

# Statements Made At ISH6 by William David Moore

This document contains three sections.

Section 1 is a correction of an action point written by the Examining Authority.

Section 2 is a clarification of a misunderstanding which I believe occurred during the meeting.

Section 3 is a copy of the written text which I read aloud at ISH6.

## Section 1

In [Actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6 \(Traffic & Transport, and Noise\)](#), the Examining Authority wrote:

“137. The Applicant is to provide a comprehensive response to Mr Moore’s D4 submission [REP4-204] addressing each of the 8 points in relation to traffic noise used in lieu of unattenuated rail noise.”

This is not what I wrote and what the Examining Authority has chosen to write does not make sense.

The road and rail noise contours introduced by the applicant indicate sound levels far higher than those measured by NMPs. **The applicant’s contours should not be used in lieu of measurements made by NMPs.**

We know what the distant road noise is during different time periods, it has been measured by NMP4 & NMP3. We know what the rail noise is during different time periods, it has been measured by NMP4 & NMP3.

But the NSRs aren’t ~12 metres from the railway line **so attenuation corrections need to be applied to the measured sound of the train pass bys to establish ambient sound levels at the NSRs during different time periods.**

## Section 2

During the meeting, I spoke of there being 32 additional freight train movements per day. The applicant kept speaking of 16 additional freight trains per day.

Each additional freight train would go into the HNRFI and then come out again, each additional freight train would pass by twice, so there would be 32 additional freight train movements by 16 additional freight trains.

I think the applicant believed I was claiming there would be 32 additional trains per day, which is not what I said.

The cumulative impact assessment for Burbage Common should include the worst case scenario for the number of additional off-site train movements past Burbage Common as those additional freight trains would be arriving and departing from the HNRFI.

### **Section 3**

*This is a copy of the written text which I read aloud at Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) on 24th January 2024.*

“The applicant’s noise assessment update note is a mess.

The update doesn’t address NMP3 and its NSR 19 of Burbage Common and Woods at all.

It doesn’t address all the NSRs associated with NMP4. It only addresses the NSRs which it thinks are on Billington Road East.

The update misstates the locations of NSRs 2, 3 & 4. The update thinks they are on Billington Road East, but they aren’t. They should not have been included in Table 5 and the claimed ambient sound levels at those NSRs can be discarded.

The applicant has attempted to introduce rail noise contours to claim all the NSRs in Table 5 experience 50 dB of ambient rail noise, but if you look at the contours and the NSR locations, you’ll see that every single one of the NSRs are outside the rail noise contours. Yet the applicant has attributed 50 dB of ambient rail noise to each NSR in Table 5. The applicant shouldn’t have done that, because they are all outside the contours.

On the claimed ambient road noise, the applicant’s own report states that the ambient sound levels predicted by the applicant’s road noise model are higher than those measured by noise monitoring positions.

At NMP5, in close proximity to the M69, the ambient sound levels predicted by the applicant’s road noise model were 7 dB above the levels measured by NMP5.

At NMP1, also in close proximity to the M69, the predicted daytime ambient sound levels were 5.4 dB above the levels measured and used in the report. The predicted night-time ambient sound levels were 6.4 dB above the levels measured and used in the report.

The applicant knew their road noise model predicts levels which are higher than those measured by NMPs, and yet the applicant has still attempted to use their road noise model to make definitive claims about ambient road noise. The applicant shouldn’t have done that, because the applicant’s road noise model is known to overstate ambient sound levels.”