

From: Joe O'Sullivan [mailto:Joe.O'Sullivan@northlincs.gov.uk]
Sent: 27 November 2015 10:38
To: River Humber Gas Pipeline
Subject: Re: EN060004 River Humber Gas Pipeline Hearing Actions Deadline 4

Dear Sir or Madam,

I refer to the above project and the action list issued for the hearings held on the 17th and 18th of November 2015. There were two actions (points 17 and 23) for NLC to submit for deadline 4 (27.11.2015). Please take this email as NLC's submission for Deadline 4.

I can confirm that NLC have encouraged both the Parish Council and Councillors Hannigan, Wells and Clarke to make further representations. The Parish Council intend to discuss the project at their next meeting Thursday 3rd December 2015 and make further representations. I can also confirm that Cllr Hannigan, Wells and Clarke also intend to make further representations.

With regard to point 23 and the view on the noise and traffic flows the applicant has provided NLC with a clarification note to which the Environmental Protection Officer has considered and concluded that:

'I would agree with the applicant's Noise Clarification Note that there would be no significant adverse noise impact associated with restriction of HGV movements to 6.5h inbound instead of 12h inbound.'

Please see email below for information the Environmental Protection Officer detailed response. You will note that the Environmental Protection Officer comments that the:

'Noise Clarification Note does not provide HGV per hour numbers. The Noise Clarification Note does not explain how the figures in Table 2 and Table 3 have been calculated. It would be useful to have that information to be able to respond in more detail if that is necessary.'

It has been confirmed that the submission for deadline 4 from the applicant will take account of these comments but it is important to note the overall conclusions are that there would be no significant adverse noise impact associated with restriction of HGV movements to 6.5h inbound instead of 12h inbound which NCL are in agreement with. Thank You.

Joe O'Sullivan
Strategic Development Officer
Tel: 01724 297497
Email: Joe.O'Sullivan@northlincs.gov.uk

Hi Joe

In the following notes, when referring to HGV movements, I am referring to the HGVs arriving at and departing from the construction area, rather than the ongoing, on-site HGV movements from the HGVs working on the construction area:

The Noise Clarification Note does not provide HGV per hour numbers. The Noise Clarification Note does not explain how the figures in Table 2 and Table 3 have been

calculated. It would be useful to have that information to be able to respond in more detail if that is necessary.

In the absence of the HGV per hour numbers and explanation of how the figures were calculated, I have considered how the HGV movement restrictions would affect the predicted noise impact for Goxhill residents by assuming that the given HGV numbers (Table 12-19 Traffic and Transport Assessment, Environmental Statement Document 6.12) would be averaged equally throughout the day over 6.5 hours instead of 12 hours. I have assumed that the number of HGV movements per day would remain unchanged. I have then used CRTN methods to predict the likely hourly noise levels associated with the changes to the hourly HGV movements. I have then looked at the difference in predicted noise levels in the context of the overall predicted construction HGV noise levels shown in Table 10-52 of the Environmental Statement Document 6.10. The calculations I have carried out are indicative only, and I have focussed on East Marsh Road where the predicted percentage increase in HGV traffic is the most significant. These calculations indicate that the restriction in HGV movements would result in an increase of less than 1 dB in the overall maximum HGV construction noise levels on an L_{Aeq} hourly basis, and that the level at this location would remain well below the example threshold levels given in BS5288. Although the hourly L_{Aeq} noise level associated with the HGV vehicle movements would increase, the increase would not be considered significant in this context, and the residents would benefit from reduction in HGV movements during more noise sensitive times of the day.

On this basis I would agree with the applicant's Noise Clarification Note that there would be no significant adverse noise impact associated with restriction of HGV movements to 6.5h inbound instead of 12h inbound.

Please give me a call if you would like to discuss this. (After today I will be out of the office until Monday).

Thanks

Sarah

Noise Clarification Note – HGV Movements

Introduction and Scope

National Grid has proposed that inbound weekday construction HGV movements on the Goxhill side of the Scheme along Thornton Road, Ferry Road and East Marsh Road are limited to 0900-15:15 hours during term time only (NB outside of term time HGV movements would be between 0700 – 1900 hours). This was proposed to reduce the effect of the HGV movements on sensitive receptors in Goxhill that could be affected by HGV movements such as school children. This note provides a clarification of the effects of this inbound restriction on the noise and vibration assessment presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) (DCO Document Reference 6.10).

The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with BS 5228-1: 2009+A1:2014 'Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites. Noise'. Figure 10.3 of ES Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (DCO Document Reference 6.10) indicates the roads where the BS 5228 methodology was applied.

Total traffic flows on roads outside of this were in excess of 1000 18 hour Annual Average Weekday Traffic (AAWT) and were therefore calculated in accordance with Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN). These traffic links are also indicated on Figure 10.3. Table 10-4 in ES Chapter 6: Noise and Vibration (DCO Document Reference 6.10) provides the assessment in accordance with CRTN which indicates that none of the links are predicted to exceed 1dB with the Scheme, which would be considered imperceptible.

