



National Infrastructure Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000  
e-mail: [SizewellC@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:SizewellC@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

---

The Applicant, Statutory Parties and  
Interested Parties

Your Ref:

Our Ref: EN010012

Date: 22 January 2021

---

Dear Sir/Madam

**The Planning Act 2008 (as amended) - Section 89  
The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 9  
The Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations –  
Regulation 19**

**Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting  
Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project**

**Procedural decision regarding the Applicant's proposed changes to the  
application and other matters**

**Applicant's change request and submission of Additional Information**

Following the acceptance of the above application the Applicant gave notice in its letter dated 6 October 2020 [[AS-004](#)] and accompanying Notification Report [[AS-005](#)] of its intention to submit a request to make changes to the application and to submit Additional Information (comprising further details on some of its proposals, additional technical information and to address minor errata in plans and documents and omissions). The Examining Authority (ExA) responded to the notification and the request for advice on the procedural implications of the proposed changes in its letter dated 23 October 2020 [[PD-006](#)]. The ExA also requested submission of some of the Additional Information at the earliest opportunity.

The Applicant's subsequent cover letter to the Planning Inspectorate dated 16 November 2020 [[AS-006](#)] confirmed that public consultation on the proposed changes would take place between 18 November 2020 and 18 December 2020 and also provided details of the Additional Information documents included with its letter. The Applicant submitted a further letter on 8 December 2020 [[AS-031](#)] providing details of the further Additional Information documents included with that letter. The ExA confirmed the acceptance of these Additional Information documents in its letters of 24 November 2020 [[PD-008](#)] and 22 December 2020 [[PD-009](#)].

The Applicant has now submitted a formal request for each of the 15 proposed changes to the Proposed Development, for which development consent is sought, to

be accepted for examination [[AS-105](#)]. It also requests that the remaining Additional Information documents now provided (some of which also relate to the proposed changes) are also accepted for the purposes of the Examination.

The Applicant's Cover Letter and all the supporting documents have been published on the project page of the National Infrastructure Planning website (NI website):

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/the-sizewell-c-project/?ipcsection=overview>

The ExA points out that although the Applicant's Cover letter and supporting documents have been published on the NI website, they have not yet been accepted as part of the application to be examined. As explained below, the decision on whether to accept these changes will be made after the Preliminary Meeting (PM).

If the ExA does decide to accept the proposed changes into the Examination (irrespective of whether or not they are material) all Interested Parties will have an opportunity to make representations on the changed application, in writing or orally at hearings, as the Examination progresses.

### **Materiality of the proposed changes and timing of the Examination**

The Planning Inspectorate's [Advice Note 16: How to request a change which may be material](#) (AN16), paragraph 2.1, explains that in assessing what constitutes a material change the tests to apply are whether the change is substantial or whether the development now being proposed is not in substance that which was originally applied for. Whether a proposed change falls within either of these categories is a question of planning judgment which may be based on criteria including, for example, whether the change would generate a new or different likely significant effect(s).

The Applicant considers that the proposed changes to the application, taken together, are material. However the Applicant states that "*The changes are not considered to be of such a degree that their effect would constitute a materially different project.*" The Applicant provides an overview of its proposed changes at Table 1 of its Cover Letter which contains a summary of whether or not the proposed changes are assessed by it to give rise to new or significantly different significant effects. The Applicant indicates that the changes would give rise to few new or different significant environmental effects. However, the ExA will need to come to its own conclusions in relation to this and to determine whether or not the changed application can fairly and reasonably be examined. That Procedural Decision represents Step 5 in Figure 1 of AN16 with Steps 1 to 4 in the change request process having now been carried out.

In relation to the timing of the PM and the start of the Examination, the ExA indicated in its letter of 24 November 2020 [[PD-008](#)] that the PM should not be held until after the Steps 1 to 4 in Figure 1 of AN16 had been taken. This would enable all Interested Parties to be fully informed before the PM and to facilitate a focussed discussion about how a changed application, if accepted, might be examined.

At that time it was anticipated that the PM date would be February/March 2021. The ExA has given careful consideration to the timing of the start of the Examination in the light of the Additional Submissions from the Applicant, Environment Agency, Natural England, Suffolk County Council, Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) and others referred to below. In particular, the ExA has had regard to the need to allow all

parties a fair and reasonable period of time prior to the start of the Examination to assess both the change request and the further information submitted by the Applicant. The ExA also notes the impacts of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic on staff resources of statutory and non-statutory consultees. The ExA has therefore decided that the PM should not now be held until March/April 2021. As previously indicated, the Rule 6 letter inviting people to the PM will include information about the material change request.

## **Responses to the Virtual Events (VE) Questionnaire**

The ExA's letter dated 22 December 2020 [[PD-009](#)] requested information from you about your capability to engage with the Examination remotely and provided a link to a VE Questionnaire. Many thanks to those of you who have completed that procedural questionnaire requesting information to help us decide how we might examine the application.

The ExA has now made proposals taking account of your input and the current and likely effect of ongoing public health controls. The ExA proposes to hold the PM using virtual methods but to remain flexible so that, should public health requirements allow, we have the option of holding physical events later in the Examination if we can. Further details will be provided in the Rule 6 letter that will be sent formally notifying you of the arrangements for the PM.

