say in relation to that, that we've been having discussions with the County Council about mitigation of road noise and the extent to which that can be enhanced through the detailed requirements of the detailed stage. So you'll recall that we have to submit details on the road schemes for approval, and details of the landscaping. And we've been doing work recently, which again, I suspect later in today, we can discuss those specific locations, and there was touched on to some extent in the compulsory acquisition hearings last week, the extent to which at the detailed stage, it's possible to enhance the sound protection qualities of the landscape scheme that associates the road. We've developed some proposals which we've shared with stakeholders in the last few days, for instance, on the to village bypass with the phone to demonstrate what may be achievable at the detailed stage. It's our suggestion that it's not sensible to commit to that at the moment, but again, we're very happy to share that information. But the nature of the corridor available to us for the road schemes does allow some enhancement of noise mitigation through landscaping, potentially through barriers, and certainly through bonds. Mr. Brian stone can probably speak well certainly can speak in more detail than I can about what that means. May be, but we certainly accept and want to work with parties about the way in which the detailed design of the road schemes can mitigate their noise impact. And that would include the potential for quiet road surfacing. We're having discussions with the County Council about quiet road surfacing. One of the implications of quiet road surfacing is the requirement for more frequent maintenance and cost of maintenance. That's something that which we're discussing with the County Council. We have, in fact, a meeting with them tomorrow, where I hope that issue is resolved, and we can report back on that. So those are the issues that I wanted to address from the colons raised particularly by Mr. Kemp or Mr. benford. I'll hand over to Mr. Brian stone No. Okay. Thank you. Hello, sir. Can you hear me? Okay, thank you.

1:00:58

Thank you, Mike Brown stone, technical lead on noise on behalf of the applicant. So there are a number of points that Mr. Flanagan asked me to respond on. The first was the selection of receptor locations and whether they were adequate and whether we should have chosen some additional receptor locations, and also monitoring locations, the receptor locations and monitoring locations where I understand agreed with account council strike me the District Council in advance of undertaking the assessment, we consider that they are a suitable and representative sample of locations to make a sufficient and robust assessment. The use of the monitoring data in the assessments is relatively limited informs for the associated development sites, the category of construction threshold that would apply, and it can be used to validate the road traffic noise calculations. But the actual monitoring data itself is a very limited use in terms of the actual assessments. And that's all important in accordance with the approach set out in dmr. The design manual roads and bridges for road traffic noise and the appropriate standard British Standard 5228 for construction noise. On operational noise. Mr. Kemp asked for a an adequate technical justification for why the 35 decibel rating level limit wasn't appropriate. I suspect the the technical justification is probably a little too detailed for today. But the the broad points are. Our position is that a noiseless is not required. The power station is designed to generate the lowest achievable noise levels and setting a noise limit is not necessary in that regard, it would serve no purpose. However, should the examining authority or the Secretary of State deem a

limit to be appropriate. Our position is that the 40 decibel L night free field value is the level below which there is no prospect of an adverse effect and that would make a suitable benchmark for it for a limit. There are problems with the L night limit in the use of L night as a limit in that it technically requires measurements over the course of a year that would clearly give issues in terms of enforcement. And we contend that the limit applied at Hinkley Point which was 45 decibels as a facade level. I believe that was over one hour is broadly equivalent to the 40 decibel night free filter limit that we say is the benchmark below which there is no prospect of adverse effect. The issues broadly with setting limits as a rating level is that they include the corrections for different acoustic character. And I understand that's why the council are keen to use it because it accounts for those particular pieces of distinctive acoustic character. But those are to be judged in the context of the receptor. So those are judged once the operation power stations is up and running. And at that point, it's too late to alter the design to achieve those as a limit. A rating level limit for something as complex as a power station is just simply not enforceable. It's not practical, it's unreasonable. But I think if the secretary state deems a limit to be appropriate, something along the lines of that set out to the point would be broadly acceptable. We'd be happy with that.

1:04:21

before you move on, to clarify where you would, if a threshold was imposed or placed on the DCM, ultimately, where would you expect that to be measured from the boundary to the site or at the facade of the receptors?

