

## Sizewell C DCO

## ExQ3 – Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	
NV.3.13	Applicant, Network Rail	<p><b>Train Warning Sirens</b></p> <p>The Applicant [REP5-119] in responding to concerns identified by Woodbridge Town Council [REP3-085 &amp; REP3-087] indicated that train warning klaxons may no longer be required except in emergency circumstances where Miniature Stop Lights were installed.</p> <p>(i) Please advise on the progress of this element of the upgrades and confirm that warning sirens would no longer be necessary in the event this form of adaption was provided at the level crossings.</p> <p>(ii) Please advise which level crossings these changes apply to and what secures the delivery of these upgrades</p>	<p>Upgrades to Miniature Stop Lights (MSL) at the following crossings have are being considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kingston Farm UWCT &amp; FPG</li> <li>- Uffold UWCT</li> <li>- Blackstock UWCT</li> <li>- Redhouse farm UWCT</li> <li>- Ellingers UWCT</li> <li>- Brick Kiln UWCT (Downgrade to Bridleway)</li> </ul> <p>All MSL's include klaxons which provide an audible alarm when the red light is active, a short time before a train arrives at the level crossing. Warning sirens are therefore a part of the design of MSLs and would form part of the upgrade.</p> <p>The klaxon volume can be adjusted to minimise disturbance subject to complying with required safety standards and must remain audible to be effective. As a standard installation, there is normally a 10 decibel reduction during the hours of 23:00 to 07:00.</p> <p>For reference, there are similar installations already in situ at both Dock Lane and Jetty.</p> <p>The Applicant would enter into a contract with Network Rail for the delivery of these schemes. For information, where half barrier crossings have been upgraded to full barrier crossings this has reduced the length of time a klaxon sounds. At these full barrier crossings the</p>

			<p>klaxons activate only whilst the barriers are actively moving, whereas a continuous klaxon sounds at half barrier crossings from barrier down through until barriers up. Local examples of this are Ferry Quay and Haywards.</p>
<p>NV.3.22</p>	<p>Network Rail</p>	<p><b>Acoustic Barriers</b></p> <p>From the information available to date there appears to be the potential for acoustic benefit which would reduce impact on nearby receptors and subject to design, location and other factors meet policy objectives in protecting human health.</p> <p>(i) It is understood from the representations made that Network Rail would oppose any barrier in principle, is this correct?</p> <p>(ii) In light of the national policy objective to protect human health please explain why you consider this position is justified.</p> <p>(iii) It is understood that there will be an imperative for safety on the rail way line, but without detail of the design and location of any acoustic barrier can a safety case be properly assessed at this point?</p>	<p>i) For the reasons previously set out in its responses to ExQ2, it is Network Rail's default position that there is no statutory requirement for mitigation of noise of trains using the existing network. Network Rail cannot comment on any specific assessment of acoustic barriers as Network Rail has not been involved in or contributed to the rail noise assessments used to produce the scheme or been engaged in the devising of the scheme itself. The Applicant has not engaged with Network Rail in relation to these issues or provided funding to allow Network Rail to analyse the impacts of the Proposed Development. On that basis, and as set out below, Network Rail cannot support the proposal of acoustic barriers.</p> <p>ii) It remains Network Rail's position that there is no statutory requirement for such mitigation of noise of trains using the existing network to be provided. Network Rail does not seek to undermine the existing regime relating to intensified use of railways, which is underpinned by primary legislation. Network Rail has not been involved in or contributed to rail noise assessments so is unable to comment as to whether the objective of protecting human health is met.</p>

			<p>iii) Network Rail has not been commissioned by the Applicant to undertake the required assessments of risk or consider the safety case for any proposed mitigation, nor is it currently engaged to undertake specific analysis of design, location and feasibility of any proposed acoustic barriers.</p>
<p>NV.3.23</p>	<p>Applicant, Network Rail, ESC</p>	<p><b>Acoustic Barriers</b></p> <p>(i) If it were deemed that acoustic barriers along the railway line were appropriate and necessary to protect human health from significant adverse noise effects, would the Secretary of State have the power to require them subject to an appropriate safety audit?</p> <p>(ii) How could this be secured?</p>	<p>(i) The Office of Road and Rail (ORR) is the authority that acts on behalf of the Secretary of State in regulating Network Rail. The ORR does not have any powers to deal with noise that may cause a nuisance beyond ensuring that Network Rail has both an environmental policy statement and management arrangements that give effect to the policies within the statement.</p> <p>Therefore, Network Rail does not consider that the Secretary of State (via the ORR) has the power to impose requirements such as the installation of acoustic barriers on Network Rail which may affect its responsibilities for management of the safety of network as infrastructure manager.</p> <p>(ii) Network Rail has not been commissioned by the Applicant or engaged in any works pertaining to noise mitigation as part of the scheme. However, Network Rail is willing to work with the Applicant consider whether noise mitigation measures are required and to carry out the detailed feasibility work necessary to determine potential options, including details of the construction methodology. Network Rail have not been</p>

			commissioned to carry out this detailed analysis.
jca	Applicant, Network Rail and SCC	<p><b>A12 – Darsham Level Crossing</b></p> <p>In response to TT.2.5 Network Rail (NR) have responded that they will be applying for funding for full barrier control crossing enhancement as part of its funding submission for CP7 (Mar 2024). They also note should funding not be secured, the mitigation works could not be delivered, and NR could not support the Park &amp; Ride car park operation due to the unacceptable risk. The Applicant has already agreed a 50% contribution to the works, but delivery of the works will be dependent on NR securing funding for the other 50%. It is proposed to have a Framework Agreement concerning the additional contribution and NR state that the Northern Park and Ride can only become operational if mitigation is secured and delivered within 6 to 12 months of the opening of the Park and Ride site.</p> <p>Explain:</p> <p>(i) Is the enhancement to full barrier control considered necessary for safe operation of the level crossing to accommodate the additional traffic level associated with the Proposed development;</p> <p>(ii) What would happen if funding was not secured as part of the NR CP7 settlement; and</p> <p>(iii) Do the County Council have any views as to the safe operation of this crossing as a result of the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>i) Yes.</p> <p>ii) If funding was not able to be secured through the NR CP7 settlement then the Park &amp; Ride facility at Darsham would need to be relocated such that it does not effect Darsham Level Crossing or be funded by the Applicant.</p> <p>iii) Network Rail welcomes the contribution to this scheme and are continuing to work with the Applicant to ensure all Level Crossing improvements can be delivered.</p>