## **Application for Additional Land**

The Applicant's Cover letter [[AS-105](#)] notes that Changes 11, 12 and 13 include 'additional land' which is proposed to be the subject of Compulsory Acquisition and which was not identified in the Book of Reference submitted with the application. These proposed changes to the Order Land mean that The Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010 (the CA Regs) are engaged if agreement has not been reached with all the relevant Additional Affected Persons.

The Applicant confirms that "*All affected landowners have been consulted regarding the proposed changes.*". In addition, the Applicant indicates that if the proposed changes are accepted by the ExA, the Affected Persons will be notified in accordance with the requirements of Regulations 7 and 8 of the CA Regs and invited to make representations in respect of the proposed changes.

The ExA is required by Regulation 6 of the CA Regs to decide whether to accept the compulsory acquisition request in respect of additional land (the Proposed Provision) by the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which it receives details of the proposed provision. However, Regulation 19 enables an ExA at any time and in any particular case to allow further time for the taking of any step which must or may be taken by virtue of the CA Regs. Since the ExA does not propose to make its decision on whether to accept the proposed changes which have led to the inclusion of the additional land until after the PM, the ExA has made a Procedural Decision pursuant to Regulation 19 to correspondingly delay the Regulation 6 decision to coincide with the decision on whether to accept the change request.

## **Confidential Documents**

The ExA's Procedural Decision dated 23 October 2020 [PD-005] requested that the Applicant explain the basis for the redaction and confidentiality of certain documents submitted with the application. The Applicant provided a summary of its reasons for redactions and/or confidentiality of the various documents in Table 2 of its letter dated 16 November 2020 [AS-006]. The Applicant explained that the following documents contained commercially sensitive information and also that they were not required for the examination of the application. As such the Applicant requested that they be withdrawn from the application:

- 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix F of Appendix 18A - Ground Investigation on Sizewell C Construction Site Area and Associated Development Part 2 of 2 CONFIDENTIAL [APP-294]
- 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix L of Appendix 18A - Pre-existing Geotechnical Data Synthesis and Interpretative Report CONFIDENTIAL [APP-295]
- 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix F of Appendix 18A - Summary of Terrestrial Surface Water Quality Monitoring CONFIDENTIAL [APP-292]
- 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality Appendix F of Appendix 18A - Ground Investigation on Sizewell C Construction Site Area and Associated Development Part 1 of 2 CONFIDENTIAL [APP-293]

The ExA requested a further explanation of the commercially sensitive aspect of the documents and justification for them not being required in its letter dated 22 December 2020 [PD-009]. The Applicant subsequently responded in its Cover Letter dated 8 January 2021 [AS-049] and stated that:

*"With regard to query (i), the documents that SZC Co. seeks to withdraw are historical reports. These reports were redacted because they contain commercially sensitive information that was not deemed suitable for public circulation. Due to the reports being of a historic nature, SZC Co. has been unable to make contact with either the Project Manager or consultancies who produced the reports. Therefore, SZC Co. is unable to amend the protective marking on documents and ultimately requests their withdrawal from the Application. With regard to query (ii), the information provided in each of these historical reports has been used to interpret the ground conditions at the main development site and is summarised in the Phase 2 report provided in Appendix 18A which is an appendix to Volume 2, Chapter 18 Geology and Land Quality of the ES [APP-281 to APP-291]. Furthermore, the historical reports that are requested to be withdrawn from the Application contain information that has since been surpassed by more recent ground investigation data that has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 18, Appendix 18A [APP-281 to APP-291]."*

The ExA has given careful consideration to the Applicant's further explanation and justification for seeking the withdrawal of these documents. Given that these historic reports have been superseded by more recent data that has been submitted to support the related conclusions and findings in the main part of the Environmental Statement (ES), we are satisfied that the adequacy of the ES would be maintained if they are not considered further. The description of the published documents listed above has been amended on the project page of the NI website to reflect the correspondence on this matter.

The ExA notes that the remaining redacted or confidential documents within Table 2 of the Applicant's letter of 16 November 2020 [AS-006], have either had names and/or e-mail addresses of individuals redacted for privacy or they have been marked as confidential for the protection of sensitive information on protected species. That approach is consistent with Section 8 of Planning Inspectorate's [Advice Note 8.4: The Examination](#), and is justified in those circumstances.

## Procedural Decision regarding Additional Submissions

The ExA has also made a Procedural Decision to accept Additional Submissions from the following:

- Mike Taylor [AS-097]
- Mr F W Poll [AS-096]
- A letter from 26 Town and Parish Councils [AS-095]
- Environment Agency [AS-093]
- Natural England [AS-094]
- The Applicant (response to the letter from 26 Town and Parish Councils) [AS-098]
- The Applicant (response to the letters from Environment Agency and Natural England) [AS-104]
- Suffolk County Council [AS-103]
- Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) (correspondence dated 15 January and 18 January 2021 [AS-101, AS-102])
- Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd on behalf of The East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST) [AS-100]
- East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council [AS-099]

All these Additional Submissions have also been published on the project page of the National Infrastructure Planning website:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/the-sizewell-c-project/?ipcsection=overview>

## Relationship between the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and the Environmental Statement (ES)

In Annex A of its Procedural Decision dated 23 October 2020 [PD-005] the ExA asked the Applicant a number of questions regarding the relationship between the draft DCO and the ES. The Applicant responded in Appendix B of its Cover Letter dated 16 November 2020 [AS-006]. Further to the response provided the ExA raised a number of additional clarifying points in Annex A of its letter dated 22 December 2020 [PD-009]. The Applicant subsequently responded in Appendix B to its Cover Letter dated 8 January 2021 [AS-053].