1:04:40

At Hinkley Point it was set at the facade of the receptors, you can measure it at an intermediate point and calculate what the equivalent level would be to achieve that level at the receptor. But setting it at the receptor is the appropriate manner of doing it. Okay, thank you on construction noise thresholds. There has been ongoing and very helpful discussions with both the Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council on noise matters generally and one of the things that has moved on I guess from the submitted documents is the noise monitoring and management plan. So as currently conceived, it is a document that sits under the code of construction practice is deemed to be a more detailed kind of document containing specific monitoring regimes, mitigation and management protocols for the specific sites. So at deadline six, we submitted an outline initial draft of the document for the main development site, with a view to agreeing the framework of it with a council and then rolling out similar documents for the other associated development sites. In consultation with the council, one aspect of that has altered and that will be submitted a deadline seven, we set out what we call a bespoke mitigation plan. I appreciate when we're talking plans sitting within plans sitting under plans. But this is effectively it's akin to a section 61 type process. It's a means for the contractor and SMT. co to have to go to the council to agree specific methods specific mitigations if appropriate, specific monitoring for activities that exceed a specific level. Previously, we aligned that level with the value in the Kota construction practice for the main development site which was 60 decibels over the daytime. In discussions with a Suffolk Council, we have now lowered that to 55 decibels. So whenever the works are expected to exceed 55. So that means it has to be judged in advance that some work will have to be the assessment work will have to be done in advance of the works. setting out exactly what will happen, where it will happen, how much noise it will make if it's deemed to be above 55 decibels. And there's an equivalent value for the nighttime as well. I think it's 45 for the night time. The contractor



must agree the principles of the works with the council. If agreement is not reached, the works cannot go ahead. To avoid getting into a deadlock. There's also a dispute resolution mechanism included in the updated draft of the noise monitoring and management plan. As I say that will be submitted at deadline seven. The dispute resolution relies on the government's groups already set out I believe in the deed and also allows for expert determination. Essentially, it was agreed between both the Suffolk and the applicant that the magistrate's court routes offered through or required through section 61 process did not necessarily offer potentially might offer the the technical expertise to resolve deadlocks in a short period of time. And so to avoid holding up the works, a more bespoke dispute resolution process has been drafted. That draft is with a Suffolk Council. And we Suffolk County as well. For comment and discussions will will continue on that document. Other points to list on my list. Mr. blacklock of Creek consulting made some comments about the adequacy of the information, particularly the background noise measurements and some of the construction noise calculations. We will be responding to all reports submitted on by create on behalf I think Mr. Grant, the Delhi fire farming partnership and Mr. bowmont. The covering four properties. I think it was POTUS farm, seven house stepped in Hall. And four Do you won't be surprised to know we don't agree with some of the assertions made by Craig consulting. Interesting, they concluded towards the end of their document that they felt despite having criticised the construction calculations, they felt they were appropriate for the stage of a project, which is where we are. They're not based on single items of plant. And the calculations that Craig consulting have put forward, have brought forward or I've taken the main construction phase works and put that forward into the preparation works and said, Well, this doesn't match the preparation work that you've performed, but then they're not comparing eggs with exits, they're comparing different things. So

1:09:26

I say well, we'll prepare a detailed response to their points. But broadly, we don't accept the criticisms of the submitted assessments. And in terms of the adequacy of the background noise measurements, as I said at the start of my speech here, the background sound level measurements only really influenced two aspects of the assessment. One is the selection of the appropriate criterion for construction noise thresholds. And whether we rely on Mr. blackbox data or on our own we get to the same answer and it can be used to validate the road traffic noise assessments. But it isn't essential to do so it is an option in the method I think we actually did respond to, I think create consulting, put some submissions in at deadline three. On behalf of Mr. Dally, I think I think we did respond to that. It was a very higher it was a much higher level document. The for detailed submissions they've now made include Mr. blacklock said the the monitoring data etc. So we will be responding at deadlines. The only other point I just wanted to pick up on Mr. Rhodes mentioned that we had done some additional noise calculations, looking at buns in a quiet road surface for Fern, and also for monets farm. And also we've looked at Oakfield house on the size or link road. We agreed to discuss with all parties options for detailed or more detailed landscape proposals within the order limits to see whether we could increase the bond heights essentially get more noise attenuation into the scheme. And also looking at quiet rate surfacing. The bands will have some effect, particularly the two phase bypass, but it was fairly limited. The quiet road surface looked like it might be a fairly effective means of reducing noise. In theory, design metaphor roads and bridges sets out what correction one should apply when one doesn't have a detailed specification for the quiet road surface. And it suggests it should be around two and a half decibel is quieter than a standard hot roll Nashville service. And because the two values bypass for

