



The Planning Act 2008

Sizewell C (SZC)

Planning Inspectorate Reference: *EN010012*

Deadline 7 – 3 September 2021

East Suffolk Council's (20026200) Response to Examining Authority's Second Round
of Written Questions

Part 5

Contents

Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions	2
NV.2 Noise and Vibration	2

Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions			
NV.2 Noise and Vibration			
NV.2.2	Applicant, S CC, ESC	<p>Quiet Road Surfacing</p> <p>(i) What additional acoustic benefit might be expected if this surface were to be used for the Sizewell Link Road and the Two Village Bypass?</p> <p>(ii) Would a different maintenance regime from a standard road be required in the event this surface were to be adopted to maintain the acoustic benefits it may bring?</p> <p>(iii) Is this now being factored into the discussions?</p> <p>(iv) In the event that quiet road surfacing were to be offered how would this be secured?</p>	<p>SCC is the responsible authority for road noise so ESC defer to the highway authority, SCC, on this issue.</p>
NV.2.5	Applicant, E SC	<p>Operational Noise</p> <p>(i) The Main Development Site (MDS) night-time noise threshold is not yet agreed with ESC. Should the ExA consider the Council view more appropriate as a safeguard for the future noise</p>	<p>ESC considers this question is best answered by the Applicant as we are not able to determine the implications on the operation of our proposed noise threshold. Equally we are not best placed to determine alternative or different mitigation, but would certainly welcome</p>

		<p>levels, would there be implications for the operation of the station at the MDS?</p> <p>(ii) Would there be alternative or different mitigations available which may be able to be applied which could safeguard the night-time noise environment in the event the noise threshold is not agreed? Are there implications for the operation of the plant?</p>	<p>further engagement with the Applicant on this matter to determine what options may be available.</p> <p>ESC would, however, note that in ISH 8 the Applicant gave specific examples of equipment at HPC where noise reduction was and was not practicable. It is the view of ESC that statements regarding the viability or otherwise of operational power station noise reduction should be fully justified in detailed, engineering terms in a way which specifically references the individual noise sources listed in Table A2 of Appendix 11C to Volume 2 Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-205].</p> <p>Table A2 indicates that there is a difference of 30 dB between the highest and lowest sound power levels for individual items of plant serving the power station. It is unclear from the assessment what contribution these individual sources make to the predicted cumulative noise level at each receptor, but this suggests that there might be opportunities for noise reduction on an item-by-item basis which could have significant benefits in terms of controlling cumulative noise levels at individual receptors. Again, if this is not the case then ESC consider that this should be justified in both acoustic and engineering terms.</p> <p>While ESC accept that a nuclear power station has very specific requirements in terms of the mechanical plant serving it and that the Applicant is best placed to understand this, it is also the case that many types of mechanical plant noise can often be reduced at source through appropriate engineering. This can have a cost implication, but ESC consider that this should be balanced against the need to</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>ensure the lowest practicable noise levels, which the Applicant agreed during ISH 8 should always be the aim. If it is not possible to reduce noise from individual items of plant using engineering methods as a result of the specific technical requirements of the power station, then this should be reasonably justified.</p>
NV.2.6	Applicant, ESC	<p>Noise Mitigation Scheme (NMS) As things currently stand the NMS is a draft with further assessments to be undertaken and to be agreed with ESC, potentially to be undertaken in phases. There are then a series of additional stages to be gone through. Stage 3 gives the owner 28 days to respond. (i) Stage 4 gives no commitment or time period for the Applicant to organise the survey and to provide the specification to the owner. Why should there not be an obligation on the Applicant to respond in a timely manner? (ii) What happens in the event the property is not found to be suitable for adaption? (iii) Should the property be suitable and the property owner progresses to receive two quotes, what happens if they are not received within 28 days? (iv) At stage 5 the Applicant makes a formal offer, but there is no obvious commitment to honour either of the quotes received, is this specified somewhere? (v) If a formal offer is made to the owner at this point, this appears to trigger a three month</p>	<p>ESC has and continues to engage with the Applicant on the NMS including the matters raised in this question. Our submission of comments on the redrafted NMS (submitted at Deadline 6) responds to many of the issues raised by the ExA and we have discussed these matters with the Applicant with a view to a further redraft of the NMS.</p>

