The Planning Inspectorate
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 4
Date:	29 October 2024

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

Simon Says

Transcript Export
https://www.simonsaysai.com

My New Project
Created on: 2024-10-29 17:01:44
Project Length: 00:58:53
Account Holder: Ryan Ross

File Name: Five Estuaries_ISH_29OCT_PT4-PINS MP3.mp3
File Length: 00:58:53

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:09 - 00:00:11:19
It's 3:45. So the hearing is resuming. Ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah.

00:00:13:05 - 00:00:21:03
I'm now going to turn to a few questions relating to cumulative construction noise. Um, starting with the applicant.

00:00:27:10 - 00:01:05:13
The assessment that's been undertaken of cumulative noise impact, uh, for constructing the three substations, in the absence of detailed information being available for North Falls and East Anglia Connection or the East Anglia Connection node has adopted what the applicant has described as a simplified approach. Applying the noise levels, um, for five estuaries across the East. Is that approach reasonable, given that the East Anglia Connection Node substation would be significantly larger, um, than the other two substations.

00:01:22:06 - 00:01:24:15
Uh, Richard Carter for the applicant.

00:01:25:01 - 00:01:49:06
Um, whilst we understand that the East Anglia connection node is, um, a larger substation, the construction activities would be similar. Um, the, uh, construction methods required, um, and the processes, uh, that we assessed would be comparable. So, um, that was the main reasoning.

00:02:02:07 - 00:02:08:10
Mr. Richard, do you have any observations to make on what Mr. Carter has just explained for the applicant?

00:02:09:10 - 00:02:55:19
Thank you sir. I was just going to cancel. Um, I think we're venturing into the unknown a little bit, sir, when it comes to the East Anglian connection node, because we don't know exactly what that means at this time. We don't know exactly what is proposed. We also don't know. Um, and I note the comments that were made in this morning session about grid and their relationship with the internal hall, right. Particularly for ales. We really don't know what kind of vehicles, um, will be going in

Viability Road because unlike this DCO that you're asked to consider here, sir, obviously he's taking the connection to proposed as something which is of a much, much larger scale than we have here.

00:02:55:21 - 00:03:16:05
Obviously correctly said you know, not only will there be underground cable laying, but there'll also be overground cable laying, erection of pylons, stringing out, stringing, said pylons, etc.. So, um, you know, back to what our vision is said so that we're kind of entering into the unknown a little bit with this. Thank you.

00:03:49:21 - 00:04:13:26
Mr. Carter, in terms of the assessment that you've undertaken, I mean, how conservative do you think your approach using this simplified approach is? Um, will it capture cumulatively everything that might be going on with three, uh, substation potentially being built out at the same time?

00:04:20:19 - 00:04:23:13
Uh, Richard Carter for the applicant. Um.

00:04:23:24 - 00:04:26:12
The the assumption that.

00:04:26:15 - 00:04:27:03
Um, all.

00:04:27:05 - 00:04:27:29
Three.

00:04:28:09 - 00:05:12:25
Um, uh, developments would be undertaking their noisiest construction phase at the same time. Um, may or may not be realistic. I mean, from a noise point of view, that is the worst. Worst case. Um, I don't know. From a construction program and, um, logistics that's outside my area of expertise. Um, as part of the assessments, we do, um, include a number of um, worst case, um, assumptions that that, um, such as the number of plant that would be involved in each of the activities and the, um, the sound power of each of those items of plants tend to be in the upper end of the range that that's available.

00:05:13:08 - 00:05:19:04
Um, so we'll assumptions like that do, um, help present the, the worst case.

00:06:10:01 - 00:06:11:06
Thank you. Um.

00:06:18:20 - 00:06:31:03
Turning to the councils, with respect to the assessment of cumulative construction noise, I contend that the applicant has used suitable data and undertaken an appropriate assessment to predict the effects.

00:06:32:18 - 00:06:37:05
So my project is going to council as far as it can answer. Yes.

00:07:31:07 - 00:07:34:06

And for the council. Um.

