



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Annex A Stage 1 Issues Table

Revision: 1.0
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

May 2020

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



Annex A – Stage 1 Issues Table Contents

Table A.1: Summary of Section 42 Responses and Consideration by Topic	1
a. Overall Proposals	1
• Theme: Need Case	1
• Theme: Safety	6
• Theme: Socio-economics	8
• Theme: Transport	28
• Theme: Construction Materials	48
• Theme: Consultation Process	49
• Theme: Community Impact	59
b. Main Development Site	61
• Theme: Site Suitability	61
• Theme: Environment – General	69
• Theme: Noise and Vibration	74
• Theme: Air Quality	76
• Theme: Landscape and Visual	77
• Theme: Ecology	78
• Theme: Amenity and Recreation	79
• Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water	81
• Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water	85
• Theme: Climate Change	91
• Theme: Soils and agriculture	92
c. Temporary Developments	93
• Theme: Need Case	93
• Theme: Site Suitability	94
d. Visitor Centre	97
• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment	97

e.	Accommodation Proposals	98
	• Theme: Need case	98
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	98
	• Theme: Environmental – General.....	103
f.	Park and Ride - Principle	105
	• Theme: Need Case	105
g.	Northern Park and Ride	108
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	108
h.	Southern Park & Ride	112
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	112
i.	Transport: Lorry Park Site Options	118
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	118
	• Theme: Environment – General	123
	• Theme: Community Impacts.....	123
j.	Transport: Junction and Road Improvement Options	125
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	125
k.	Transport: Rail Improvements	129
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	130
	• Theme: Community Impact	136
Table A.2: Summary of Section 47 Responses and Consideration by Topic		137
a.	Overall Proposals	137
	• Theme: Need Case	137
	• Theme: Safety	141
	• Theme: Socio-economics	143
	• Theme: Accommodation	171
	• Theme: Transport.....	181
	• Theme: Construction Materials.....	190
	• Theme: Consultation Process	191
b.	Main development site	202
	• Theme: Site Suitability.....	203

- Theme: Environment – General 209
- Theme: Air Quality..... 214
- Theme: Landscape and Visual 215
- Theme: Ecology 216
- Theme: Amenity and Recreation 217
- Theme: Historic Environment 218
- Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics 220
- Theme: Climate Change 223
- Theme: Soils and Agriculture 223
- c. Temporary Developments 224**
 - Theme: Site Suitability 224
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 227
- d. Visitor Centre 228**
 - Theme: Need Case 228
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 231
- e. Accommodation Proposals 251**
 - Theme: Need Case 251
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 254
 - Theme: Environment – General 279
 - Theme: Community Impact 281
- f. Northern Park and Ride 284**
 - Theme: Need Case 284
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 285
- g. Southern Park and Ride..... 296**
 - Theme: Need Case 296
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 297
- h. Lorry Park Site Options 305**
 - Theme: Need Case 305
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 305
 - Theme: Community Impact 315



i.	Transport: Junction and Road Improvement Options	318
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	318
j.	Rail Improvements	322
	• Theme: Need Case	322
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	326
	• Theme: Noise and Vibration	349
	• Theme: Community Impact	350

Table A.1: Summary of Section 42 Responses and Consideration by Topic¹

a. Overall Proposals

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Timescale	Comments and concerns about the length of time the construction will take, and resulting disruption from this.	<p>Construction of the Sizewell C nuclear power station is estimated to take 9–12 years. Construction of the main development site is anticipated to be undertaken in the following five main phases, although these phases would overlap as work on different phases would be undertaken simultaneously in different areas across the main development site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1: site establishment and preparation for earthworks. Phase 2: main site earthworks and completion of temporary infrastructure. Phase 3: main civil engineering works. Phase 4: mechanical and electrical installation. Phase 5: commissioning and land restoration. <p>Following construction of the units, they would undergo commissioning, with an expected phasing of 12 months</p>	Y

¹ Note: Comments in bold and shaded grey were also raised by Section 47 consultees.



