

AUDIO_ISH3_SESSION1_27092023

Wed, Sep 27, 2023 4:13PM • 1:17:09

00:04

Okay, good afternoon. And before I begin, can I confirm that now everyone can hear me and see me? And can I also confirm that Miss Evans that live streaming of the event has commenced? Thanks. The no fire test is planned for today should alarm sound, it is an emergency event and we'll need to evacuate the building. Emergency exits are located in each corner of the room. And you can also exit to the main doors that you entered to. The fire assembly point is in the main carpark. And if anyone would need assistance in the event of needing to evacuate the building, please can you let the case Team No. No fire test is planned for today. So the time is now 202. And this issue specific hearing in relation to the London Luton Airport Expansion Project is now open. At today's issue specific hearing, we will be considering noise and vibration and related effects. My name is Deborah Holmes. I'm a planning inspector and a chartered civil engineer. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the member of the panel of inspectors to examine this application. Today I will be going through the management the event and introductions and one of my colleagues will be taking the notes. I will now ask my colleagues to introduce themselves.

01:26

My name is Dr. Richard Hunt. I'm a planning inspector and a chartered environmentalist.

01:32

My name is Joe Downing I'm planning inspector and charter town planner and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel of inspectors to examine this application.

01:43

With Bev Davis and Andrew Robinson, the five of us make up the panel which is called the examining authority. I can confirm that all members of the examining authority have been have made formal declarations of interest. And then there are no known conflicts of interest with regards with examining this application. There are two of them. I'll call it two other colleagues from the planning spectrum with us today. For those of you who are present in the room, you may have already spoken or heard from Sharon Evans, who's a case manager for this project. And Miss Evans is accompanied by Melbournian case officer. For those of you have joined us virtually you will spoken to the other case officer Jennifer Savage, and together they are the case team for this project. If you have any questions regarding the application process in general, I would ask you to please email these to the case team who will be happy to help up. Before we come to the to the items on the agenda today, we need to deal with a few housekeeping matters. And I'll try and get through these as quickly as possible. Can everyone attending please make sure that your phone is switched off or turn to silent? toilet facilities, including disabled facilities can be found the lobby. As far as I'm aware, no requests have been made or any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this plimner meeting. If anyone needs any special measures or arrangements, please can you speak to the case team outside the room for the purpose of identification, and for the benefit of those who may listen to the digital recording later, I will

ask that at every point you speak, please give your name. And if you're presenting an organization or an individual who is that you represent. For those attending virtually Can I repeat the requests made in the image from this conference, that in order to minimize background noise, you also make sure that all audible notifications are turned off. And then you stay muted with your camera turned off unless you are speaking as this is the blended event. It has been structured in such a way that questions or points that you may wish to raise can be done so at the relevant point in the proceedings. When we get to those points, I would ask that if you want to speak you switch on your camera and either use the raise hand function in Ellis teams, or speak at the appropriate time. Please be aware that there may sometimes be a delay before we can acknowledge this, but your patience while waiting is appreciated. Can I also remind people that the chat function on teams will not work. So please do not try and use this to ask any questions or post any comments. Miscavige will explain what to do if you lose your connection. And if and were able to adjourn for short period if there are more significant problems. Do we have any members of the press in attendance? Great. We will adjourn for a short break at convenient points in the agenda. Ideally no more than every 90 minutes or so. If for medical or other reasons anybody requires a break at a specific time. Could you please let the case team know and if we can, if possible we'll adjust the program to meet your needs. Are there any comments or questions regarding the general management of today's event in the moon now, online now as a digital recording be made of this hearing, which will be available on the National Infrastructure website. If you speak in the hearing, it's important that you understand that your comments will be recorded and that the digital recording will be published and retained usually for a period of time. Five years from the Secretary of State's decision, we are subject to the general data protection regulations, it's extremely unlikely that we'd need to ask you to give us sensitive personal information to put in the public domain. In fact, we'd actively encourage you not to give us sensitive personal information that would be put in the public domain such as your address, economic, financial, cultural or health related matters. If you feel that it necessary for you to refer to sensitive personal information, we encourage you to speak to our case team in the first instance, we can then explore with you whether the information can be provided in a wet listen format, which could then be redacted before being published. Please note that the only official recording of this procedure in is a digital recording on the project page of the website, tweets blogs and similar communications coming out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence. So moving on to the purpose of today's hearing. Today's specific hearing is being held at our request because we want to explore and discuss a number of matters relating to noise and vibration. This is to ensure that we have all the information that we need to make our reports the Secretary of State the agenda was placed on his Bachelor's website on Tuesday the 19th of September 2023. And can be found the examination library at referenced AV eight double O one. Today's hearing will be structured discussion, which Dr. Hunt will lead based on the published agenda. I'd like to remind everyone that the examination is a predominantly written process. You'll see the examination timetable that there are opportunities for the ESA to ask written questions. And we can also hold more hearings if needed. I'd like to reassure you that while we may not ask a question or topic, it doesn't necessarily mean that we believe this matter has been fully addressed. It could be that we'll examine it at a later date, often written questions. We're familiar with all the documents that have been submitted. So when answering a question, you don't need to repeat at length, something you've already written about. If you want to refer to information that you've already submitted, it would help us if you could use the examination library reference for that document. We're expecting that most of today's contributions will be from parties that have already requested to speak. This is a public examination though, and if there's a point