The ExA has considered the responses received on 8 January 2021 and requests that the Applicant provide responses to the questions in Annex A below.

## Other matters

1. The ExA note, with regard to Proposed Change 1: *Potential to increase the frequency of freight train movements to facilitate bulk material imports by rail*, that the Applicant is involved in ongoing negotiations with Network Rail and

freight operating companies. The Applicant should provide an update of the position with respect to these negotiations along with an outline of its intended approach and any implications for the change request should this potential not be realised.

2. The ExA notes the submission of the Land Changes Plans provided in accordance with Regulation 5(b)(i) of the CA Regs. Please can the Applicant provide a further version of these plans that not only identify the land required as additional land and land affected by the proposed provision (shown in pink and pink and green hatching) but also identifies the different categories of land within the whole of the Order land as shown on the Land Plans submitted with the application [[APP-008](#)].
3. Please can the Applicant provide a visualisation of the enhanced permanent beach landing facility when in use.
4. Please can the Applicant provide an unredacted version, in respect of statutory consultee responses only, of Book 5, 5.1 Consultation Report Addendum Annex A: Copies of all consultation responses – Parts 1 and 2.
5. The ExA request that the Applicant submits a Microsoft Word version of the draft DCO (clean and track changed) alongside the PDF version together with a SI template validation report for the draft with each iteration of the draft DCO provided.

The ExA requests that the clarification and documentation sought be submitted **by 23:59 on Thursday 4 February 2021**.

If you have any questions about any of the matters raised in this correspondence, please contact the Case Team using the details provided in this letter.

Yours faithfully

*Wendy McKay*

**Wendy McKay**  
**Lead member of the Panel of Examining Inspectors**

This communication does not constitute legal advice.  
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.



# Annex A

No.	ExA's questions (Annex A of [PD-005])	[AS-006] 16 Nov 2020- Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations (Annex A of [PD-009])	Applicant's response of 8 Jan 2021 to Annex A of [PD-009]	Questions following the Applicant's responses of 8 Jan 2020
8(1)	<p>The ExA note that the following are listed in the draft DCO, Work No.1A:            "(q) one electricity transmission tower /pylon outside the power station's security fence, and associated transmission infrastructure including overhead line conductors";            "(s) removal of an existing transmission tower / pylon and associated transmission infrastructure";            "(w) temporary and permanent access roads";            "(x) Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces"; and            "(aa) temporary water resource storage area, associated structures and plant".</p> <p>However, it is not evident where these are included in the Project Description of the ES and therefore assessed within the ES. The Applicant is requested to provide clarification of the cross-referencing of such Works between the draft DCO and the ES project description and reference to relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Work No 1A(q) and (s) are described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2, 2.5.47 and assessed accordingly within this volume.</p> <p>In relation to Work No. 1A(w), temporary and permanent access roads are detailed throughout ES Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 3. For example, at 3.4.194 reference is made to new vehicular accesses onto Valley Road, Lover's Lane and King George's Avenue including temporary accesses into LEEIE, and at 2.4.80 reference is made to access roads serving the ancillary buildings.</p> <p>Work No. 1A(x) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.155 under the sub-heading 'Phase 2'.</p> <p>Work No 1A(aa) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.133.</p> <p>All works described above are assessed in Volume 2 of the ES.</p>	<p>Work No.1A(w). The ExA notes also the Applicant's response [AS-0061] para 4.7 to the question about temporary construction works accesses in PD1 [PD-0051] in particular that the temporary construction works accesses are shown on the construction parameter plans [APP-0221].</p> <p>The ExA also notes that Art 19(1)(a) of the draft DCO [APP- 0591] allows accesses shown on the ROW plans to be created. However looking for example at the accesses to the LEEIE shown on the Access and Rights of Way Plans [APP-0131] Sheet 3 of 27 there is one more access (A1/5) than is shown on sheet 3 of 4 of the construction parameters plans [APP-0221]. In addition, when the Access and Rights of Way Plans [APP-0131] sheet 3/27 is compared with the Works Plans [APP-0111] Sheet 3 of 27 an additional access is shown on the Works Plans (A1/7) and the numbering of the other four accesses changes (A1/5 becomes A1/14; A1/6 becomes A1/8; A1/8 becomes A1/9). There are other instances of similar discrepancies on other plans. It is also not clear what role is played by the numbering; it is not used in the draft DCO so far as the ExA can see.</p> <p>The ExA also notes that the Applicant's response in para 4.7 of [AS-006] referred to above that it recognises that construction accesses are not yet confirmed for the associated development sites.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to question 8 in Annex A of [PD- 005] is also noted in relation to Work No. 1A(w). Please will the Applicant submit a list of all the accesses and access roads comprised in Work No 1A(w) with, for each of them, the paragraphs in the chapters of the ES which show how they have been listed in the Project Description and assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant also submit a list of all other accesses and access roads comprised in the "authorised development " (as defined in Article 2 of the draft DCO) with, for each of them, the paragraphs in the chapters of the ES which show how they have been listed in the Project Description and assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant submit a set of plans showing each and every temporary construction access and each and every permanent access. The planned accesses should be referenced clearly in the list requested above.</p> <p>The ExA seeks clarity and consistency on these matters as between plans, descriptions, the draft DCO and what has been assessed in the ES.</p> <p>The ExA suggests that the effect of Article 19 of the DCO is that the accesses shown could be permitted under it without further consent. They should only be accesses which have been assessed and are in accordance with the parameters plans. For associated development sites where there are no parameters plans, the range of locations or areas assessed should be shown. For such accesses, the approval of the street authority after consultation with the highway authority would be necessary. Article 19 would appear to require some redrafting.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the ExA's comments in relation to apparent inconsistencies between the accesses shown on the Rights of Way Plans, Works Plans and Construction Parameter Plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant will undertake a review of all plans that show accesses to ensure that all plans are consistent.</li> <li>The Applicant also notes the ExA's comments in relation to the role that the numbering plays, and will consider whether the draft DCO should include express reference to the numbered accesses.</li> <li>The Work No 1A(w) access roads comprise the following, all of which have been assessed as part of the proposed development:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the footpath from Valley Road to the caravan park, which is described in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, para. 3.4.201;</li> <li>other temporary access routes, which are described in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, paras 3.4.156 - 3.4.159 (main accesses), 3.4.194-3.4.196 (LEEIE) and 3.4.205 (Sizewell Gap); and</li> <li>the permanent access route from B1122 to the main development site, which is described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 4, para. 4.10.3.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Once the review exercise described above has been carried out, the Applicant will provide the ExA with a list of all accesses and access roads comprised in the authorised development, as well as the new set of plans showing all such accesses (as requested by the ExA).</li> </ol> <p>The Applicant considers that Article 19 of the draft DCO is drafted in substantially the same way as Article 15 of the Southampton to London Pipeline DCO. The only difference between the two is that the accesses that can be constructed without street authority approval are identified in the Rights of Way Plans in the</p> <p>draft DCO whereas in the Southampton to London Pipeline DCO they are identified in separate work numbers.</p> <p>The Applicant does not propose to add new standalone work numbers for each proposed access. However, the Applicant will carry out a review of the plans that identify accesses, and will provide any updates to the drafting of Article 19 once this exercise has been carried out. For the avoidance of doubt, any updates to the draft DCO in this regard will not be reflected in the updated version that is submitted to the ExA on 11 January as this review exercise will not have been completed by then.</p>	<p>The ExA notes that the Applicant is to carry out a plan review.</p> <p>It would assist the ExA if the output could include a clear explanation of where each of the accesses has been assessed in the ES and also how all potential accesses under Reg 19 have been assessed.</p> <p>(The ExA has, in this table, numbered the parts of the Applicant's responses of 8 January 2021.)</p>