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>between the commissioning of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the Sizewell C nuclear power station.</p> <p>Further details on the construction of Sizewell C nuclear power station are provided in the Chapter 3, Volume 2, Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The construction of the off-site associated developments would be undertaken early in the construction programme. The construction period of each associated development would vary, however each is assumed to take no longer than 24 months.</p> <p>Following construction, the associated development sites would remain operational for approximately ten years to support and mitigate the effects of the construction of the main development site. Once these facilities are no longer required, they would be removed and the land restored, where applicable. The removal and reinstatement of the associated development sites would vary, however is assumed to take no longer than 12 months</p> <p>An indicative phasing schedule for the Sizewell C Project as a whole is provided in the Implementation Plan, Appendix I of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Principle of Nuclear Energy	<p>Opposition to and negative comments about nuclear energy.</p> <p>Comments and suggestions about the use of renewable sources of energy as an alternative for national energy policy.</p>	<p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK’s energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK’s binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Locations	Suggestions that the generation of nuclear power should take place near the areas where it will be consumed.	<p>Following the preparation of the Strategic Siting Assessment (SSA) and an Alternative Sites Study, NPS EN-6 states that only those sites listed in part 4 of the NPS are potentially suitable for the deployment of new nuclear power stations by the end of 2025.</p> <p>Part 4 of the NPS identifies 8 potentially suitable sites including Sizewell (para 2.3.2 – see further below). As a result of the SSA and the Alternative Sites Study, the Government stated in NPS EN-6 that it does not believe that there are any alternatives to the listed sites that are potentially suitable for the deployment of new nuclear power stations in England and Wales before 2025.</p> <p>Accordingly, the NPS considers that all 8 sites are required to be listed in the NPS so that they are each available as a</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		potential opportunity for nuclear development subject to consideration through the DCO process (paragraph 2.3.2). Each site listed in NPS EN-6, was assessed by the Government by way of an SSA and an Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS), which has assessed the sustainability of the NPS on Nuclear Power Generation, taking account of potential alternative strategies and the potential impacts of nominated sites.	
Safety concerns	Comments about Sizewell A and B nuclear facilities, including safety issues and concerns about the long-term impacts.	<p>The safety of Nuclear Power Plants (NPP) is assured by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the process of Generic Design Assessment covers safety analysis. This can be found on Her Majesty’s Government (HMG) website. The Generic Design Assessment was approved on 13 December 2012.</p> <p>The design proposals have due regard to the Generic Design Assessment. Further information can be found within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Safety	<p>Comments about emergency procedures, particularly fire, rescue and emergency services, during the construction period, as well as how to deal with an evacuation, including suggestions that roads would need to be improved to handle emergencies.</p>	<p>The existing sites have emergency processes, procedures and arrangements in place that cover site evacuation in accordance with The Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001, which are currently being upgraded to REPPIR 2019 (REPPIR 2019).</p> <p>This approach and construction activities are agreed with the Local Government agencies in accordance with REPPIR 2019 and will be applied from the point of Nuclear Site Licensing.</p> <p>The Sizewell C proposals include a range of highway upgrades that would ensure that there is sufficient capacity on the local highway network to deal with the predicted levels of construction traffic. These are set out within the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 8.5).</p> <p>In addition, the DCO includes a mitigation measures that set out procedures that would be put in place during the construction stage such as the Traffic Incident Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.6), Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7), Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 8.11) and Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p>	Y

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Technology / Location	Concern over the designs for the main development site and the proposed nuclear reactor at Sizewell C, including concerns that the EPR design is not yet proven. Some also express concern about the siting of reactors for Sizewell C and D at the same site.	<p>Designs for the main development site have evolved significantly in response to consultation feedback and as a result of detailed design evolution work since the Stage 1 consultation. Further information is set out in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1). Consideration of alternative designs for the main development site are included in Chapter 6, Assessment of Alternatives and Design Evolution, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p> <p>The Generic Design Assessment for the EPR design was approved on 13 December 2012.</p> <p>Sizewell B and Sizewell C would be located adjacent to each other, however both will operate under their own Nuclear Site Licenses and nationally policy (NPS EN-6) identifies the location of Sizewell C as 'potentially suitable' for a further nuclear power station.</p>	Y
Terrorism	Concerns about the safety risks of nuclear power, including radioactive leaks, terrorism threat, impacts of	The safety of Nuclear Power Plants (NPP) is assured by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the process of Generic Design Assessment covers safety analysis. This can be found on Her Majesty's Government (HMG) website. The Generic Design Assessment was approved on 13 December 2012.	Y