00:07:37:18 - 00:08:08:25
At paragraph nine point 12.26 of the Airborne Noise and Vibration Assessment 091. The applicant has acknowledged that the cumulative construction traffic noise in Bentley Road may not be adequately mitigated by the impact by the implementation. Implementation of the proposed 40 mile an hour speed limit, and that further mitigation in the form of a speed limit below 40 miles an hour.

00:08:09:02 - 00:08:43:05
The rerouting of HGV traffic and the undertaking of sound English sound insulation works for affected dwellings may be required. Actually, this question is for both the applicant and Essex, but I'll start with Essex. How practical and or effective do you consider the implementation of additional mitigation measures, such as lowering the speed limit, um, below 40 miles an hour in Bentley Road, or the rerouting of HGV construction traffic,

00:08:45:04 - 00:08:51:07
um, or undertaking sound insulation? Uh, how practical do you think any of those measures might be.

00:08:53:24 - 00:09:27:20
Sir. Thank you. Mark. Essex County council. Um, unfortunately, my computer is unable to access app 091 at this time, so obviously I look forward to this in writing. However, what I would say in relation to that is that I'm not aware that any of the properties along Bentley Road are other listed and believe that the road is in the conservation area, so mitigation informs of additional glazing or additional soundproofing would not pose a problem in terms of heritage assets associated with the development.

00:09:28:21 - 00:09:35:12
Ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah. I note that the um speed limit on Bentley roads I believe 50 miles an hour.

00:09:37:28 - 00:09:56:15
It's 60. It's national national speed limit and reducing. It's d restricted. Yes. Be restricted. Yeah. Hence you know keeping speeds down Could potentially stop in a vehicle from making a percussive noise with speed on on on the road itself.

00:10:00:03 - 00:10:00:18
Thank you.

00:10:10:09 - 00:10:22:20
In terms of the possibility of using an alternative HGV route to Bentley Road, any thoughts about the practicalities of that given the road layout in the area?

00:10:26:22 - 00:10:40:07
Sir Mark, would you ask him to cancel? I don't really think it's for me to give the applicant any suggestions about amending their scheme, as it is at the moment, we we have a scheme in front of us, so that's what we go with.

00:10:40:09 - 00:10:48:17
Yeah, it's not so much about amending. It's whether or not there would be alternatives that could be used, say to get Um.

00:10:51:24 - 00:11:08:13
Noisier HGV traffic in and out of the the work site that's going to be served via Bentley Road. Having I would visited the area, it might be challenging to find another route that would be better or able.

00:11:08:24 - 00:11:21:01
So the obviously one of the issues here is we're taking access off national highways road network. And I know National Highways refers to creating any additional junctions on those road network.

00:11:24:25 - 00:11:35:29
But again, sir, if you please include that in your next set of questions, I'll ask it to our, um, highways and transportation engineers to see if they have anything else to add in the mix. We want that.

00:11:49:17 - 00:12:00:29
So then turning to the applicant again, in terms of the practicalities of the three possible mitigations that have been suggested, um, in the noise assessment, lowering the speed limit.

00:12:14:16 - 00:12:27:21
This may not for the applicant. Yes, we believe lowering the speed limits can have an impact, uh, on the noise levels of the vehicles, as can mitigation be applied to the properties.

00:12:32:28 - 00:12:35:24
If that was not the question, please, mayor, clarify the question.

00:12:44:16 - 00:12:57:01
I think the real nub of this question is there's a suggestion that's been made that alternative routing for HGVs might be possible. What do you think the practicalities of that are or is

00:12:58:23 - 00:12:59:08
it.

00:13:02:10 - 00:13:06:23
Because it's been suggested in the noise assessment as a possible mitigation.

00:13:08:21 - 00:13:28:10
For the applicant. Uh, we know that this is in the cumulative section. So for us and our scheme, we don't think that rerouting there's that many viable options. We can't say what other schemes because it's cumulative may

00:13:30:02 - 00:13:31:02
may consider.

00:13:48:29 - 00:13:59:16
Just to be clear on that point, as far as five estuaries is concerned, Bentley Road is is the route that you think you would use and there would be no alternative.