<p>8(2)</p>	<p>(Original Q.8 in full is set out here)</p> <p>The ExA note that the following are listed in the draft DCO, Work No.1A:  “(q) one electricity transmission tower / pylon outside the power station’s security fence, and associated transmission infrastructure including overhead line conductors”;  “(s) removal of an existing transmission tower / pylon and associated transmission infrastructure”;  “(w) temporary and permanent access roads”;  “(x) Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces”; and  “(aa) temporary water resource storage area, associated structures and plant”.</p> <p>However, it is not evident where these are included in the Project Description of the ES and therefore assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to provide clarification of the cross-referencing of such Works between the draft DCO and the ES project description and reference to relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Work No 1A(q) and (s) are described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2, 2.5.47 and assessed accordingly within this volume.</p> <p>In relation to Work No. 1A(w), temporary and permanent access roads are detailed throughout ES Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 3. For example, at 3.4.194 reference is made to new vehicular accesses onto Valley Road, Lover’s Lane and King George’s Avenue including temporary accesses into LEEIE, and at 2.4.80 reference is made to access roads serving the ancillary buildings. Work No. 1A(x) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.155 under the sub-heading ‘Phase 2’. Work No 1A(aa) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.133. All works described above are assessed in Volume 2 of the ES.</p>	<p>The Applicant’s attention is drawn to Article 15 of the draft DCO for the Southampton – London Pipeline NSIP which may be a useful example.</p> <p>The Applicant’s response at [AS-006] to question 8 in Annex A of [PD-005] is also noted in relation to Work No. 1A(x) and also its response to questions 9– 12 on where various parking facilities are assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant supply a list of the vehicle parks it lists in its response to show which park listed is which Work No in the draft DCO.</p> <p>In the interest of clarity of what has been assessed and simpler enforcement of the DCO would it not be helpful to have in the draft DCO a list of all the parking facilities which are listed, with their Work No., location, a name, number of spaces to be provided for different modes of transport and the triggers by when they are to be operational?</p> <p>A Requirement would secure compliance with the capacity and triggers.</p>	<p>Work No 1A(r), which is described as “Approximately 1,370 permanent parking spaces”, relates to the permanent power station parking shown on operational parameter plan SZC-SZ0100-XX-000-DRW-100050. 600 of the 1,370 spaces are to be allocated as Sizewell C outage car parking.</p> <p>Work No 1A(x), which is described as “Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces”, relates to temporary parking in the temporary construction area near the main site access road (see ES Volume 2, Figure 3.2).</p> <p>Work No 1A(y), which is described as “Temporary freight management facility, approximately 80 HGV parking spaces and associated infrastructure”, relates to HGV parking on LEEIE in the early years of construction (see ES Volume 2, Figures 3.1 and 3.2).</p> <p>Work No 1A(z), which is described as “Temporary park and ride facility, approximately 600 associated car parking spaces, approximately 20 bus spaces, a terminal area and associated infrastructure”, relates to parking on LEEIE in the early years of construction (see ES Volume 2, Figures 3.1 and 3.2).</p> <p>Work No 1D(gg), which is described as “up to 688 operational car parking spaces and access roads”, relates to Sizewell B Relocated Facilities operational parking (112 spaces) and outage parking (576 spaces)2 (see ES Volume 2, Appendix 2A, Figure 3).</p> <p>Work No 3(b), which is described as “multi-storey parking area to provide up to 1,300 vehicle parking spaces approximately 60 blue badge parking spaces, drop off areas, associated structures and plant”, relates to the temporary accommodation campus multi-storey parking (see ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1 and Design and Access Statement, Figure A.17).</p> <p>Work No 3(c)(ii) and (iii), which are described as “surface vehicle parking area to provide up to 300 parking spaces” and “motorcycle and cycle parking spaces”, relate to the temporary accommodation campus surface parking (see ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1 and Design and Access Statement, Figure A.17).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the ExA’s suggestion of a Requirement to secure compliance with capacities and triggers. The capacities are approximate and the ES assumes parking delivery by phase, which is considered to be acceptable.</p>	<p><b>(1)</b> Please will the Applicant overlay the location of the parking areas described in its response of 8th January 2021 onto the plans to which it refers.</p> <p><b>(2)</b> In relation to work 1A(r) (a) Has this parking facility been mentioned in any of the answers given before to Qs 8-12? and (b) Please will the Applicant indicate where this is described and assessed in the ES?</p> <p><b>(3)</b> In relation to Work No 1A(x), (Q.8 and Q.9, 1st tiret of response) Thank you. Is this the area marked “laying out of construction roads and parking?”</p> <p><b>(4)</b> In relation to Work No 1A(y), (Q.9, 6th tiret of response). Thank you. The ExA cannot see any notation to that effect on either Fig 3.1 or 3.2 of [APP-186]. Does the Applicant mean the notation “Freight Management Facility Developed and Operational” on Fig 3.2 of [APP-186]?</p> <p><b>(5)</b> In relation to Work No 1A(z) (Q.9, 5th tiret of response) Thank you. Is that the “Park and Ride Developed and Operational” on Fig 3.2 of [APP-186]?</p> <p><b>(6)</b> In relation to Work No.1D(gg) The answer to Q11 of [PD-005], the original question, was that operational car parking was 112 and outage was 576. However, the answer went on to say that (gg) – which is operational car parking - would be amended to say 576 and (hh) – outage – would be amended to 112. The ExA notes that the third revision of the DCO has 112 operational in (gg) and 576 outage in (hh) [In revision 3 (gg) has of course become (c) and (hh) has become (d)]. Please will the Applicant confirm that the third revision to the DCO has the correct numbers of spaces.</p> <p><b>(7)</b> Also in relation to Work No.1D(gg), the Applicant refers the ExA to “ES Volume 2, Appendix 2A, Figure 3”.</p> <p>However, this appears to be [APP-181] which is an outline drainage strategy for the Main Development Site. Please can the Applicant clarify this.</p> <p><b>(8)</b> Again the ExA is finding difficulty in seeing these on Fig 3.1 of [APP-186] which is the Construction Parameter Plan. The ExA has not checked the Design and Access Statement referred to. The description in the ES is what is sought. As before, please will the Applicant specify where in the ES they are described and assessed</p>
-------------	---	---	---	---	---