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	extreme weather and fire.	The design proposals have due regard to the Generic Design Assessment. Further information can be found within the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 27 (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Decommissioning	Concerns and considerations to be made about the disposal of nuclear waste as well as how the decommissioning of the sites will be managed post operation.	<p>The safety of Nuclear Power Plants (NPP) is assured by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the process of Generic Design Assessment covers safety analysis. This can be found on Her Majesty's Government (HMG) website. The Generic Design Assessment was approved on 13 December 2012.</p> <p>The design proposals have due regard to the Generic Design Assessment. Further information can be found within the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 7 (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Education	Comments and suggestions about apprenticeships and support for	SZC Co. are committed to supporting and enhancing existing skills, training, education and employment strategies for the region that would benefit the Sizewell C Project itself and the long-term future of the region's key growth sectors.	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	education from SZC Co..	<p>Stage 2 set out a commitment to work with the supply chain and other agencies to maximise apprenticeships for local residents.</p> <p>Stage 2 also set out commitments to primary and secondary engagement through existing national curriculum activities, SZB activities, science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programmes and careers advice including non-STEM programmes.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in Annex A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) (Employment, Skills and Education Strategy).</p>	
People and Economy	Requests and support for proposals of funding for community services as part of the development proposals.	<p>One of SZC Co.'s core principles is to strike a balance which seeks to optimise the benefits which local facilities, amenities and services could gain from the increased activity generated by all phases of the Sizewell C Project, whilst mitigating any significant adverse effects that might arise from that activity.</p> <p>While SZC Co. cannot directly fund public services, Stage 2 committed to undertake an assessment on the potential transitional effects of the construction workforce on council-provided services, emergency services and health services, and mitigate them where significant adverse effects may be</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>considered likely – either through management measures within the Sizewell C Project, or financial commitments.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Community Impact	<p>Comments stating that existing community infrastructure and facilities are insufficient to cope with the influx of people.</p>	<p>SZC Co. is required to mitigate the effects of the Sizewell C Project, which in terms of accommodation and public service demand issues, would occur only during the construction phase.</p> <p>While SZC Co. cannot directly fund public services, Stage 2 committed to undertake an assessment on the potential transitional effects of the construction workforce on council-provided services, emergency services and health services, and mitigate them where significant adverse effects may be considered likely – either through management measures within the Sizewell C Project, or financial commitments.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y
Further Information	<p>Concerns about and requests for greater assessment and</p>	<p>SZC Co.'s core objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts,</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	figures provided about local community impacts.	<p>whilst optimising local benefits that directly arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>Stage 2 set out the work that would be undertaken to assess these effects, including: assessing the impacts on key public services such as school places, local healthcare services, police and other emergency services; undertaking a health impact assessment; assessing potential negative and positive impacts on tourism; and assessing the impacts on individual communities, including but not limited to Leiston, Theberton and Eastbridge.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) and Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). A summary of the local environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project on people and communities is contained in the Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13).</p>	
Community	Suggestions the proposed development should benefit the community by improving a specific local facility, or in general and concern	The Sizewell C Project must include measures that mitigate likely significant adverse effects on public services and community facilities should they be likely to arise. This could include improvements or additional facilities for use by workers in some cases, which may have the potential to be shared with the local community or leave a legacy.	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>that current proposals do not do this.</p> <p>Support and requests for community benefits, such as providing legacy benefits to the community wherever possible and minimising disruption.</p> <p>Comments and suggestions that the development should give back to the community or provide compensation.</p>	<p>Stage 2 set out options for sports facilities, which could either be located within the campus site or remotely in Leiston with public access. These plans were refined through consultation to identify proposals for permanent, shared sports facilities including a full-size 3G pitch and two MUGAs in Leiston.</p> <p>Further information and a finalised position regarding the embedded mitigation for workers’ recreation is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Community Impacts	<p>Concern about the impacts of construction on the local community, including stress</p>	<p>The scope of local community health issues (including mental health) and opportunities to be explored and addressed was set out during Stage 2.</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	caused by disruption.	<p>Construction activities with the potential to impact upon local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines of the Environmental Statement (e.g. air quality, noise, transport), and these have further informed the scope and focus of the health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the Sizewell C Project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Mitigation	Support for proposed mitigation for construction impacts on the local community and requests for further mitigation, such as restriction of pile-driving hours, fishing agreements, double glazing to housing	<p>The approach to mitigation is set out in Chapter 6 (Methodology) of Volume 1 the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2). It is explained that mitigation measures are those measures that are envisaged to prevent, reduce and, where relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>There are two primary methods of securing the various mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Requirements set out at Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1); and 	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and negotiated purchase of housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> as planning obligations under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – also known as a 'development consent obligations'. <p>A Mitigation Route Map ('the MRM') (Doc Ref. 8.12) is submitted with the DCO application, which sets out all of the mitigation identified in the Environmental Statement (Book 6) as well as other non-environmental mitigation proposed by SZC Co., together with the relevant securing mechanism. This document does not form part of the DCO itself but is submitted to assist the decision maker and interested parties to understand how the mitigation relied on by the Applicant is secured by either of the two primary methods set out above.</p> <p>A Community Fund is proposed as part of the DCO Section 106 Obligations. SZC CO. Energy proposes that the Community Fund would be administered on behalf of the community and that its purpose would be to fund local projects or activities supported by the community which would add to the quality of life in the local area.</p> <p>The Community Fund would be available to be spent on measures which the community consider could enhance the quality of life in the local area. A similar fund related to Hinkley</p>	