00:14:02:24 - 00:14:03:09
Agreed.

00:14:31:00 - 00:14:39:23

I'd now like to turn to the operational side, um, of the proposed substation and turning to the applicant first.

00:14:42:04 - 00:15:07:24
Um, given the precise design for the proposed onshore substation is unknown at this time. What reliance can be placed on the modelling of the substations operation noise. Given that the modelling is based on an indicative substation. How sensitive would the predictions for operational noise be to changes to the layout and or plant composition for the substation?

00:15:14:09 - 00:15:44:12
I mean, am I correct in thinking that the starting point for the assessment is that you potentially looked at, dare I say, a typical substation that's already operating somewhere and have been able to establish what the various bits of kit are that would go into a substation of of the size proposed, and then being able to undertake a modelling exercise based upon known noise levels for the various components from an established site.

00:15:47:08 - 00:16:17:21
Richard Carter for the applicant. Uh, yes. Essentially. That's correct. We were provided with information about the various electrical components that are likely to be required in the substation, given the, the, um, engineering requirements, um, that the substation will deliver, um, and, um, and, and a potential layout which, um, as you say, may or may not reflect the final layout.

00:16:18:06 - 00:16:51:11
Um, from a noise perspective, uh, when you're looking at, um, a source of noise that's, um, several hundred meters away from the receiver location, um, moving those sources around a few meters, um, 10 to 20m is not going to have any material effect on the on the calculations Actions that, um, have been carried out. And ultimately, um, what we're looking to achieve here is working to a noise limit.

00:16:51:26 - 00:17:02:04
Um, and that's what would be the governing, um, um, factor in, in the, um, in the operation of the, of the substation.

00:17:25:12 - 00:17:53:25
And from a more sort of engineering perspective, the components of substations. Uh, is this an area where there's a lot of evolution going on at the moment compared to other areas of energy generation and technology where there's lots of ounces going on. Is this an area where things tend to be quite stable or, um. Is the constantly changing and potentially will have different, um, noise outputs?

00:17:56:21 - 00:18:16:04
Alice Maynard for the applicant, the engineering options for onshore substations are designed with noise in mind. And when various OEMs, um, original equipment manufacturers are designing these things, they consider the noise output

00:18:17:19 - 00:19:01:06
there are within say, if I was going to a specific supplier of this equipment, they would have a range of options with different decibel limits coming with a range of various price tags that would be suitable for different, um, different areas. For example, in inner cities, in rural, you know, there are various configurations that are available and any developments are made with this in mind. Um, hence when we look at purchasing, you know, specifying and purchasing the equipment, this will be considered

along with a range of other options that are not in not indicative to the, you know, not part of the actual equipment.

00:19:01:08 - 00:19:16:14
There are external options such as, you know, sound walls, noise enclosures, things that can be done, um, to achieve the 35 decibel limit that has been modeled.

00:19:59:21 - 00:20:14:14
Thank you for the Council's any observations about the modelling that's been done and its robustness given, um, the situation where the final design of the substation at this location is not yet known.

00:20:16:22 - 00:20:52:06
I think, sir Mark, would you as a county council? Um, nothing other than my comment that we are, um, entering into quite unproven ground at this particular point in time because obviously we have the potential, the three substations to be located in this close proximity. We don't know. Um, in this particular case, using the Rochdale envelope, whether that's going to be air insulated and gas insulated and understand the applicants comments about the difference in, in in the design of those taking into account noise complaint.

00:20:53:12 - 00:21:09:13
Um, just to let you know that we we obviously just tried to discuss this with the applicant and we will um, through their on site, their um, landlord consents manager be entered into discussions with them to talk about this specifically in the next couple of weeks.

00:21:13:26 - 00:21:14:11
Thank you.

00:21:31:08 - 00:21:41:20
In terms of of the noise output, is there much Difference when you compare air insulated versus gas insulated plant.

00:21:47:04 - 00:21:55:01
I'm presuming the assessment that's been undertaken has that's relied on air insulation.