					(9) In all of the above cases, please will the Applicant indicate where each parking facility is described and assessed. (10) The ExA would appreciate it if Examination Library references could always be used, for documents in the library. This goes for the quotation of all documents throughout the Examination and pre-examination.
8(3)	<p>(Original Q.8 in full is set out here)</p> <p>The ExA note that the following are listed in the draft DCO, Work No.1A:  “(q) one electricity transmission tower /pylon outside the power station’s security fence, and associated transmission infrastructure including overhead line conductors”;  “(s) removal of an existing transmission tower / pylon and associated transmission  “(w) temporary and permanent access roads”;  “infrastructure”;  “(x) Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces”; and  “(aa) temporary water resource storage area, associated structures and plant”.</p> <p>However, it is not evident where these are included in the Project Description of the ES and therefore assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to provide clarification of the cross-referencing of such Works between the draft DCO and the ES project description and reference to relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Work No 1A(aa) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.133.</p>	<p>The Examining Authority is not clear where the ES states the location of the temporary water resource storage it has assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant indicate where to find this, and also where to find it in any change to its location in the material change proposal currently out for consultation?</p> <p>Please will the Applicant also point to where the parameters for this facility are to be found in the application documents and, in due course, in the material change request?</p>	<p>(1) The location of the temporary water resource storage area is shown in the ES, Volume 2, Chapter 3, Figure 3.2.</p> <p>(2) The proposed change to the location of the temporary water resource storage area is shown on Figure 4.7 of the proposed changes Consultation Document.</p> <p>(3) The description of the temporary water resource storage area is set out in the ES, Volume 2, Chapter 3, paragraphs 3.4.133- 3.4.138. This section provides details of, amongst other things, the water resource storage area’s approximate height and expected volume.</p> <p>(4) The proposed revised details will be located in the track change version of ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, which will be submitted with the change request on 11 January 2021.</p>	<p>(1) The ExA cannot see any track change version of ES Vol 2 Ch 3 as part of the change request. Please will the Applicant clarify this.</p> <p>(2) Please will the Applicant give greater clarity on what parameters have been assessed and clarify how and “approximate” or “expected” parameter is appropriate.</p>
9	<p>Can the Applicant clarify the number of (a) car parks and (b) parking spaces which are being provided at each in relation to the Works described in the ES?</p>	<p>ES Volume 2 Chapter 3 (construction):  - Phase 2 – on-site car parking providing 1000 spaces (up from 300 spaces in Phase 1) (3.4.155)  - Accommodation campus parking providing 1300 spaces, 60 disabled spaces, 120 motorbike spaces and 120 pedal bike spaces (3.4.178)  - Kenton Hills parking upgrade providing 15 additional spaces (3.4.181)  - 400 parking spaces associated with caravan park pitches (3.4.198)  - 600 car parking spaces and 20 bus parking spaces for use during the early years only at LEEIE (3.4.204)  - 80 HGV parking spaces for use during early years only at LEEIE (3.4.205) ES Volume 2 Chapter 2 (permanent development)  - 112 replacement car parking spaces and 576 outage car parking spaces relating to Sizewell B Relocated Facilities (2.2.2(g), 2.5.26, 2.5.38)</p>	<p>Please see question 8(2) above</p>		<p>Whilst turrets 1, 5, 6, and 7 have been addressed in the answers to Q8(2), turrets 3, and 4 appear to be outstanding. Please will the Applicant respond to them.</p> <p>The intention is to bring all these into the list suggested in Q8(2) of [PD-009] and again with this PD.</p> <p>In relation to the 2nd turret, what has happened to the 120 pedal bike spaces?</p>
10	<p>Can the Applicant clarify the Work in the draft DCO to which ES Paragraph 2.5.26 ‘Sizewell Replacement car Park’ relates?</p>	<p>The replacement car parking described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2 2.5.26 is the same as the parking described in Work No. 1D(gg).</p>	<p>Please see question 8(2) above</p>		
11	<p>An Outage car park of 576 spaces is listed in ES Paragraph 2.5.38.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that this is Work No. 1D(hh) in the draft DCO, and if not, clarify which Work the outage car park relates?</p> <p>The ExA notes that draft DCO does not specify a limit on spaces to be provided and therefore the link is not clear.</p> <p>Furthermore, the ExA request that the draft DCO be amended to include the number of spaces for clarity.</p>	<p>The proposed Sizewell B outage car park assessed in the ES has 576 spaces, as described in Volume 2 Chapter 2, 2.5.38. The replacement Sizewell B operational car parking assessed in the ES amounts to 112 spaces. The combined number of spaces therefore is 688. The 688 limit is specified in Work No. 1D(gg).</p> <p>We agree that this is an error and will amend the draft DCO accordingly so that 1D(gg) specifies 576 spaces and 1D(hh) specifies 112 spaces.</p>	<p>Please see question 8(2) above</p>		

