

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 11:05 AM
To: Thames Tunnel
Subject: LR04363 Comment on Written Questions

Dear Sirs

On behalf of Elm Quay Court I would like to raise an issue relating to Q29 and the noise issue covered therein.

Q 29.1, inter alia, asks the Applicant to provide an assessment of the significance of the noise impact for each receptor at all sites. Questions 29.2 to 29.4 also relate with the Applicant being asked to map the noise regime for each site.

On first reading this is comforting to Elm Quay Court because, as pointed out in my representations (1248 and supplementary representation of the 7th November 2013), we feel that the baseline noise measurements in the vicinity of Elm Quay Court were non-existent or not fit for purpose (please see the supplementary representation for details). However, we have a concern that the Applicant might again disregard Elm Quay Court, ignore the residential block as a receptor site and thus treat it as not falling within the Panel's directions relating to Q29 . In my representation 1248 of May 2013 I pointed out that:

In spite of the large number of residences within EQC and its (very) close proximity to the construction sites, it appears to have been largely ignored in the documentation. For example, in the main non-technical environmental report, a word search indicates no mention of it and in Volume 14, Appendix G (dealing with noise at Heathwall) there is a single mention that it is "...located in relatively close proximity to the site".

Our measurements indicate that Elm Quay Court is 70m from the Heathwall site and within 250 linear metres of the Kirtling Street site (including the proposed jetty).

We would therefore, with respect, request that the Panel clarify to the Applicant that Elm Quay Court is a receptor site, to be included for purposes of Q29.1 etc in the measurements to be undertaken.

Yours faithfully

David Starkie