00:21:56:12 - 00:22:18:02
Uh, Richard Carter for the applicant. Uh, yes, sir. That's correct. Uh, the assessment was done on the basis of air insulated, on the understanding that that is the noisier plant. Um, as to quantifying how much noisier. I, I couldn't tell you here and now, but, um, um, but, yeah, I understand they're insulated is. It's the worst case.

00:22:37:09 - 00:22:47:16
And you referred to discussions on this point in the next year. Is that feeding in ultimately to the statement of common ground work that's being undertaken in the background?

00:22:48:13 - 00:22:51:29
Thank you, Sir. Michael Jackson, County counsel. That's correct sir. Yes. Thank you.

00:22:52:18 - 00:22:55:12
Will that be involving tendering as well? Um.

00:22:55:21 - 00:23:14:20
It'll be involved. It'll either be involving their environmental health officer, should the team having the particular experience noise, or we will use someone the county council uses on its, um, consideration of minerals and waste sites in terms of noise, which may be more applicable in this case, given the nature of the sound we're talking about here. Thank you.

00:23:32:19 - 00:23:48:14
Turning to the applicant in terms of seeking to control the noise that might emanate from the substation. What do you think the primary mitigation measures are that are feeding in, or will feed into the design, or would feed into the design?

00:23:50:12 - 00:23:57:20
Alice Maynard For the applicant, the primary measures would be through the use of quieter equipment,

00:23:59:12 - 00:24:11:09
through the use of, uh, noise barriers, through the use of noise enclosures. Um, would be the primary measures, the primary physical measures.

00:24:20:12 - 00:24:34:29
In terms of noise barriers, that they would be integral to the substation compound, presumably. And where do they tend to be located? Do they tend to be located very located, very close to source, Or do they tend to end up on the periphery?

00:24:35:27 - 00:25:02:07
Not for the applicant. It would the design of any of these measures. Obviously they all interact together. So it has to be a holistic design. Um, they would likely be closer to the source. Um, so that, you know, noise doesn't spread out the, their design, you know, how they're founded. They have to be isolated from vibration. All of this is very sort of particular and detailed, uh, to make sure that they're effective.

00:25:46:29 - 00:26:01:12
You can now like to turn on to cumulative noise associated with the operation, um, of the existing Lawford substation and the potential three proposed new substations.

00:26:03:02 - 00:26:44:24
Um, turning first to the applicant in terms of the existing Lawford substation, how has that played into the assessment that you've you've undertaken? Um, the examining authority on its accompanied visit went out, spent quite a bit of time in and around, um, the Lawford substation. Um, it is um, we found it to be quite dominant in, in the local noise environment. So how have you assessed it? I mean, have you just treated it as being part of the background for that part of the area, or have you given any special consideration?

00:26:47:10 - 00:26:59:13
Presumably it's it's quite long established. It's perhaps not the most up to date or modern of Kit, um, that you might now find for a substation site, particularly in a rural location.

00:27:02:27 - 00:27:22:13

Uh, Richard Carter for the applicant. Um, yes. The existing Lawford substation as as you suggested, as it does form part of the existing baseline that's there. So there was no special, uh, additional measures that that, um, were given to, to that.

00:27:34:26 - 00:27:50:29
And can you help on how representative it is as an installation? Is it? Is it perhaps getting a little bit long in the tooth and a more modern installation perhaps wouldn't produce as much external noise.

00:27:52:20 - 00:28:02:05
For the applicant? It's a challenging question to comment on UK power network substation and the equipment and how it may be working.

00:28:04:05 - 00:28:05:15
WI.

00:28:08:23 - 00:28:14:11
There would be differences in equipment, um, from between the two substations.

00:28:18:04 - 00:28:18:26
It.

00:28:20:22 - 00:28:23:21
I would have to, uh.

00:28:27:28 - 00:28:39:05
Yeah, I think that's all I can say. It's difficult to comment on UK power networks, a different body substation, um, and how its equipment's operating. Apologies.