farnum Hall and then the houses in the area, and from what its harm, the two village bypass will be the more prominent noise source in terms of traffic noise. You do seem to get from the calculations around the two and a half decibel reduction is actually a fairly effective measure. I think that is everything I had on my list. If there's anything else I can up with, I'm happy to say

1:12:00

that that's fine. Thank you. So can I just confirm with Mr. Flanagan, then that that's your full response

1:12:14

is subject to one point which is Mr. Galloway and Mr. Rhodes responded to the effect that the construction would be controlled through the cicp. I think Mr. Galloway may have made an order by misunderstood but he may have added an additional point that he was struggling to find the plans which show the branch line upgrade works because they're within the DCA. He would find them if he if he wanted the references work number four see within the DCA, which includes works to the Saxmundham to a certain branch line. So so they are there. So that's the only additional point I wanted to raise.

1:12:51

Thank you. Okay, thank you. I do know that there are three hands gone up. Obviously, it is the applicants right to have the final say. And I do want to get through the agenda items. So can I just check with each of you? Are these Mr. Souther roll? Is this a point specifically about the monitoring and the actual agenda item in terms of whether we have the information before is to understand the effects?

1:13:26

Mr. Moore, I apologise I don't know. My hand must have gone up in laboratory. I haven't got a point to make apologise. I have no problem at all. Same point to Mr. Melon.

1:13:37

Oh, yes, it was just to clarify with Mr. Rhodes. With regards to the acoustic fencing on the green railroads. The land which isn't owned by Network Rail, is he ruling out any acoustic fencing along that?

1:13:54

Okay, well, I'll come back to the applicant in a moment. And then Richard Smith, counsellor for Suffolk County Council, your hand is also raised.

1:14:04

Yes. Good morning. First of all, I want just to apologise, I had an eye test and I wasn't able to join this meeting until 2211. So I missed the first part, I'm anxious to ask a question on vibration caused by railways. Is has that been covered? Or is that being covered later? The noise aspect which I also have concerns about, I think has been dealt with adequately. But it is the vibration aspect which can particularly concerns me.

1:14:33

We're going to come on to the rail issues later on in the agenda. So that's probably the appropriate time to ask that point. Thank you. I understand. Thank you. If I can just come to Mr. Flanagan, if you're able to assist on that point raised by Mr. mallen.

1:14:52

Yes. The question was, whether By Network Rail is not being considered. Mr. Rhodes dealt with acoustic barriers, ask him again, if I may.

1:15:13

So john rose for the applicant. The honest truth is, it's not a location where we'd consider there'll be particular benefit in terms of acoustic fencing. And as the point was raised just now, it just occurred to me that I should have a further discussion with Mr. brownstone about that which I will undertake to do during the course of this morning. But it's not an area that we focused on, particularly as being as noise sensitive as others where we've been considering barriers. But I can't give you a technical response. But I'll speak with Mr. brownstone in a convenient break and update the examination if I can

1:15:52

be very helpful. I mean, it may be appropriate at the juncture on the agenda when we're dealing with rail. Yep, thank you very much. Thank you. So I think we've largely dealt with item number two there. two, a one and two. So if I can now come to be which is whether the sole low levels for construction traffic, rail noise vibration are set at appropriate levels. Then a Suffolk Council's impact report. Originally, they were concerned that the levels were not justified, and the vibration effects needed to be restricted to daytime. The rail noise levels thresholds within the noise monitoring scheme, I notice have now been adjusted following discussions. But could each party explain their current position in respect of the lower salt levels, whether they are now agreed for the respective elephant elements of the development? So I can come first to Isa for counsel, please?