12	<p>The draft DCO at Work No. 1D(gg) lists an 'up to 688 space car park'.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant clarify where this is captured as part of the description of the Proposed Development in the ES?</p>	See response to query 11 above.	Please see question 8(2) above		
13	<p>Work No. 1A includes a number of the listed works which are plural in their content which leads to ambiguity for the draft DCO in terms of what permission is being sought for.</p> <p>Furthermore, this raises issues in relation to the EIA undertaken in understanding the Project Description and ensuring that all Works have been fully assessed.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to consider this in the next draft DCO and ensure that such Works are limited to being within the envelope of assessment undertaken in the ES.</p>				<p>In its response [AS-006] of 16 November 2020 the Applicant stated "Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider this and amend the draft DCO as necessary.</p> <p>" The second and third revisions of the DCO (submitted on 8 and 12 January 2021) do not appear to have any amendments to address this question.</p> <p>The ExA would be grateful if the Applicant would make the amendments in the next revision.</p>
21	<p>ES Paragraph 2.5.35 lists the 'western access road' leading to the laydown area however the ExA note that it is not clear where this is secured through the draft DCO or of which of the authorised Works it forms part of.</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify this and revise the documentation as necessary?</p>	<p>The 'western access road' is included in the description of Work No. 1D(gg).</p> <p>As stated above, the Applicant agrees to review and update the draft DCO in relation to the car parking numbers and will more generally review Work No 1D to ensure consistency in use of terminology and use of categories of sub-works between the draft DCO and the ES description of development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Examining Authority's current thinking is that Work No. 1D(gg) is somewhat imprecise as it refers to "roads".</p> <p>The ExA welcomes the Applicant's commitment to review Work No 1D for consistency with the ES.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Updates to Work No 1D will be made by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The description of Work 1D(gg) has been amended for DCO revisions 3.1(A) and 3.1(b).</p> <p>Please will the Applicant explain where the Western Access Road is tied into that Work and referred to in the DCO.</p>
Parts B to F	<p><b>B. SZC Bk6 ES V3 Ch2 Northern Park and Ride Description of Development.</b></p> <p>1. The Northern Park and Ride, Work No.9 in the draft DCO, does not reference the creation of car parking spaces (over 1250 are anticipated by the ES), nor the diversion of a 11KV overhead power line. Can the Applicant review Work No.9 against the ES and where appropriate, amend the draft DCO to include the upper limit on the car parking spaces to be provided and ensure that the draft DCO includes the power line diversion, or explain why those amendments would not be appropriate?</p> <p><b>C. SZC BK6 ES V4 Ch2 Southern Park and Ride Description of Development</b></p> <p>1. Noting the issues raised in relation to the Northern Park and Ride above, can the Applicant also review this component of the Southern Park and Ride. In addition to those points noted above, the ExA notes the omission of reference in the draft DCO to</p>		<p>The ExA welcomes the Applicant's commitments to review Works 9-13 in the draft DCO.</p>	<p><b>Work Nos 9-13 will be updated in the following ways:</b></p> <p><b>Work No. 9</b> - While the Applicant has made the change to this Work description to refer to the number of car parking spaces, it does not consider it to be appropriate to add reference to the potential diversion of the 11KV electric line. Should this work be required, it would be undertaken by the relevant electricity undertaker under their own powers, rather than by the Applicant.</p> <p><b>Work No. 10</b> - While the Applicant has made the change to this Work description to refer to the number of car parking spaces and to the traffic incident management area, it does not consider it to be appropriate to add reference to the potential diversion of the 11KV electric line. Should this work be required, it would be undertaken by the relevant electricity undertaker under their own powers, rather than by the Applicant.</p>	<p><b>Work No.11</b> -please will the Applicant note that the ExA will expect a commitment to its delivery and effective triggers / and restrictions to ensure it is provided. Please can the Applicant point to where these are to be found.</p> <p><b>Work No 12</b> - Thank you and noted. Please will the Applicant direct the ExA to the parameters for the SLR and where they are secured by the DCO.</p> <p><b>Work No.13</b> - the ExA notes that in fact the number of spaces at the FMF is not currently specified in this Work. Please will the Applicant rectify this in the next revision?</p>