00:29:22:15 - 00:30:16:18
My next question. We've kind of already touched on, um, and it's the interrelationship between what would be the three new substations, um, and the difficulty that the potentially is at the moment because no project has actually finalised its design. But, Mr. Carter, what sort of level of confidence can you give that the predictions or the modelling and the predictions that you've worked up? Um, for the cumulative effect of those three substations in this location? Um, how confident are you, um, that each of them, if they were operating together, um, could be operated in a manner that would not be, um, for want of a better way of describing unduly, um, neighbourly.

00:30:30:03 - 00:31:18:12
Richard Carter for the applicant. I mean, ultimately, the, um, what's what will be the governing factor will be the, the noise limits. That would be, uh, set at the nearby properties. Um, and we've, uh, the noise impacts assessment talks about individual limits, uh, for each of the substations. So it's down to the individual substation or development to design their substation in such a way that they meet their noise limits, and providing that each of the development substations do not exceed those limits, then, uh, a level of 35dB would not be exceeded at any of the receptor locations.

00:31:18:14 - 00:31:38:04
So in that regard, I'm I'm very confident that it is achievable. Um, and in many ways the modeling is is purely academic. Um, it comes down to, um, the design and um, and meeting those limits when, um, the appropriate time.

00:31:46:20 - 00:32:21:04
So in the case of five stories, you're working to 35 DB at Norman's farm because that's the closest, if I recall. Receptor. Um, there is a property to the south, but I think, um, Norman's is actually as at least as the crow flies, it's the closest. So you'll work for five stories to 35 DB at Norman's. Presumably, North Falls is similarly looking at 35 for Norman's because again, that must be the closest residential.

00:32:22:14 - 00:32:46:07
To Richard Carter for the applicant. Um. No, sir. There's a slight misunderstanding there. I believe if, um, if I can draw your attention to the, um, the the noise and vibration assessment app, uh, 091. Uh, table 953 on um, page 132.

00:32:56:23 - 00:33:29:07
Um, that table, uh, a portions, the overall limit of 35 DB, um, to each of the developments. Um, and whilst it will be a function of their distance, um, it does look at, um, all other um, factors of environmental noise propagation and affords More of the limit to the, um, the substation that produces the the higher noise level.

00:33:29:19 - 00:33:59:20
Um, or as predicted, to produce the higher noise level at each of those locations. So in the case of Norman's farm, um, it is actually North Falls that has slightly higher limit than five estuaries. And the limit for North Falls is 33dB. And for um, for five estuaries it would be 31dB. Um, and the East Anglia uh connection node would be, uh, much lower at 23.

00:33:59:22 - 00:34:04:00
But when those three noise levels are summed, we will come to 35.

00:35:01:06 - 00:35:12:19
Mr. Wizard for, um, the councils. Any comments to make on the assessment of the three substations working in combination?

00:35:15:12 - 00:35:18:28
Thank you sir. Mark, was your counsel? Not at this time, sir. No. Thank you.

00:35:31:15 - 00:35:41:29
Now if all three stations become operational. And then there was an issue that arose in terms of,

00:35:43:15 - 00:36:01:16
um, one of the receptors, whichever one it might be, that there was an issue that the expected level had been exceeded. How might that, um, situation be, in effect, some sort of re-engineering to address it? How practical might that be? Uh,

00:36:03:07 - 00:36:08:29
particularly in terms of trying to work out which of the sources was potentially causing the problem.

00:36:13:09 - 00:36:38:04
Uh, Paul McCartney for the applicant. Um, this is where the the noise investigation protocol would kick in, which is the protocol that we are currently working on with Northvolt and National Grid to put to, for example, Essex County Council seeing if you get a complaint. This is how we work out who is causing it and therefore who has to solve their problem. I don't know if that's the full extent of your question, or you want to move on to how our problem solved.

00:36:38:18 - 00:36:41:24
But perhaps, yes, that's the bit that really matters.

00:36:51:13 - 00:36:54:20
Obviously not for the applicant if the examining authority is ready.

00:36:58:23 - 00:37:34:19
The um, firstly, it would if there was an issue, it would, it might be because of faulty equipment. So that would be essentially rectified. Um, if it would be a persistent issue rather than a fault issue, uh, you know, something flapping or something making an intermittent noise that was unexpected. Then if it was a physical measure, that would be rectified. Otherwise, again, noise enclosures and barriers are physical measures that can be erected externally and so fairly practically outside of the equipment.