that you want to make, please do raise your hand if you in the room or raise your virtual hand or switch on your camera if you're attending virtually so that we can hear from you. Finally, I would like to remind everyone that this is not an inquiry, and unless we specifically request it, there will be no formal presentation of cases or cross examination. This means that any questions that you have for other parties need to be asked through the examining authority. Turned into the agenda for this hearing. We consider that the main items for discussion, construction and operation are noise and vibration, and operational noise controls including green control growth. Today's agenda is for guidance only. And we may add other issues as we progress. Should this take longer than expected, it may be necessary to prioritize matters and discern difference and matters to further written questions. Finally, it's important that we get the right answers to the questions that Dr. Hunt is going to ask. Please remember that the examination is a predominantly written process. If you cannot answer the questions being asked right now or you require more time, we'd rather you tell us that you need to respond in writing then give an incomplete or incorrect answer. We can then further response either to an action point to be submitted at deadline three on the on the fifth of October, or to later written questions or to a later hearing. Are there any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's hearing? Okay, so the case team has provided me with a list of those interested and other parties who are expected in expressing interest to be heard today. I'm going to now ask those of you who are participating in today's hearing to introduce yourself to the examining authority, and the people who are watching the livestream this event. When I say your name, please introduce yourself including how you'd like to be referred to, for example, Dr. and Mrs. Mr. And if you're representing someone who is that you represent. If you're attending virtually then please switch on your camera and microphone when I call your name. So we'll start with the applicant please.

09:11

Good afternoon, Madam, my name is Miss Rebecca Clutton. I'm off counsel. I'm instructed by Mr. Tom Henderson, who's to my right of VDB Pitman's legal advisors to the applicant who's rising and I'm going to just introduce you now to three of those speakers who will be dealing with the topics this afternoon. To my left I've got Dr. Callum Sharp. Dr. Sharp is a senior acoustic consultant with AECOM and he's the noise and vibration lead for the applicant. To Dr. Sharp's right is Mr. Eddie Robinson. Mr. Robinson is also a senior acoustic consultant. And he's an noise modeling lead for the project and then sat behind I'm afraid can't quite see him yet. We'll probably also be calling on Mr. Richard Connelly, Mr. Connelly's in a Aviation planter and he'll be dealing with points in relation to fleet mix. And then finally, you've already met this morning, Mr. Mark de who deals with green controlled growth. Madam, I appreciate your introductions. There is just one small housekeeping point arising from this morning that I wanted to pick up if that's okay. And it was in relation to a point raised by Miss Davies in relation to the climate change section of the agenda. And Miss Davies asked me to confirm whether or not this application was the first application for an airport expansion project to be made since the six carbon budget had been adopted. And I can confirm that it's not the Bristol airport inquiry, what took place after the adoption of the six carbon budget. And so when we do our note on the approach to be taken to contribution, the assessment of the contribution that this project makes to carbon budgets. We will be saying that it will be in relation to the national targets and that that has been established at other projects that have been undertaken or been approved since the six carbon budget has been adopted.

11:06

Thank you very much for that clarification. Can move now to Luton Borough Council.

11:14

Good afternoon Madam Michel fry council for Luton Borough Council. Madam on this topic, the Luton Borough Council is aligned with the other host authorities so I would imagine for most of the xes questions Miss Ross who sits by right will answer on behalf for last. Thank you.

11:31

Thank you. Okay, moving on to the joint host authorities then.

11:36

Hi there Fiona Ross. I'm acting for the five host authorities so Hartfordshire county council North hearts council dacorum Borough Council, Luton Borough Council and central Bedfordshire Council. And I also have Ben Holcomb with me who I may call upon to present it in more detail on the noise aspects.

11:56

Thank you. And now booking them show Council.

11:59

Good afternoon. My name is Mark Westman Smith, and I am here on behalf of Buckinghamshire Council. And I'm here with Steve Braund. Who is the Environmental Protection Team Leader and you may well speak this afternoon.

12:18

Thank you, and I've got a national highways. Nope. Okay. Civil Aviation Authority.

12:34

Good morning, ma'am. I'm on the screen, I'm afraid. No problem. I'm Nick grant of counsel here for the Civil Aviation Authority. Alongside me you have Mr. Graham French, who's the head of network resilience policy. We're here to do our best to help if we can. There's nothing we particularly wish to speak about. I'm afraid I don't have any of my subject matter experts with me today. So the moment we start, verging into anything remotely technical, I'm likely to have to come back in writing, I'm afraid.

13:08

Okay, thank you very much. And next I'll move on to the interested parties though. Mr. lamborn from that Occam

13:18

Thank you, man. I'm I've pressed something I shouldn't have done but anyway. Yes. Andrew lamb born Chair of Loudoun County community group.

13:26

Thank you. And then I have a Mr. Phillips from the happiness society.

13:36

Nope. Okay. Mr. Hale, from St. Albans, quieter skies.

13:44

Good afternoon. I'm here. I don't know if you can see me yet.

13:49

You're very quiet. And

13:54

I'm representing St. Albans, quieter skies. I'm the chair. I doubted I will have much to ask except possibly under Section Five.

14:04

Thank you. I've also got Mr. Mill's Barker. Not a baker. Now, Tim O'Neill

14:22

and Mr. Reddington

14:29

Yes, my name is Michael Reddington. I'm representing myself. I'm a resident of Wigmore.

14:35

Thank you most welcome. And finally a Mr. Thompson.

14:45

I see I have a hand up for Mr. Hale.

14:51

Apologies that was mistake.

14:55

No problem. Before we move on, can I confirm that we've heard from everyone who wish choose to participate in today's meeting. Okay, thank you. I'll now pass over to Dr. Hunt to lead us through the rest of the items on the agenda.