1:17:10

Thank you, sir. I'll ask Mr. Kemp to address that straightaway. Thank you.

1:17:18

Good morning sir. Mark can be Suffolk Council. So in terms of laws and cells across the board, as we stated in comments on the applicants initial stem the common ground rep 5138. The applicants assessment approaches substantially changed as pre application consultation and significantly different laws and cells have been adopted in the US. Now this approach also differentiate differentiate cells from solar was identified as significant in AIA terms. And there's a discussion to be had around that. It's possibly important to note that as C's focus is now more on the practical measures to minimise and mitigate noise impacts as far as possible. And therefore, been generally prepared to accept the laws and sells in the s for for construction, round noise and vibration, provided that the various issues relating to the practical controls which will be discussed under agenda five gender and five are addressed. Now, specifically your question in terms of the change in thresholds for rail noise. So previously, the NMS was going to be offered at Seoul as a means to avoid so the change has come that the the NMS is going to be offered at the EIA significance level rather than Seoul. We are currently yet to accept that on the basis of the round noise mitigation strategy being broadened in terms of its

scope, and the same questions in terms of deliverability and commitment to that being answered. That being that the NMS may need to be considered as a form of probably secondary mitigation. If those those particular things in the RMS can't be delivered, in just in terms of going back again to the RMS and the track up grace the Suffolk line, Mr. Rhodes, saying that they do not consider the the the track upgrades necessary. It's our assertion that they would be considered necessary and as part Part of the the responsibility to mitigate and minimise adverse effects that at low, and that comes with part of the package of accepting those those changes and the NMS coming in at the significance criteria.

1:20:19

I'm still not 100% clear what the council's position is on this, because obviously, the national policy statement, the way it is set out is very much on the basis that souls must be avoided in effect. And if the level isn't an agreed level, it's not clear to me quite whether I'm or the panel are in a position to advise the secretary of state whether you know quite where we're at. So I understand why you're wishing to focus in on the outcomes. But we do need to understand formally the position of the council relative to each of those levels that have been suggested as appropriate by the applicant.

1:21:15

It will be opposition of obviously, that cells are avoided. Hence why we regarded the NMS being implemented at Seoul to be to be not accepted to use mitigation to avoid so is not avoiding Sol Sol as a point to be avoided.

1:21:36

Yes, I understand that position. But have you agreed the level of which the soul would apply? In each case.

1:21:47

Currently, the the loaves and sells are agreed, I believe. They say with the caveat that the the controls are the practical controls are in place to to mitigate and minimise as far as possible.

1:22:05

Okay, thank you. Are there any other points you wish to make at this stage? Not at this time, sir. Thank you. For I can then come and ask any other interested party, whether they've got any points to make on this item of the agenda? Mr. blacklock? I see your hand up. Mr. Camp if you're able to switch your camera off. Thank you.

1:22:34

Good morning, again. Is this going back on to the point made by Mike Brown saying that about the ambient levels, they are related back into the lows themselves or the lows especially when it is in table 3.12 of dmr the baseline noise level is actually the the lower or should be the low and then this will be determined from five to eight. So I will suggest that the importance of background monitoring of ambient monitoring is quite quite keen. Okay, thank you. Mr. mallen. Again,

1:23:20

are they Yeah, it's just with regards, obviously, the the lower levels. If the monitoring points that they've used to provide the baseline levels, if they're in the wrong position, and those then it would make sense that the levels would be you know, not not the correct figure. So in terms of that, I could suggest different monitoring areas where the levels would be more apt on the green railroad than have been provided by the applicant. Okay, thank you.

1:24:06

Mr. Bedford from Suffolk County Council.