	<p>the traffic incident management area. Can the Applicant review the draft DCO against the ES and where appropriate, amend the draft DCO to include the upper limit on the car parking spaces to be provided and ensure that the draft DCO includes the power line diversion and traffic incident management area, or explain why those amendments would not be appropriate?</p> <p><b>D. SZC Bk6 V5 Ch2 Description of Two Village Bypass</b></p> <p>1. The ExA notes that Work No. 11 "Two Village Bypass" in the draft DCO does not specifically list the flood compensation land development. Can the Applicant either justify this approach or amend the draft DCO as appropriate?</p> <p><b>E. SZC Bk6 V6 Ch2 Description of Sizewell Link Road</b></p> <p>1. The ExA notes that Work No. 12 as currently drafted in the draft DCO is very generic. The ExA also notes that the ES provides a further description of some larger components including, but not limited to, raising a railway by 2m and then building a bridge over it. Such detail is not included in the draft DCO. Can the Applicant review the Proposed Development of the Sizewell Link Road and the drafting of Work No. 12 and either justify this approach or amend the draft DCO as appropriate? F. SZC Bk6 V8 Ch2 Description of the Freight Management Facility 1. The ExA notes that Work No. 13 stipulates the number of car parking spaces however information relating to the number, floor area and purpose of buildings to be erected is omitted. The ExA request that the Applicant review this and ensure that parameters are secured in the draft DCO.</p>		<p><b>Work No. 11</b> – The Applicant does not consider there is a need to refer to the flood compensation land development, as this would be authorised by Part 2 (a) and (b) of Schedule 1</p> <p><b>Work No 12</b> – The Applicant considers the description of Work No. 12 provides a suitable description of the works that will be undertaken. The description is clear about what is being proposed, but reflects the flexibility that is allowed for through the limits of deviation and the requirements. The Applicant does not propose to raise the East Suffolk railway line by 2m. The description of development in the environmental statement does not refer to this, but simply confirms that "The proposed Sizewell link road would rise up on a 2.5m embankment, and cross the railway via the bridge, to provide sufficient headroom as required by Network Rail".</p> <p><b>Work No 13</b> – The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to make changes to the description of this Work.</p> <p>The level of detail is consistent with the drafting of the two park and ride sites. As with other elements of the proposals, the development authorised by this description is controlled by the relevant plans and requirements, and it would be unnecessarily restrictive to list the number, floor area and purpose of all buildings. The description refers to 'amenity, welfare and security buildings', which the Applicant considers adequate and appropriate.</p>	
Part G				
Q1		<p><b>CHP and back-up plant</b></p> <p>The documentation appears to refer to a series of alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Combined Heat and Power Plant, draft DCO description "Work No. 3 I (vi) combined heat and power plant".</li> <li>2. Emergency Equipment Store back up generator, draft DCO description "Work No. 1A (i) emergency equipment store, associated structures, back up generator and other plant".</li> <li>3. Emergency response energy centre, draft DCO description "Work No. 1A (h) (v) emergency response centre"</li> </ol> <p>Please will the Applicant clarify for the ExA where the ES has assessed these elements of the draft DCO in respect of noise, air quality and landscape effects for both the construction and subsequent operational periods and how each element is intended to function.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant also clarify the flue heights and their relation to the parameters plans.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms in relation to the environmental assessment that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Work No. 3(c)(vi) is assessed in the ES as part of the proposed development, and is described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, para. 3.4.180 (second bullet point).</li> <li>2. Work No. 1A(i) is assessed in the ES as part of the proposed development, and is described in Volume 2, Chapter 2, para. 2.7 and Table 2.7.3. Work No. 1A(h)(v) is assessed in the ES as part of the proposed development, and is described in Volume 2, Chapter 2, Tables 2.1 and 2.4.</li> </ol> <p>The CHP Plant, if progressed over the air source heat pump option, would serve the daily needs of the accommodation campus and would only be in use during the construction phase. During the operational phase, the CHP Plant would be retained as the emergency equipment store back-up generator, which would be used only when there is a loss of off-site power to the emergency equipment store.</p>	<p>The ExA thanks the Applicant for this explanation. However, the ExA is unclear what height is proposed and has been assessed.</p> <p>The response states that the "CHP Plant/ back-up generator has one stack, which is described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2, Table 2.7 and Chapter 3, para. 3.4.180 respectively. The back-up generator is within parameter zone 1M". The ExA observes that the parameters in Table 2.7 of Chapter 2 (Description of Permanent Development)[APP-180]and para 3.4.180 of Chapter 3 (Description of Construction)[APP-184]are different. Table 2.7 gives a maximum height of 36 m (plus a 3.5m tall stack). Para 3.4.180 gives a building height of approximately 10m with a CHP stack of approximately 4m. Also, if the maximum parameter is 36m plus 3.5m tall stack this would exceed the maximum parameter as detailed for construction in Zone CA3 [APP-022].</p>

