

Sizewell C DCO Inquiry

Written Representation after ISH 12 and ISH 13 from
Stephen Beaumont Interested parties AFP209 and 358

I attended Issue Specific Hearings 12 and 13 at Snape on 15th and 16th September respectively.

The initial arrangements for ISU 12 in the letter of 17th August included “potential adverse effects on human health and living conditions of local residents during construction and operation” with reference to noise and air quality, “Monitoring and Controls”. Similarly for ISH 13 “Landscape and Historic Heritage” Sizewell Link Road.

I prepared to speak about my interests on these matters and so advised the Case Team before Deadline 7. I saw the detailed agenda for ISH 12 Point 3 and ISH 13 Point 2 but when attending the Chairman of the ExA, Mr. Maund, made it clear that the agenda should be strictly followed. I decided not to speak and so informed Case officer Sian Collins.

My principal concern was, and still is, the noise and pollution to be produced by the heavy traffic on the SLR both in respect of our Listed Heritage Asset Theberton Hall - which will be 180 metres from the road – as well as other dwellings along the route, both Listed and not.

The Community Impact Report of the DCO mentions “Significant Adverse Effects” of noise in relation to the Hall and other dwellings in Theberton. (P.150, 159 and 160) both in relation to Construction Activities and Operation of the SLR.

In the ensuing Relevant Representations Report by the Applicant (P. 176) this has been reduced to “Minor” but no reasoning has been provided for this reduction.

In checking the DCO – Volume 6 Appendix 4B Construction Assumptions and Calculations (P. 23) Theberton Hall is shown as Receptor 14 in respect of Noise.

Figures produced by the Applicant were apparently based on two 30 minute readings taken at Receptor 14 although we had neither seen, nor given consent for, any acoustic testing equipment on our property.

I therefore commissioned Create to carry out an expert Construction and Operation Noise Assessment and this I sent to PINs on 6th August.

Create believe the baseline work completed for the noise impact by the Applicant is flawed. I have noticed that the Applicant has derided the Create Report without any fair consideration, but this appears to be their wont for all criticism.

Over the years since the line of the SLR was fixed by the Applicant I have asked on various occasions for details of their Noise Mitigation scheme as mentioned in the DCO and Relevant Representations. The latest such request was a letter sent to their agents on 29th July. I have never been provided with any details nor been approached by the Applicant or their agents on the matter.

I hoped that the ISH 12 & 13 might shed some light on the Applicant’s proposals, and they did, but they also raised further concerns for our Health and Well-being.

In ISH 12 there was detailed discussion on the effect of noise on inhabitants of dwellings near to the rail operation. In a

recent study by the University of Southern Denmark it was found that transportation noise is associated with a higher risk of all cause dementia, especially Alzheimer's disease. The Applicant produced the measures that they thought would be necessary to prevent sleep deprivation caused by the 8 or more proposed rail movements every night.

Mention was made by the Applicant of the probable noise level of 55dB rising to 80dB. The Application then went through the proposed Noise Mitigation measures for this problem. These included firstly ensuring the dwelling windows were kept shut, then double glazed and then secondary glazing added.

It was finally suggested that acoustic barriers would have to be added along the rail line before rail deliveries start.

We have seen elsewhere that the Noise Mitigation measures will include both planting of hedges and trees and possibly the building of earth bunds.

Thus transposing these possible Noise Mitigation measures from the Applicant in respect of Theberton Hall these can be summarised as:-

- Keep our windows closed all the time. This is not an acceptable change after 230 years of occupation of the house.
- The addition of double glazing. Not allowable to a Listed Georgian Building by East Suffolk Council Conservation Officers due to the change in design to the wooden sash windows.
- Secondary glazing. If proved this would be efficient.
- Landscaping and planting. From my personal experience of planting both trees and hedges here there will be insufficient growth for at least 12 years. As the SLR is

to be completed after 2 years into the development and removed at completion 10 years later this will be ineffective.

- Acoustic baffles or bunds appear to be the only solution for Noise Mitigation. I look forward to discussing these with the Applicant.

I heard Mr. Philpott Q.C. claim the Applicant was in discussion with all land owners along the route but can confirm this is not correct – for example we have had no contact whatsoever. I noted that Mrs. Cassini from the ExA asked the Applicant to elaborate in DL 8 with whom they have been talking to and where these discussions are at. I shall be interested to see the Applicant's response.

I can confirm here that despite the repeated concerns we have expressed to the Applicants during all Stages of the Consultation and the DCO relating to the exit to our drive to Pretty Road preventing both operation of services and deliveries, the compulsory acquisition of a small area of our property, the issue of noise and air pollution, and compensation, no contact has yet been made by the Applicant with us.

I heard in ISH 13 that there are still a number of items to be settled on the SLR design such as the use of a “quiet” surface and the road speed being reduced to 50 or 40 mph from the intended 60 mph, I heard Mr Kratt, for the Applicant, state it was their intention to submit enhancement improvements. This may be particularly relevant after the query from Neil Murphy from the ExA on the effect on SLR design by lowering the speed limit.

Without agreed and sensible resolution of the matters of noise, air quality and access it is my belief that our Listed Heritage Asset will no longer be habitable.

If this comes to pass we will be looking to the Applicant for full compensation. They have already referred us to the Property Price Support Scheme in the Relevant Representations Report (P. 178) – “refer to the PPSS to assist those who wish to move as a result of the development” but despite many requests for further details, the last being in our letter of 29th July, we have received nothing.

You may be aware their current published proposals for PPSS are limited to the Main Development Site. They are far more limited than the scheme on offer to the dwellings near to their Hinckley Point development.

I have covered the matters above in relation to Theberton Hall but they will apply to many other dwellings, both Listed and not, along the route.

It is concerning that now you are approaching the end of your Inquiry the Applicant is still unable, or unwilling, to provide all details of many basic elements which affect the public when surely these should have been included in the DCO.

Stephen Beaumont

24th September 2021