00:38:11:17 - 00:38:30:02
Turning to Mr. Carter, and presumably identifying a faulty bit of kit is quite easy. Something flapping around. That shouldn't be. Um, but if you had a situation where you've got three new noise sources, all perhaps with quite a low, um,

00:38:31:29 - 00:39:09:09
droning type noise, how how easy would it be to, in effect, look at the three sources and try and work out which might be the one that was actually causing the problem. I can think of a an entirely different scenario where two new viaducts were constructed. Um, after construction, there was a noise that arose and it became really quite difficult, even though it was only two structures to work out which of the two structures it was that then needed modifying it, that took months to resolve.

00:39:14:13 - 00:39:48:11
Richard Carter for the applicant. Uh, the first step would be to determine whether or not, um, 35dB is actually being exceeded at the, um, uh, the, the dwelling where concern has been raised or, um, and if that's found to be the case, then, um, the further investigation works are likely to involve some near-field noise measurements of the three individual substations.

00:39:48:15 - 00:40:09:25
So it's possible to, um, measure individual down to the individual items of plants to see if your, um, they're making the level of noise that you anticipate them to be making, the level of noise of, um, and it's a process of elimination, essentially.

00:40:29:26 - 00:40:38:19
How confident are you that through that process of elimination, the source could be found and then move on to working out what to do to rectify.

00:40:41:22 - 00:40:43:14
Richard, counter for the applicants.

00:40:45:12 - 00:41:15:25
It's a it's a fairly iterative process. Um, if the noise level has been exceeded, um, at the, uh, at the receptor location, then something must be producing a higher level of noise. Um, and by moving closer to each of the noise sources, that that signal will only get stronger. So it gives you a high level of confidence of of what item of um equipment is is at fault.

00:41:32:02 - 00:41:52:07
And in terms of the evolving um, noise investigation report, is that something that ultimately the applicant expects will be submitted as an examination document so that we've got an understanding of what the process might be and how the three projects have committed to address the matter.

00:41:53:13 - 00:41:57:11
Uh, for the applicant. Yes, sir. We intend to submit that once it's agreed.

00:42:35:00 - 00:42:53:26
And in terms of that report's production, any idea as to when it might be signed off by the three projects? Remembering that this project, uh, is examining, we're getting towards halfway, uh, in the not too distant future.

00:43:03:13 - 00:43:10:22
Uh, well, good for the applicant. If we could possibly come back in writing on that at deadline three. So. And that would give us a chance to have a discussion with the other two parties.

00:43:12:06 - 00:43:17:15
Well, we'll we'll touch on deadlines type things in that regard tomorrow, but that helps. Thank you.

00:43:40:06 - 00:44:05:04
And then just turning to the council, I mean the applicant on a cumulative basis as assessed, um, the operation of all three proposed substations, um, ultimately as having a minor effect upon the, um, noise receptors in the area. Any views on that was something you'd rather take away and perhaps come back in writing.

00:44:06:15 - 00:44:22:16
Thank you, sir. Michael. Justice Kennedy council, that is something I would like to take away, sir. Um, I, I don't believe there's any issues at all, but I just need, um, clarification from someone, uh, more qualified than myself in terms of the noise environment. Thank you.

00:44:29:18 - 00:44:39:17
It was that. That concludes the questions that I had on noise. And that really brings us to the end of the, um.

00:44:42:17 - 00:45:00:09
Agenda item 3.2, which was the socio economic matters before we we draw this part of the agenda to close. Is there anything either from the councils that you wish to raise at this point before I turn to the applicant, anything from the councils?

00:45:01:00 - 00:45:13:02
Sir. Thank you. Mark wishes to council not on this particular agenda item, but as I have the microphone. Can we just talk very briefly about how. What the schedule is going to be for the remainder of the day.

00:45:13:09 - 00:45:31:23
Can we can we do that when we decide? And I have chat probably with colleagues as to where we are, because we have got to have for anything from anybody else. Before I turn to the applicant on social. Okay. Nothing. Okay. Applicant. Anything else you wish to raise on socioeconomic matters?