				<p>So, Work No 3(c)(vi) (CHP Plant) and part of 1A(i) (back-up generator) relate to the same piece of plant albeit used in different phases of the development and for different purposes hence their different treatment in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the CHP Plant/ back-up generator has one stack, which is described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2 Table 2.7 and Chapter 3, para. 3.4.180 respectively. The back-up generator is within parameter zone 1M. The primary function of the emergency response energy centre is to host power distribution plant (back-up diesel generator, HV ring main unit and transformer, switchboards) and fuel to run the backup diesel generator and the on-site emergency response facilities and equipment.</p> <p>The emergency response energy centre is unrelated to the CHP/back-up generator. The Emergency Response Energy Centre does not have any stacks.</p>	<p>Please will the Applicant (a) state what heights have actually been assessed (b) demonstrate that the correct heights have been assessed (c) clarify the relationship with the maximum height in CA3 (d) clarify for the ExA where the ES has assessed these elements of the draft DCO in respect of noise, air quality and landscape effects for both the construction and subsequent operational periods.</p>
Q2			<p><b>Alde Valley Academy Leiston</b></p> <p>The draft DCO describes the Sports facilities at Work No. 5 as "Landscape works including open space, sports facilities and associated structures and plant.</p> <p>The location of the above works is shown on sheet no. 11 of the Works Plans." However, this does not appear to correspond with either of the descriptions in the ES Vol 2 Ch 2 [APP-180] Description of permanent development para 2.9.1 or ES Vol 2 Ch 3 [APP- 184] Description of Construction para 3.4.222.</p> <p>Please clarify what has been assessed in the ES and make clear where the details of the floodlights, illumination plans, and acoustic barriers can be found.</p>	<p>The Applicant will update the draft DCO to more closely align Work No 5 with the description of development in the ES. ES Volume 2, Chapter 9 (noise and vibration) assumes a permanent 2m acoustic fence at para. 11.6.178. ES Volume 2, Chapter 13 (landscape and visual ) recognises at Appendix 13G that the sports pitch would be floodlit and screens out an assessment of the pitches as it would not result in significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The Applicant will be proposing an additional Requirement to submit reserved matters for details of the layout, scale and external appearance of the buildings and landscape works comprised in Work No 5. This additional Requirement will be included in the updated draft DCO submitted on 11 January 2021.</p>	<p>The amendment to the description of Work No. 5 in the DCO versions 3.1A and 3.1B is welcomed as is proposed requirement 12A in 3.1B. (In referring to 3.1B the ExA notes that 3.1B is part of the Material Change request on which no decision has yet been made. The amendment will need to be carried into the DCO whatever the outcome of the change request.)</p> <p>Please will the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) clarify how Work No 5 in its original and amended form has been assessed in the ES,</li> <li>(b) explain where the limits in drawing PDB17-033-06-02-P1 (which is referred to in proposed requirement 12A) have been assessed and regarded as limits (and state where in the Application documents that drawing is to be found),</li> <li>(c) explain the basis on which the floodlighting was scoped out,</li> <li>(d) define the number of lighting columns, expected type of construction e.g. monopole or lattice construction, and the luminosity/level of luminance, preferably giving an indication of the degree of light spread with a contour plan showing any impact upon neighbours (and the landscape/night sky) and</li> <li>(e) clarify where the ES indicates whether in erecting the lighting columns there would be adverse effects on the neighbouring trees root systems.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant will appreciate that floodlit sports pitches, whilst often welcomed by councils in improving the quality of sports provision, can be an issue for neighbouring properties, especially residential, which may be sensitive receptors in relation to (for example) noise and light.</p>