15:13

Thank you, Miss Holmes, and good afternoon, everyone. Just before I start, I wanted to take the opportunity to manage people's expectations about what will be happening today. As my colleagues have said in other hearings, the examiner authority aware that there was a recent planning inquiry held to consider the proposed increase in passenger cap from 18 to 19 million passengers per annum, and that many people who presented evidence that inquiry have also made submissions to this examination. However, this was held under the rules and procedures for such an application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Unlike a planning inquiry, where a lot of evidence is presented

orally, and is subject to cross examination, the National Infrastructure regime is a predominantly written process, with most evidence and questions asked in writing. The purpose of the hearings this week, as Miss Holmes has said, is to enable us to ask the questions that allow us to gather the evidence that we need to enable us to make a report to the Secretary of State. As a result of these hearings, you will not be asked to present evidence, nor is there the opportunity to orally ask questions of or cross examined other parties about their evidence, except under very limited circumstances. The hearings are an opportunity for the examining authority to ask questions based on the evidence submitted so far. It's also important to emphasize that the examination is a six month process. And as a result, not all of the evidence will have been submitted, nor will all of the questions have been asked or answered as yet. For those of you joining hearings for the first time today, I also wanted to highlight that some noise related subjects, such as green controlled growth, and Noise Compensation, have already received a degree of scrutiny through issue specific hearings on the draft development consent order, and compulsory acquisition hearings yesterday. If you're interested in these topics, I'd suggest reviewing the audio recordings of those hearings for reference. What it does mean is that some points that you might expect to hear discussed today, in this session may already have been addressed and won't necessarily be repeated. I'll be referring to a number of technical documents in the course of this session, I will provide a full reference documents, including the examination library reference when I first mentioned them, but after that, I'll use the shortened form of the document name. For example, rep one dash 003 es chapter 16 noise and vibration Rev. Two, I will refer to as the noise and vibration chapter from now on. So if we can turn to item to the agenda, I'd like to start by reviewing some aspects of the construction stage assessments, including some of the underlying assumptions. And appendix sorry, app, Dash 049 es appendix 4.2. The Coda construction practice, or COC Ps are referred to it from now on highlights that earthworks could be a 24 hour 24 hour activity during the summer season, and identifies a range of other 24 hour activities, including tunneling and highways works amongst others. In a similar vein, the noise and vibration chapter provides a qualitative assessment works at junction 10 of the M one concluding effects are unlikely to be significant as they're unlikely to exceed the loan 100 meters, then the noise and vibration chapter of the report goes on to say that m one junctions and works are likely to be out of hours would not be significant as they're subject to Section 61 consent. So the first question is given that 24 hour working appears to be very likely, is the assessment based on daytime hours of working and plans on times a realistic worst case assessment? And should it quantitative nighttime construction noise assessment be provided

19:20

Rebecca Clinton for the applicant serve most of these questions are going to be dealt with in the first instance by Dr. Sharpe, Q.

19:29

Dr. Sharp Arab for the applicant. So as with all the noise and vibration assessments in chapter 16 of the environmental statement rep 1003 We take a reasonable worst case approach. So the methodology for the construction noise and vibration assessment and the assumptions relating to the reasonable worst case approach are set out in Section 16.5 and 16.6 of chapter 16 And then further information is provided in Section Five Have appendix 16.1. And as you have seen in the results of the chapter in Section 16.9, we identify no significant noise effects. In terms of methods of working and the types of plant that were used that's been set out and taken from the construction methods statement and

program report. As as 082. And generally, within each assessment phase, we've taken those items of plants and broken them down into key periods with within which we would expect there to be the greatest levels of noise and vibration for the noise and vibration assessment, again, has a reasonable worst case, I'll just talk a little bit more about the reasonable worst case approach and then move on to the to the out of hours working points. So there was a couple of agenda items mentioned as well in terms of hoardings and how methods of work have been used in the assessment. So, for example, the predictions assume that all items of plant are positioned at the edge of any construction area closest to the nearest sensitive receptors, as a reasonable worst case approach. And we assume no benefit from hoardings within the predictions. So again, tending on the reasonable worst case. In terms of the working hours, the core working hours assess out in the code of construction practice, just a PP 049 from 8am to 6pm. On the weekdays, excluding bank holidays, from 8am to 1pm, on Saturdays. But it's important to note that measures to control impacts both inside and outside of the core working hours are controlled through the code of construction practice. So the mitigation in the code of construction practice, that's ap 049 is secured through requirement eight of the development consent order. And that could have construction practice requires that best practical means are employed to reduce noise and vibration. And that would include screening, as well as various other very standard measures to reduce and control construction noise and vibration. The key aspect of the Kota construction practices, it requires prior approval under Section 61 of the control of Pollution Act for any construction activities that are likely to generate noisy activities or perceptible vibration, and that's within core hours as well as outside of core hours. But in particular, the code of construction practice gives voice to the fact that any work outside of those core hours would be potentially or those periods are more sensitive. So paragraph 14, point 2.9 of the code of construction practice has a specific mechanism for considering impacts of activities that would occur outside of those core hours recognizing that they are more sensitive.

23:08

Thank you. My concern is that at the moment, we we have effectively a knowledge position where it's very likely that nighttime working will occur. It's not a sort of, it doesn't appear to be uncertain from the documentation in front of us. So it's very likely that will occur. There will be mitigation required, but at the moment I have what I have is a daytime assessment of the impacts. And then a nighttime assessment that concludes no significant effects because there is a fallback position of the section 61 process. But my understanding is that section 61 is prior consent for noisy activities where best practical means supplied. But it doesn't mean that that equates to no likely significant effects during the nighttime period. And given that nighttime period is of the greatest sensitivity and the most concern for local residents. It's the time of day that I would be interested in understanding what the potential for impact is. So I suppose my question to you is, is there some form of quantitative assessment that can be provided if these nighttime works which go forwards?

24:31

I think wants to take that one away and respond to you in writing if it's okay, sir.

24:35

Okay, thank you. Can you confirm when you'd be able to do that by

24:43

I think it'd be deadline for it. Thank you.

24:53

So, my next question is around construction methods statement. So, use of static conveyor belts is referenced in as 08 to the construction method statement Rev. One, can Applicants explain how use of a static conveyor belt system has been considered in the noise assessment.

25:23

Rebecca clutton for the applicant I think Mr. Robinson is going to deal with this point, sir.