00:45:34:27 - 00:45:36:00
Not seeing anything.

00:45:38:02 - 00:45:41:11
Not seeing anything from anybody online either. Oh.

00:45:45:21 - 00:45:48:21
Yeah. Yeah. If you'd like to make your point.

00:45:52:10 - 00:46:35:11
Thank you. Sir. Simon Olmsted's from the National Landscape Partnership. Um, I just would like to raise a point about receptors during construction of the substation. And it may be that this issue has already been being covered in the applicant's documents. But there the substation is relatively close to the, uh, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, branded as a national landscape boundary. And I wondered whether, um, as tranquillity, both noise and light um has been considered um in respect of the construction and the impact upon the area of outstanding Natural Beauty.

00:46:36:03 - 00:46:36:21
Thanks.

00:46:38:13 - 00:46:51:16
Thank you, Mr. Instance. Um, on the tranquillity point, Mr. Carter, have you got any observations to assist in terms of what sort of a system assessment you have or haven't done?

00:47:01:23 - 00:47:27:21
And Richard Carter for the applicant. Um, as I understand, the, um, the area that um, has been referred to, theirs is approximately 1.5km away. Um, the study area that we're looking at for noise impacts was 650m beyond which, um, impacts diminished to, um, a low extent.

00:47:30:27 - 00:47:33:22
So I'd say he was outside of our study area.

00:47:34:20 - 00:47:54:22
And the reason I'm you put a figure, um, in the noise chapter of the is, which was a response to one of the parish councils, which has got a lot of green. I'm trying to remember where it is. Uh, that might actually help Mr. Armstrong with his point. Um.

00:48:00:11 - 00:48:06:21
Put in the rash of post-its on my hardcopy. Means I can't really find it. Um.

00:48:24:21 - 00:48:36:04
Richard Carter for the applicants. Uh, I believe it's on page 119. Um, and it is figure 912.

00:48:38:28 - 00:48:46:29
Did I did I ask that that be brought up on screen? And perhaps you, Mr. Carter, you can talk me through what that actually shows.

00:48:49:25 - 00:49:21:03
Mr. Carter for the applicant. So this figure, um, illustrates the level of operational noise from from the substation. Um, I would point out this is just the five story Substation at this stage is where it was in

the, um, in the environmental statement. Um, but it shows the, the, the various noise contours which, uh, the thick black lines. Um, and, and that's, that sort of radiates out.

00:49:21:16 - 00:49:36:12
Um, and as you point out, it was, um, in response to a little Bromley Parish Council. Um, so it's centered around their village rather than any other areas, but.

00:49:54:11 - 00:50:25:04
Mr.. Hamster's on on your tranquillity point, does what Mr. Carter has just explained assist. Um, although this image or this figure is only in relation to five estuaries. When you start aggregating up the other, the two other substations and the distances involved, um, I think basically what Mr. Carter is saying is he doesn't consider there would be an effect on tranquility within the knob. Mr.

00:50:25:08 - 00:50:30:12
Carter, is that a fair assumption of a summation of what you just said?

00:50:31:18 - 00:50:58:06
Richard Carter for the applicant. Um, yeah. I should clarify, actually, that the figure that's that's been shown at the moment is for the operation of the substation and, um, rather than the construction, which, uh, I forgot that was the initial, uh, uh, subject of the the question. Um, so it could be a little bit misleading. That figure, um, I'm afraid, um.

00:51:04:05 - 00:51:12:14
I mean, in, in terms of hiring, which perhaps might be the noisiest activity on the substation site.

00:51:14:18 - 00:51:41:01
Any thoughts if, if, if the applicant or the various applicants are seeking to control the effect of noise for adjoining residents or nearby residents at the sorts of distances to the the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, um, would it be reasonable to expect that piling footprint would would not be something that would affect the tranquility within the er of outstanding natural beauty?