With the 6.15 hour restriction in place the total 18 hour AAWT flow would not be affected on these traffic links as the restriction would still be within the 18 hour period (06:00-23:00).

This assessment presents the predicted construction noise levels with the restriction in place, the difference between the levels presented within ES Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (DCO Document Reference 6.10) and whether the conclusions in ES Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (DCO Document Reference 6.10) would change.

Receptors Potentially Affected

Identified sensitive receptors which would be affected by the restriction in HGV movements are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 – Noise and Vibration Assessment of the Inbound Haul Route – Affected Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive Receptor Name	
East Marsh Farm - Goxhill	New Bank Farm - Goxhill
Ferry Farm – Goxhill	Riverside Cottage - Goxhill
Fir Tree Farm (Bungalow) - Goxhill	Salt Marsh Farm - Goxhill
Fir Tree Farm (House) - Goxhill	Springfield - Goxhill
Five Seasons - Goxhill	The Homestead - Goxhill
Goxhill Haven - Goxhill	The Poplars - Goxhill
Grasmere – Goxhill	Totney Hill Farm - Goxhill
Kinglsey House - Goxhill	Uplands Lodge - Goxhill
Lynton Stud Farm - Goxhill	

Residual Effects

Table 2 presents the range of predicted construction noise levels with the HGV movement restriction in place.

Table 2 Noise and Vibration Assessment – Predicted Construction Noise Levels

Sensitive Receptor	Predicted Construction Noise Range	
	Maximum L _{Aeq} 12 Hour	Minimum L _{Aeq} 12 Hour
Springfield	55.4	47.7
Kinglsey House	55.9	49.0
Totney Hill Farm	57.5	51.5
The Homestead	53.1	47.2
Riverside Cottage	57.6	51.6
Ferry Farm	59.0	53.1
Salt Marsh Farm	55.6	49.6
New Bank Farm	58.4	52.4
The Poplars	59.2	53.3
Goxhill Haven	52.2	46.4
Uplands Lodge	56.4	49.8
Grasmere	57.6	51.7
Five Seasons	56.7	50.7
East Marsh Farm	58.9	52.8
Fir Tree Farm House	61.7	56.0
Fir Tree Bungalow	61.2	55.5
Lynton Stud Farm	58.1	52.4

Daytime construction noise levels are all predicted to be below 65dB L_{Aeq} 12 hour throughout the construction period at potentially affected sensitive receptors. In accordance with BS 5228 daytime construction noise levels with restricted HGV movements would not be considered significant.

Table 3 presents the difference between the predicted construction noise level with the restricted HGV movements and the levels presented in the ES.

Table 3 - Noise and Vibration Assessment – Difference between Noises Levels with Restricted HGV Movements and Noise Levels Presented in ES

Sensitive Receptor	Predicted Construction Noise Range comparing restricted HGV movements with those in the Environmental Statement	
	Maximum L _{Aeq} 12 Hour	Minimum L _{Aeq} 12 Hour
Springfield	0.4	0.1
Kinglsey House	0.3	0.0
Totney Hill Farm	0.1	0.0
The Homestead	0.4	0.1

Sensitive Receptor	Predicted Construction Noise Range comparing restricted HGV movements with those in the Environmental Statement	
	Maximum L _{Aeq} 12 Hour	Minimum L _{Aeq} 12 Hour
Riverside Cottage	0.1	0.0
Ferry Farm	0.1	0.0
Salt Marsh Farm	0.2	0.0
New Bank Farm	0.1	0.0
The Poplars	0.1	0.0
Goxhill Haven	0.5	0.1
Uplands Lodge	0.2	0.0
Grasmere	0.1	0.0
Five Seasons	0.2	0.0
East Marsh Farm	0.1	0.0
Fir Tree Farm House	0.8	0.1
Fir Tree Bungalow	0.7	0.1
Lynton Stud	0.8	0.1

The difference between the construction noise levels presented in Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (DCO Document Reference 6.10) and with the HGV restricted movements in place would be less than 1dB LAeq_{12 hour} at all identified sensitive receptors. The changes during this compressed period are relatively small due to the increase in traffic over the 6.15 hour period being offset by the period during which HGV movements would not take place. The standard is a 12 hour average taking into consideration hourly noise levels. The noisier levels during the 6.15 hour period combined with the lower levels are then combined to give an average which demonstrates that overall changes would be very small with the restriction in place.

In terms of environmental noise a difference of 1dB LAeq is considered negligible and would be below the threshold of perception.

Summary

An assessment of construction noise impacts with restricted HGV movements at Goxhill in accordance with BS 5228.

The predicted construction noise levels would remain below 65 dB LAeq at all identified affected sensitive receptors, and as such would not be considered to be significant based upon the criteria set out in BS 5228 Annex E.

The difference between the noise levels with the HGV restriction in place and those presented in Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (DCO Document Reference 6.10) would be negligible, therefore the conclusions reached in Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (DCO Document Reference 6.10) would not change.

Therefore, with either 12 hour inbound HGV movements or 6.5 hour inbound HGV movements, the effects would not be considered significant.