25:29

Sir Eddie Robinson on behalf of the applicant. So, when when we're assessing construction noise, we put together predictive noise model based on within the construction methods statement that accounts for all noise sources. So, in general, the noise sources are based over an area because we don't have specific details of of where items such as conveyor belts are going to be located. So, so we undertake reasonable worst case method by by locating them near the edge of boundaries. So So in that sense, we have covered and we know, we consider that to be quite a conservative approach to predicting noise construction loans.

26:18

So in terms of the assumptions around the static and variables, then are they included within the plans on time? Assumptions? Could you direct me to where that is in? Yes.

26:31

I, Eddie Robinson from the applicant, can I respond back to you in writing on that, please?

26:37

Yes, of course.

26:45

And in rep 1007, the outcome provided a copy of the New Century Park decision notice, which referenced an acoustic screen was part of the design for the airport access road in the original New Century Park permission. In your comments on London Luton hotel BPR, a property fund LLP relevant representation, you confirm that a screen would be provided? Can you provide any plans sections, location or acoustic specifications for the screen and demonstrate how this would be secured?

27:26

Rebecca clutton for the applicant, sir that seems to me to be a matter that will have to respond to in writing. But can you just just sorry, can I didn't take a note of it as you were saying it can you just repeat precisely what it is that you want plans sections?

27:44

Plan? What I need to know is where where would the acoustic screen be? What it would look like and what acoustic specification it would have

27:57

that and Lisa,

28:00

Luton Borough Council I will look up the details as well from the planning permission on Newson Parker to provide what details we had at that point. That will be very helpful. Thank you.

28:29

You mentioned Doug sharp moments ago, the the construction practice includes opposition's around hoardings to screen noise and construction practices talks about this being placed in areas exposed to high levels of construction noise. And can you provide information regarding the likely location of such holdings? And can well you've already confirmed whether any Reliance has been placed on them. So it's more what locations would those holdings be in at the moment?

29:07

Dr. Sharpe, or the applicant, I think that that kind of information will be provided as part of the section 61 Consent applications, depending on the type of construction the plant the hours of operation, and distances sensitive receptors. It's not specified at this at this time. Okay, we haven't taken into account in in our noise assessment.

29:29

Okay. And the question that sort of sits behind this is given that the application is concluding no significant effects from construction noise. Is there actually need for hoardings in these locations? And why are they being proposed as a mitigation measure if construction noise is not significant? And just for context, and Mr. Reddington, you had a hand up?

29:54

Yes, this relates to the previous questions, which was the noise barrier on the access remote. I wasn't expecting to answer anything on this, but I'm fairly sure I raised the question. And one of the responses I had was there will be no acoustic screen on the access road. I just want to make it clear that I would expect I would expect you to screen and I assume that the response will be in the positive.

30:25

Thank you. Yes. The the screen has been committed to you in the response to relevant representations. It may not be the same screen that you are asking about. I think that is the distinction. Okay. I think your representation was talking about the the new entrance into the site, not on the main. This is the western end of the access road.

30:50

Okay, I was talking about accessible as it goes across, even Green Road. Yes. So

30:57

this the the screen that I'm talking about is at the western end, near the Ibis hotel, I believe. And can I just ask the Applicant to briefly comment though, on the Mr. Eddington's comment went about the screen at the eastern end of the access road and whether it's required

31:19

Calum sharp for the accident, we have not identified any need for any road mitigation in terms of a screen on the eastern side of the airport access road. Thank you.

31:37

And to monitoring like stations ML to a diamond end and ml 15 on East and Green Road. We used to inform the construction noise assessment. Could the Atkins explained where the measurements in table 4.4 of the sorry, I seem to have lost my reference of as oh nine six as appendix 16.1 noise and vibration? Can you confirm whether those are free field or facade measurements? Eddie Robinson

32:21

on behalf of the applicant, I can confirm those are free field noise measurements.

32:28

Thank you would it be possible to bring up as 120 the ambient noise monitoring data and survey sheets?

32:45

S 120.

33:16

If we could turn to page 21. I think that's monitoring location two.

33:28

From the setup figure, and monitoring location to the monster appears to be within 3.5 meters of reflective surfaces. And the same also goes for monitoring location 15 on page 48. And my question is whether a three decibel facade correction should have been applied to the monitoring data. And how would this affect the results of the construction noise assessment?

34:09

Eddie Robinson on behalf of the applicant

34:12

can we respond in writing on that would have to review the noise monitoring location and location in relation to the noise source that influencing noise levels at location.

34:26

Okay, thank you. I suppose obviously my concern is that if the measurements are actually facade measurements rather than free field measurements, there's a three disability difference in the numbers

and that has a bearing on the assessment may be that it overall reduces the baseline noise level and therefore the final assessed noise levels but I would like to understand what the indications are for the conclusions of the assessment in any likely significant effects.

34:55

Yeah, I just thank you. Thank you for clarifying that Dr. Sharp for the applicant. We can have a look at that. But just in the way that the baseline noise measurements were used for the construction noise assessment, I think it's unlikely it would affect the outcomes. We'll, we'll look at that. Thank you.

35:10

If you can turn up

35:11

sorry, Rebecca. And for the applicant, I was just going to ask you, if you could repeat the references, just so make sure we've got a clear note of the ones that you want the applicant to look at.

35:20

So it's monitoring location two on page 21. And monitoring location 15 on page 48.

35:27

So two on page 21 and 15, on page 20,

35:32

and both of those are in as 120.

35:36

I'm grateful thank you sir.

35:43

And the code of construction practice table 14.2 identifies additional temporary vibration thresholds or receptors that are above the significant significant observed adverse effect level or soul of the Council has agreed to these relaxed thresholds above soul being applied.

36:06

On Earth for the host authorities of economic and

36:12

an outcome for the holster associates

36:13

I missed the reference of the relaxed

36:19

it's table 14.2 of the code of construction practice. It includes additional temporary vibration thresholds that are above the soul level.

36:36

Okay, well take up points away and come back and writing.

36:40

Well, perhaps the applicant is able to explain whether you've had a conversation with the local authorities regarding that particular point.