		<p>embargo on the works that have been identified as triggering the need for the insulation/mitigation scheme. Is this correct?</p> <p>(vi) It is understood that at stage 6 following works being undertaken, that this would need to be verified as being carried out prior to any payment being made. What time frame would this be undertaken within and what timeframe would be in place to make the payment?</p> <p>(vii) Please provide an update to the NMS to provide clarity on the above points.</p>	
NV.2.7	Applicant, ESC	<p>Noise Mitigation Scheme</p> <p>(i) Please provide an indication of over what time frame you consider a receptor who qualified for noise mitigation under the scheme could reasonably expect to undertake the necessary works and receive payment for them from the beginning to the end of the process. (ii) How does this fit with the latest implementation plan which indicates works on the rail line would commence in Q2 2023? [REP2-044]</p>	ESC considers this question best answered by the Applicant who will be responsible for these aspects of the Noise Mitigation Scheme.
NV.2.9	Applicant, Network Rail, ESC	<p>Rail Noise Mitigation</p> <p>Additional assessments of rail noise were undertaken in Woodbridge and Saxmundham to consider the implications of the rail strategy in respect of house boats and park homes.</p> <p>(i) Please provide an update on what the noise mitigation proposed is to be and how this would be secured.</p>	(i) ESC considers this question best answered by the Applicant as they are proposing the mitigation for these receptors. We have been and continue to be in discussion with the Applicant and have requested that mitigation for these, and indeed all receptors, is not restricted to certain things but that all forms of mitigation are available and considered as part of a bespoke mitigation scheme for each individual property taking account of its circumstances and specific impacts.

		<p>(ii) In the event screening in these locations would facilitate an improved noise environment for these receptors, has a similar option been considered for other receptors along the line?</p> <p>(iii) Could this be secured in the event it was considered appropriate?</p>	<p>(ii) Acoustic Barriers along the rail track to provide mitigation for sensitive receptors has and continues to be a matter of discussion with the Applicant. Where it is a viable option to install screening, we would encourage and welcome this as part of the Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy and the Applicant's consideration of mitigating and minimising noise impacts in line with relevant policy requirements.</p> <p>(iii) ESC considers this could be secured as part of the Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy along with other mitigation schemes that form part of the requirement to mitigate and minimise noise impacts.</p>
NV.2.10	Applicant, Network Rail, ESC	<p>Noise and Vibration from Rail Freight</p> <p>ESC have sought additional clarification in respect of the uncertainties of the predictions of noise and ground borne vibration from rail activities. Can the ExA be updated on the current position regarding this updated information and whether the parties are agreed now as to the suitability of its forecasting, and the consequential assessments of noise and vibration and the consequential suitability of any mitigation</p>	<p>ESC's request for clarification remains outstanding and subject to requests for information as submitted to the Examination at Deadline 6.</p>
NV.2.11	ESC, Applicant (ii only)	<p>Operational Noise at Leiston Leisure Centre</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that page 63 section 165 20j of the Deadline 5 Response to Deadline 3 and 4 submissions from the Applicant the noise level should be 55 dB LAeq(T).</p>	<p>(i) Yes, this is a typographical error and should read 55 dB LAeq(T).</p> <p>(ii) Requirement 12A of the draft DCO (June 2021) [REP2-015] suggests that details of landscape works would be prepared by the Applicant and submitted to ESC for approval. ESC</p>

		(ii) Please explain how the installation of the noise barrier at the necessary point in the programme is secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism?	expect the barrier to form part of the proposed design and would not approve were the barrier not shown in detail.
--	--	--	--