1:24:13

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I think that I've got the answer in relation to the cells and lows in relation to the county Council's concerns in relation to road traffic noise, but rather than risk me getting it wrong, I'm going to ask Mr. B, to simply confirm the position from the technical perspective. So if I can bring in Mr. beer, please Thank you.

1:24:40

Hello, sir to bear on behalf Suffolk County Council. The road traffic laws themselves are aligned with the criteria from the who guidelines and annoying noise insulation regulations, prospectively and therefore accepted by Suffolk County Council, notwithstanding the need to minimise and mitigate the road impact imposed at random noise.

1:24:58

Thank you. If I can come back to the applicant to respond to those two areas points, please.

1:25:09

Yes, thank you, sir. Obviously Welcome to clarification both from East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council that the lols and souls are agreed as to Mr. Kemp's points, that there is an obligation to take reasonable steps to mitigate and minimise between the role and the soul. That is obviously we accept it's about policy says and come back to that point. I think they are on the agenda in relation to the mitigation, what those reasonable steps are. As two more data points are going to head over to Mr. brownstone to address Mr. blacklock point about ambient levels. And in case he's got anything further to say on lols and cells as well. Thank you. Lisa, can

1:26:03

you hear me? Okay, thank you. Mike brownstone on behalf of the applicant. Mr. blacklock, made the valid point that ambient noise level monitoring informs the west where lol sets for construction noise that's entirely correct. I was speaking more generally about the impact categories. And the kind of more general EIA type criteria is great. The loan is defined in dmr as being equal to the ambient noise level. And that's the approach that we have adopted Well, that is set out in our submission. And when you are above low, one must apply mitigation to minimise and reduce the effects. And we do that irrespective whether it's above or below low because the coder construction practice implements a flexible approach to construction mitigation throughout so we believe we meet in the tests irrespective of whether the loan is where Mr. blacklock says it is or where we say it is. On Mr. melons point about the green rail route, we consider our locations to be appropriate. And as I say, the ambient noise levels

effect were lowly set for construction noise. And we are mitigating irrespective of whether we're above or below low through the code of construction practice.

1:27:29

So if I may, I'm just gonna also bring in Mr. JOHN Rhodes on this question of souls and souls as well briefly,

1:27:40

John Rhodes with applicants tread carefully in this area because I'm not an expert, but in policy terms, I think we may be possibly in danger of confusing you in relation to rail noise. So, my understanding in relation to rail noise is that the soles are agreed. And then what was then said was that the level at which noise mitigation for rail kicks in we have also agreed that should be below so in the case of rail noise. And I think Mr. Kamin said we are yet to accept that which I was that matters, Mr. Campos slightly surprised, because I thought that was accepted. What we know that Mr. Kemp is quite rightly continue to push us for is are we doing everything we can to minimise mitigate rail noise. And that's a discussion we've been having with Mr. Kemp for, you know, a good time. And that's obviously a very important discussion. But in relation to his then point, which was you don't avoid sold through mitigation through a noise mitigation scheme. I just wanted to say policy terms. That's not that's not agreed with us. We said anything that you do avoid. So the noise mitigation scheme, in fact, that's its purpose. And there are multiple precedents for that in policy, practice and, and other schemes. So the hierarchy is certainly I've understood it in policy terms, is that we need to work to minimise and mitigate the noise impact of what we're doing. But our absolute obligation, we completely accept that responsibility. But our absolute obligation in policy terms is to avoid so and we do that ultimately, the fallback is the noise mitigation scheme, which avoids the impact of Seoul on residential properties. And Mr. Brownstone could talk to the level of that, but certainly the purpose of it its function in policy terms, as well as in practical terms, is to avoid Seoul. And in the case of rail, in fact, it does it goes beyond that it avoids a level lower than sole, but we certainly think it's valid and effective in meeting the NPS policy requirement.

1:30:05

Mr. Floyd, is that the vinyl paying for your team? Yes, it is. Thank you, sir. Okay, well, I think it's half past 11. So it might be an opportune time for a 15 minute break. So, just a turn now until 1145. Those people watching on live stream you will need to refresh your browsers upon resuming Thank you