36:49

I'm sure show up for the applicant. We've certainly had extensive discussions with the host authorities on the construction noise and vibration assessment, including the assessment criteria and thresholds and laws and souls that's recorded as agreed in the statement of common ground. Whether this particular aspect and this particular table is included on that I'll have to defer to the authorities. But from my perspective, yes, we've had those discussions and agreed the process and the assessment criteria.

37:19

My only concern is that there was an assessment in the environment statement, and then the total construction plank practices, adding additional thresholds that slightly higher than were assessed in the Yes. So that's, that's what I want to understand. And at the same time, would it be possible There are criteria is that three millimeters per second and five millimeters per second? Would you be able to provide descriptors for those as you have for the other thresholds?

37:54

I'm sure if we can, yes, I'm sure we can provide that. Thank you.

38:00

And the noise and vibration chapter assesses vibration impacts based on continuous flight auger will CFA piling. And county applicants explain what controls are in place to secure use of the quiet piling techniques to ensure that the assessment of effects is representative of the likely effects that would be experienced by receptors close to the airport.

38:36

Or sharpen the app for the applicant. I'm just looking through the code of construction practice, I think best practicable means requires the use of quieter equipment and low vibration equipment. But we can check for that reference and get back to you on that.

38:53

Thank you. And one of the reasons I was asking the question is that impact piling was secured in the New Century Park decision notice. And given that this potentially more noisy method might already have been established as a preferred method of working at the site. Would it be appropriate to restrict this method? If CFA piling is what has been used in the ES and has been assumed or actually should there be an assessment of different piling techniques within the s?

39:34

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant? I think we have to get back to on that one.

39:38

Thank you. And I just wondered if the local authority had a view in terms of the piling method, and whether any discussions had been had about securing particular types of planning methodologies to ensure that the conclusions of the vibration assessment remain robust and Representative

40:01

So Michael froufrou leaving our council so far as we're aware, we haven't had any discussions but again, we will confirm that and come back I'm writing so I'll just pick it up so, you

40:15

can show up for the applicant if I may. Just to point out the reference I was looking for is paragraph 14 point 2.2 A, which requires that a lead contractor will have a duty to avoid reduce control and or manage construction noise and vibration through best practical means including noise and vibration control at source for example, the selection of quiet and low vibration equipment

40:47

there is nothing currently that would restrict another type of planning from occurring. There is a sort of broad commitment to taking a lower Illinois method of piling but it's not secured in any fashion.

41:02

Rebecca clutton for the applicant I think so that's just something we can take away and work out whether we do need to just add some drafting into restrict that or whether if we want to retain the flexibility there's some sort of assessment that needs to be done.

41:13

Okay, thank you that's everything I wanted to touch on on construction for the moment. So we'll wait to see the Atkins traditional submissions on that so deadline for I think he was saying for most of those, so anything that can be provided sooner.

41:37

Rebecca clap for the applicant, we'll just have a review amongst ourselves and we'll see if we can come back to you before the end of the before the end of the hearing as to what we provide more quickly. Okay,

41:47

thank you. We're gonna move on to traffic noise. The noise and vibration chapter explains that construction traffic noise and phase two A is compared against the DO SOMETHING scenario for the previous phase of work, and that this is a conservative estimation of road traffic noise. Can you explain why the do somethings scenario rather than the two minimum scenario is used as the comparator for the purposes of the impact assessment and why this represents a conservative approach?

42:23

Now I'm short for the applicant. If I understood the question correctly, in terms of identifying are EIA likely significant effects were comparing the DO SOMETHING scenario with the proposal element to the do minimum without the proposed development is that what you're

42:39

thinking paragraphs 16 point 9.7 tunes 16 point 9.74 explains the assessment is that the DO SOMETHING scenario from the previous phase of work it may be that it's a typographical error

42:59

Sorry, could you repeat the reference was

43:01

16 point 9.72 and 16 point 9.74.

43:09

Point just Rebecca click with the Apollyon we just have a moment to find those document Thank you.

44:37

township for the applicant it's simply a result of the phasing of the growth of the traffic so we wouldn't get to assessment phase to be without the completion of the growth and the traffic associated with assessment phase to a to a comparing

44:55

this is purely talking about the the do something scenarios against the previous to something situation. Okay, thank you sorry this has helped clarify. And the use of the 74 Dispel la q 16. Our threshold has been unacceptable adverse effect level threshold has been questioned by the local authorities. And once the ual was applied to the A 14 project, can the applicants explain what makes the local context sufficiently similar to the A 14 project for the same URL to be applied in this instance.

45:42

I'm sorry for the applicant. In setting the UA el the unacceptable adverse effect level we've had mine to precedent from consented DCF schemes like a 14. But as we have set out in the deadline to paper that is titled additional service access noise modeling additional information. Rep. 2040. We've also had regard to British Standards and guidance in the setting of the UAE L. So we've had regard to British standard 8233, and the Association of noise consultants and Institute of acoustic Institute of acoustics professional planning practice guidance note. And we'll use that information to derive the 74 u a l and how we've done that as set out in that paper. And I'm happy to elaborate on that if you if you'd like me to help.

46:43

If you could just expand a bit appreciate that there is precedent for using that number. But obviously, the setting of thresholds within noise policy statement takes into account contexts so that actually the

context is specific and the levels are specific to the location. So the question is, why are those levels acceptable in the loosened area? And are they applicable in the Luton area rather than in the Cambridge area?

47:12

Contract for the applicant? Yes, thank you. That's yeah, that's clear. I mean, we think it is based on the standard and guidance which sets internal its starting point is pretty standard 8233, which sets or provides guidance for acceptable internal noise levels, which I would argue are appropriate regardless of whether it's in Lucena or Cambridgeshire, we're interested in a sound environment for people inside their homes. Okay, thank

47:40

you. Did the counselors want to comment?