00:52:10:04 - 00:52:46:01
Richard Carter for the applicant. And the assessment focus is on the the the closer receptors as that generally offers a worst case um assessment as, as noise will diminish uh with increasing distance. Um and whilst it's recognised that um um transient spaces, like areas of outstanding natural beauty where you may have uh, people walking through can be considered as noise sensitive, um, they are, uh, a lower sensitivity class.

00:52:46:06 - 00:53:01:12
Um, so, uh, that coupled with the increased distance, then the impacts are going to be much lower than a reported for the, uh, the dwellings that are situated, um, much closer to.

00:53:22:13 - 00:53:27:18
Mr.. Time stats. Does that provide any clarity on the point, particularly in tranquillity?

00:53:29:18 - 00:54:05:03
It provides some, um, some clarity, but it's, um. Yeah. As we've. Sorry, Simon. Um, for the National Landscape Partnership. Yeah, it does provide some clarity, but I think, as we've seen from the figure shown, that that was during operation. Um, I think my question and my concern, it relates to the

construction phase. And I suppose I'm trying to argue the case that the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty itself is a receptor rather than the residence within it.

00:54:05:05 - 00:54:36:17
I'm seeing that as a an entity in itself, and I think we shouldn't just focus on noise. I think also the light is also a contract indicator for tranquility. And as, um, the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, there are moves to secure, uh, dark sky status. Um, I think, um, you know, temporary, um, inappropriate lighting.

00:54:37:10 - 00:55:00:29
Um, can, um, yeah. Not help the tranquility, which is a defined feature of the national landscape. And I'm sure the applicant is aware of the National landscapes, um, lighting Guide, which is a guide to help, uh, developers and those determining applications on the good use of light.

00:55:02:24 - 00:55:03:20
Thanks very much.

00:55:12:15 - 00:55:17:12
Does the applicant have anything to respond to Mr.. Stats point about?

00:55:23:05 - 00:55:32:10
I mean, some some of the visual effects we we are going to touch on when we get to landscape effects, which will almost certainly be tomorrow.

00:55:33:26 - 00:56:07:15
Uh, Paula McKinney for the applicant. Yes, sir. We think that probably does sit more comfortably within that topic. The construction lighting, as well as being temporary, um, would be task based and orientated and cold and directed at the tasks being undertaken. It's not the intention to direct lots of light up into the sky. For example, there is no permanent operational lighting proposed, so in the operational phase there would be no impact on dark skies, that the operational lighting would be either motion sensitive security lighting or task based. If immediate repairs or operations were going on on site, it wouldn't be always on lighting.

00:56:28:03 - 00:56:31:25
I'm sorry. My colleague wants me to note that this is all in the CP.

00:56:51:21 - 00:57:00:02
On socio economic matter, was there anything else that anybody wish to raise? I'm particularly looking at those that are online

00:57:01:24 - 00:57:03:25
not seeing any indication.

00:57:22:08 - 00:57:31:22
Uh, with the examining authority is of a mind that we adjourn this evening. But, Mr. Orgill, before we do that, you want to wanted to raise a point on timetabling.

00:57:32:15 - 00:57:48:06

Yeah. Thank you, sir. I was just going to ask you if you had the time to consider landscape today, because my my colleague sitting next to me won't be here tomorrow, but she's promised to give me a written description of what questions might, might arise then. So. But tomorrow it is, sir. Thank you.

00:57:48:13 - 00:58:05:22
Unfortunately, yes. Progress today is perhaps been a little bit slower than we thought it might have been. Um, but if if the council was happy to proceed on that basis, uh, no doubt. Mr.. Would you will do a very good job of presenting whatever note he's, he's given overnight.

00:58:07:10 - 00:58:07:25
Um,

00:58:09:15 - 00:58:18:27
so I think the intention is that tomorrow morning we'll resume by looking at, um, navigation and shipping matters,

00:58:20:15 - 00:58:32:17
and then we'll progress to landscape and visual and then offshore ecology, and then we move on to, um, transportation.

00:58:36:07 - 00:58:49:13
If there's nothing else before we rise for this evening, not seeing anything from anybody, I'll adjourn the hearing and will resume at ten tomorrow morning. Thank you very much.