47:45

On or ask for the host authorities, I think simply to reiterate the point that we've made previously, which is that obviously the Heathrow preliminary environmental information report used, you will have 71 decibels. And that's not something that we would expect to be revised upwards in the context of you know, had that application being examined. And so we think that is a more appropriate, more appropriate level to set for the year. Thank you.

48:20

If we can move on,

48:23

and tabled 16.25 of the noise and vibration chapter indicates that the surface access noise model consistently underestimates aq 60. Now traffic noise when compared against measured results, with variance ranging from between one to eight decibels. In significance terms, obviously, eight decibel magnitude of change is equivalent to a short term major adverse effect, or long term, moderate adverse effect. First of all, Candiac can provide an equivalent table for the LA Q eight, our nighttime traffic noise.

49:04

Contract for the applicant? Yes, we can provide that. Well, we won't be able to do so is as a direct comparison to the measurement locations because the measurements were short term measurements made during the day. But we can provide the equivalent eight hour nighttime from the model.

49:23

You so your monitoring was continuous monitoring those so wouldn't there be 24 hour data available?

49:33

Indeed, sir, that's the case we'll be able to provide it for that information, but not for the ones that are short term data and measurements. Yeah.

49:38

Okay. Thank you. And can I just ask and without being another deadline for submission?

49:47

I think I think yes, what's the deadline for for that just to make sure that we have the data correctly available. And thank you.

49:57

And with reference then to relevant model Link guidance. Could you explain how this level of variance constitutes an acceptable level of correlation against the measured data?

50:10

I'm sorry for the applicant. So we're aware of this of this issue, of course, as you know, and we've provided some additional information, again, in the document I referenced before, which is the surface access noise modeling additional information. We've also been having extensive discussions with the host authorities noise consultant on the topic. So just to outline the kind of methodology in the modeling that we've undertaken, just briefly, because I think it's relevant to the question. We have used the design manual for roads and bridges, guidance, la 111, and the calculation of road traffic noise methodology, also known as CRT N, and that CRT N methodology is a standard methodology has been successfully relied on for over 30 years as an indirect industry sort of standard approach to assessing road traffic noise, the validation of the model, we believe to be appropriate as described in that paper they're referenced. And the CRT n is an empirical model that was validated at the time of its creation from 1000s of long term measurements specifically for the purpose of validating and tracing that model. There is no requirement in the design manual for roads and bridges or the CRT N methodology for revalidating, the noise model based on short term spot measurements. And in fact, the design manual for roads and bridges itself cautions at paragraph 4.2 That measurements on site cannot be compared as a like for like on a like for like basis to the outcomes of the CRT and noise model, which represents an 18 hour annual average weekday noise level. However, it is standard practice to do spot measurements just to understand and quality assurance and provide context for the model. And in general, those measurements did show good agreement within three decibels for the majority of the locations. But there were four particular locations which has been identified as having a wider variation. So we have undertaken further analysis of those measurement locations, including sort of in collaboration with the host authorities noise consultant to go through each and every one of those four locations, and understand why there are discrepancies between those local short term measurements. And I should say all four of those measurements are short term three hour measurements, and understand why they're different from the measured outcome. And we have been able to identify reasons that are sort of justifiably representing why there's noise levels are different. So one of the key things, as I mentioned, is the fact that it's just a short term three hour measurement. The other thing to note is that in the spot check exercise for some of those locations, the planned survey location was used rather than the actual survey location, which on the day was adjusted slightly as is common for noise surveys when you turn up and can't quite measure where you where you thought you might be able to, that has since been corrected, and the spot check measurements been redone. And they're a lot closer than they were. And they're also just generally sort of very localized conditions for those for measurement locations, such as poor road surfacing and a reflective surface in one case. So taking those points into account, we're now confident that the differences are attributable to those

specific four locations. And once those are taken into account, the measured the spot check measurements show good agreement, as do the rest of the comparisons. And we, as I've said that was sort of taken in a collaborative approach with with the host authorities noise consultant, and as a result, I believe, we have now agreed that those particular spot checks do not affect the validity of the model as a whole and its ability to model the the baseline and the environmental impacts or the proposed development.

54:25

If that's helpful, and do you have a copy of that report that you're able to submit?

54:33

I'm sorry for the applicant, we'd be happy to provide that information. And that's something we could do for deadline three.

54:41

Thank you. And do the counselors have any comments to add to that?

54:47

Again, I was interested because it's actually something to ask

55:05

Just going back to the ambient noise monitoring data and survey sheets, the ambient noise monitoring has been used to spot check and verify Baseline Road Traffic noise levels. So, in my notes, I have manipulation locations 23 to 29 and 41 to 44. One thing I did notice in looking at the survey data sheets was that again, they didn't appear to be necessarily free field locations, they might have been facade locations, and that might be appropriate in CRT n. But as part of your response, are you able to just double check that the monitoring is the appropriate has been expressed appropriately and there isn't an a facade correction that's needed in any of that monetary.

55:57

I'm sorry for the Applicant Yes, we'd be happy to check that and get back to you with with the rest of the information. Okay, thank you,

56:03

Rebecca Clinton for the applicant, Sir, can I just have the monitoring locations again, please.

56:07

So there's ml 23 to 29 and 41 to 44. Thank you. I think the particular ones that I was sorry, that's that's all of the monitoring locations that are covered for road traffic noise. I think it was specifically ml 26 ml 28 ml 29. Were actually the distance from surfaces is not stated and ml 43 as well.

56:45

So AI and ML 41.

56:52

Rebecca clap for the applicants so 2628 2941 and 43. Thank you.

57:10

And a number of noise console figures have been provided in the ies and thank yous the applicant for providing updated figures on OS background, which was substantially more easy to engage with than the previous figures. Figure 16.83 includes the proposed airport access road. And but it's unclear how the model parameters account for changes such as dueling of Foxhall way, which is included as an assumption within the asset presence or how the any dueling on other junctions has been taking into account. And can you explain how future changes carry with carriageway widths in particular, on voxel way, but also the other junctions in the Wigmore area have been accounted for in the noise model, and particularly how this factors into receptor distance this

58:04

column shop for the applicant. So upgrades to the existing road network have been taken into account in the road traffic noise and noise modeling, both in terms of physical changes to the road layout, which would provide the response to your point about distance to receptors. And also, of course, in terms of any impact that has on traffic distributions, speed and numbers and everything that's fed into the road traffic noise model as well. Okay, that's

58:33

helpful. Thank you. Could you tell me where that information can be found in the environment statement?

58:39

Yep. So the in terms of physical road layout that's combined, or sorry, that's provided in the transport assessment, a PP dash 200. There are a series of drawings, which are the upgrades or updates to the physical changes to the road layout. And in terms of how that traffic modeling has been updated, that's in the strategic modeling forecast report, which is a PP dash 201.

59:06

What I meant was in terms of the actual noise model itself, and where would I find the explanation of those assumptions and how they've been factored into the noise model?

59:19

I'm not sure that we necessarily have just described at that point in any particular place we can make in check, but I think it's implied certainly that the proposed development includes the road traffic upgrades and that's that's been taken into account. However, I'll check if there's a particular reference that would help assist with that.

59:37

Okay, thank you. And in terms of the airport access road, the highest level or current ground level is taken to be the worst case for the purposes of noise assessment, but we're dropping the height by two

meters 10 to reduce the distance to receptors to the north and the northwest of The site leading to an increase in noise

1:00:08

Sorry, could you repeat that particular aspect of the road.

1:00:11

So on the airport access road, the limits of deviation allow for two meters up or down. And at the moment, the assumption is that the highest alignment in the road is the worst case. But actually, if you drop the road by two meters, presumably it moves it closer to the receptor, so the north and to the northwest, so reducing the distance by a small amount, and just trying to understand whether actually the lowest alignment is the worst case.

1:00:58

Clap for the applicant, sir. On that one. I think we've already committed in the context of wanton hearings we had the other day to coming back on limits of deviation and the impact of those on assessments. I think if we wrap that point up in that note, that'd be acceptable.

1:01:12

Yeah, we find Thank you.

1:01:19

And,

1:01:21

as dash 096 as appendix 16.1, the noise and vibration information read one states that TRL method three has been used to derive nighttime traffic flows for the purposes of noise assessment. The design manual for roads and bridges, explains that TRL method three is reliable most UK roads, but that exceptions can include roads where the proportion of nighttime traffic to daytime traffic is a typical EEG for roads having facilities that operate 24 hours per day, such as airports, having selected method three. And given the airport context. Can you explain how you determined that movements on the local road network? Were not a typical?

1:02:13

Cut into the applicant? So I think Dr. Sharpe and the noise team aren't quite the right people to answer that question. It might be one that we can come back to tomorrow in the issue specific hearing relating to traffic and transport, failing, which we can come back in, in writing, but I think it's not a matter that any of the witnesses here today can deal with.

1:02:34

So when understanding was that the it's a factoring process to take the traffic numbers from the traffic model or the night time period. I assumed that was part of the noise processes. Purely done under the transport assessment.

1:02:51

No capture for the applicant? No, that's the case. We just don't have a road traffic noise modeler here who has been working on that methodology. So I just want to check with him before getting back to you. Okay, okay, thank you

1:03:18

so I was just confirming my with my colleague and we'll we'll pick that up in tomorrow's session and

1:03:29

the noise and vibration chapter explains that there would be a residual significant adverse effects for properties on Stoney lane, but that it is committed to investigating and if necessary funding opportunities for parking controls traffic management and calming measures. Can you explain how this would be secured and how the current approach gives sufficient certainty that the aim of the noise policy statement for England to avoid significant observed adverse effects will be satisfied in this location?

1:04:03

Rebecca come to the applicant. I think that's another point that we'd like to come back to tomorrow if that's okay, so

1:04:13

yeah, we'll we'll pick that up in the morning. Will there be someone with a noise? Freelance shortly. Will there be someone with a noise skill set and tomorrow's session?

1:04:25

Rebecca Clark with the applicant I certainly think we we will endeavor to her have that person available assuming that we can check that they are but that's what we're hoping to do. Okay, thank you

1:04:48

the noise and vibration? Sorry. There's a corollary question to the study Lane question, which is around Crawley Green Road and whether a similar principle applies So if that can be picked up at the same point in time,

1:05:05

Rebecca and for the applicant, can I just get you to repeat the question, just so that I make sure we've got the right, the right one down and that we answer it correctly. So

1:05:16

significant adverse effects are identified on stony lane. Yep. And the applicant commits to investigating and if necessary funding opportunities for parking controls, traffic management and calming measures.

1:05:30

And so it's just the same question in respect to another location, which is,

1:05:34

which is clearly Green Road or the Green Road. So there are 55 properties identified as potentially experiencing significant adverse effects. The main thing I'm trying to get to really is what certainty is there that that mitigation will be forthcoming for those receptors on on Stoney lane and Callie Green Road?

1:05:54

Yes, thank you. So we may be that actually, if it relates specifically just to the where it's secured, I might be able to come back to you on that in a few moments at the end of the session. Okay, thank you.

1:06:09

That's all I wanted to pick up on on the traffic noise moments. If we can move on to fixed plant noise and app 112 as appendix 16.3, the fixed plant noise management plan explains that fixed plant would be designed to achieve a rating level five decibels below the background sound level, or a level not more than five decibels above background of the worst effects and receptor. The New Century Park permission conditioned fixed plant noise levels to be 10 decibels lower than the existing background. Can the amplicon confirm whether this lower standard of noise control for the proposed DCO development has been agreed with the local authority?

1:06:59

Again, this is something that in general term, we have discussed the methodology with the local authority, whether that particular aspect has been agreed I would I would have to check with them.

1:07:13

And ask the local authority

1:07:16

and Holcomb for the authorities, the general methodology is being agreed. But these specific limits were something we're seeking to talk to the applicant on, just see whether 10 DB would be more appropriate. But allowing the caveat.

1:07:33

Okay, thank you. And given that 10 DB is an established principle in that location, is there a reason for looking for a more relaxed standard

1:07:46

LM sharp for the applicant, I think I would just start off by saying that the criteria has been set based on avoiding significant adverse effects and adverse likely significant effects. So that's been our first aim. And we believe that that criteria and that methodology, which has been applied elsewhere, for other schemes, and has been applied quite successfully, and is based on British standard 4142, which notes that actually any noise level, equal to or above background is likely to be a low impact. So we consider that five decibels below background is sufficient in protecting and avoiding those effects. So that's the

basis for the assessing of that criteria rather than any criteria that have been used elsewhere close by, but certainly we'd be happy to to consider that and discuss that with the local authorities.

1:08:42

Thank you, I suppose my concern is that obviously you have a context of the cumulative impacts of aviation noise, ground noise, and road traffic noise on receptors. So each relaxation of standards compared to previous standards that have been achieved would be more of an impact on the local communities. So it's about ensuring that they have the the best outcomes from this from a noise perspective

1:09:15

thank you that's understood we can we can have a look at it in that context and continue the discussions with Windows authorities as we've noted. Okay.

1:09:26

Did the local authorities wish to add anything

1:09:33

but I'll come to the authorities now we're happy to engage with that. Thank you and

1:09:42

can I just again on the fixed plant noise so it has any fixed plant noise source been included in the ground noise modeling, or any allowance for noise levels point SPL is greater than the background sound level being made at the moment

1:10:10

Eddie Robinson for the Applicant. So the ground noise assessment considers engine ground running aircraft taxiing AB use GPUs and far far training activities.

1:10:27

But is that all the fixed blonde? That would be crazy noise?

1:10:34

counter for the applicant? No, that's that's specific to the ground noise assessment. So the fixed plant noise control would cover everything else that is fixed plan associated with the development. So those items are listed in Appendix 16.3 In terms of what those sources may be. And also, there's full information provided in chapter four the proposed development there's a particular table that I'm trying to find table 4.1, which lists the various items of noise sources that might be considered on the face plan. So, so, substations fuel storage facility, water treatment facility and a solar battery storage.

1:11:19

So if I can interrupt sorry, the question was, has five decibel above background being factored into the noise modeling at this point in time, so is there any recommendation there may be an increase over the baseline?

1:11:35

Callum sharp for the applicant. Because we have limited information on the fixed plant noise assess out in in the noise chapter. The approach is to define the outcome and the noise limits to avoid those effects. So we have not included any modeling of fixed plant in the assessment. We're relying on the fixed plant noise management plan which is secured through the DCO to avoid those significant effects by targeting five decibels below background.

1:12:07

So there could be an increase of up to five decibels above the noise levels that already be experienced, in addition to the various other noise as noise sources that we increase the noise effects for the local local population.

1:12:25

I don't think that's necessarily the case, the framework is there to avoid that situation happening and to ensure that noise levels would be five decibels below background as far as reasonably practicable.

1:12:38

So I suppose the corollary questions if there is an allowance to go up to five decibels, but background is the s actually assessing worst case at this point in time?

1:12:49

Lm sharp for the applicant, I think it's also worth just clarifying as well the difference between the background sound and the general ambient sound and the LA 90 metric which is used in the fixed noise management plan. So the BS 4142 assessment of assessing effects from fixed plant noise is based on a metric of the Le 90 which is a noise metric, which represents 90% or the noise level that is exceeded for 90% of the time. So in other words, it's the 10% of the quietest period of a given time period. So things like for example, aircraft noise and intermittent sounds would not contribute to that noise level. So where we are targeting a five decibels below background sound level that would be substantially below an LA cue, for example, be slang sound level or ambient sound level in the area. So we do think it is sufficient protection from things like or sufficient protection from the idea of these noise levels adding together and increasing the overall ambient sound.

1:14:00

Thank you any other comments from the council's?

1:14:09

And I'll come to the authorities. The other point is that for fixed plant mitigation is inherently simple, especially with the amount of plant expected so the actual need to rely on that caveat for individual items of plant might be necessary but we're not looking across the board that I wouldn't expect from the applicant thank you

1:14:46

as well as the assessment on residential receptors the plan states that noise from fixed plants or non residential receptors would be assessed using a methodology approved in writing by the relevant planning authority and has this non residential receptor method been agreed or discussed with the relevant planning authorities? And what is the likely method of assessment?

1:15:08

Callum sharp for the applicant? Again, yes, we've discussed it in outline terms. But whether we focused on that particular aspect of it, I'm happy to defer to the authorities to answer on that one. We haven't predefined that that methodology at this stage. And that's common for approaches for for this type of approach that's been applied before, such as for high speed too. And the reason being that the methodology will necessarily depend on detail that isn't available at this stage, such as detail of the items a plant, as described and which sensitive receptors are being exposed, how they are used, when they are used, how sensitive they are. All of those will need to be taken into account in that assessment. So we don't think it's appropriate to predefine it at this stage. But as as Mr. Cole Holcomb has pointed out, in general terms, the items of plant that we're expecting, or that are part of the pros development are expected to be easily mitigated. And we're not expecting there to be any need for any special types of mitigation to avoid effects, those non-residential receptors. So we think this outline approach is appropriate, given that given that context.

1:16:27

Thank you. Were there any other comments?

1:16:31

Or ask for the host authorities? I'm happy to engage with the applicant on that point. Thank you.

1:16:45

I'm wondering if it might be appropriate to take a short recess. I'll hand over to my colleague, Miss Holmes.

1:16:56

Thank you. Yes. We'll take a short break now and we'll come back at 25 to thank you