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Point C, for example, is being used to fund a wide range of measures such as the repair of community facilities, the sponsorship of community activities or the running of community events. These measures do not directly mitigate specific impacts identified by the environmental impact assessment carried out in relation to the Hinkley Point C proposals, but they do collectively help to offset residual harm to local quality of life, so far as reasonably possible. Further details are set out in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Community Impacts	Comments about the experience of the effects of Sizewell A and B development on the local community.	<p>SZC Co.'s overall objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts, whilst optimising local benefits that would arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>Based on evidence from contractors at Hinkley Point C, along with experience on Hinkley Point B and Sizewell B, SZC Co. has identified that a single site campus would enable SZC Co. to provide the most flexible accommodation offering, making it easy for workers and contractors to manage their accommodation needs.</p> <p>The size would generate a critical mass that would in turn allow the provision of a range of amenities to workers. This should</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>make the campus environment more attractive and encourage workers to stay on site, leading to fewer potential problems, in terms of worker behaviour and community disruption. Further details may be found in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project will also implement measures to encourage good worker behavior including mandatory drug and alcohol testing and a worker code of conduct. Further details are set out in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). In addition, a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) has been developed with partners including the local Councils and emergency services.</p>	
Impact on Property	Concern about the impact of the development on landowners from blight and destruction, as well as a resulting decrease in property value.	<p>SZC Co.'s overall objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts, whilst optimising local benefits that would arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>SZC Co. will minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls.</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and best practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination.</p> <p>SZC Co. has committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.	
Economic Impacts	Concern about the impact of the development on local businesses and the tourism industry.	<p>SZC Co. recognises that tourism is a key strength within Suffolk’s economy, and in particular within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which stretches north and south of Sizewell C.</p> <p>At Stage 2, SZC Co. set out that it is working with partners including local authorities, Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation (DMO), Visit Suffolk, Visit East Anglia (now Visit East of England), and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to understand and define the tourist sector, drawing on published research by these partners and using public datasets and methodologies from the ONS.</p> <p>Stage 2 also set out that SZC Co. is working to identify the key reasons tourists come to the area and the extent to which Sizewell C could have an impact on the attractiveness of the area for tourists, and the opportunities the Sizewell C Project could bring.</p> <p>Further information – including an assessment of potential significant effects on tourism based on a Tourism Survey</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		undertaken by Ipsos MORI and informed by stakeholders - is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).	
Recreation and Amenity	Concern about the impact of construction and the development on recreational activities and their enjoyment by local residents and visitors.	<p>SZC Co. recognise that local residents and visitors have concerns over the impact of the construction on recreational amenities.</p> <p>SZC Co. have undertaken a full assessment of the effects of the development on amenity and recreation within the study area. This includes the impacts on recreational activities and the users of these activities and has allowed for the development of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 15 of Volume 2 and Chapter 8 of Volumes 3-9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4 - 6.10).</p>	Y
Community Impact	Concern about the impact of the development particularly on vulnerable groups such as pensioners and schoolchildren.	At Stage 2, SZC Co. set out intentions to work collaboratively with other service providers (including health, social services, and children’s services) to determine the likely impact of the Sizewell C Project and develop ways of both mitigating any effects on the existing capacity and maximising benefits where possible.	Y



Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		EDF has held several meetings with these important public service providers to help develop an understanding of the potential effects of the Sizewell C Project, assessed in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). Details of potential effects and strategies to mitigate them are also set out in the Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).	
Safety	Concern about the impact of the development on local emergency and other health services due to the increase in traffic and people in the area.	<p>The Sizewell C Project has embedded a number of measures to avoid impacts on local emergency and health services, including provision of an on-site occupational health service.</p> <p>Any residual effects on health services are identified via a health impact assessment, set out in Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>A Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) has also been prepared collaboratively with stakeholders, including local authorities and the emergency services, setting out how any potential impacts on local people would be addressed or avoided. Where needed, financial contributions will be made via the s106 agreement to support local services in addressing any increased demand.</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Economic Benefits	Comments stating that the local community and economy will benefit from the proposed development.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the recognition that the Sizewell C Project’s effects on the local economy will be overwhelmingly positive – supporting long-term, sustainable careers through employment, skills and training initiatives secured in partnership with Suffolk County Council and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership’s strategic plans for the regional economy.</p> <p>Jobs will be created in construction, non-construction, management, support and operational positions across a range of skill levels.</p> <p>Stage 2 sets out proposals to develop measures that maximise the benefits of the Sizewell C Project through an economic strategy, skills, education and employment strategy and an approach to education.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in Annex A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) (Employment, Skills and Education Strategy).</p>	Y
Short-term Benefits	Comments about the 'boom and bust' nature of the	The Sizewell C Project will generate a significant demand for labour, in a range of employment sectors and skill levels in both	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>economic benefits of the development, especially in Leiston as demonstrated during Sizewell A and B.</p>	<p>construction and non-construction-related activities, and long-term operational jobs once the power station is built.</p> <p>The construction phase will last 9-12 years, during which there may be at least one economic cycle, with fluctuating employment/unemployment rates. As such, the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and all related strategies are designed to be flexible and able to react to a changing economy The Sizewell C Project therefore offers resilience in that sense, but also offers the potential for upskilling of existing roles/people in the local area.</p> <p>The Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) also sets out how the local labour market could significantly benefit from a long term major project, helping to smooth seasonal variation (particularly the tourism industry) and help build resilience through the economic cycle with direct, indirect and induced income and employment.</p> <p>SZC CO. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, Annex A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) that sets out measures to</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		support local people into work, into higher skilled work, and to develop sustainable careers in construction, energy and other sectors that support the Sizewell C Project and the wider ambitions for growth in the region.	
Employment Benefits	Support for local employment benefits in the area, and requests for ways in which employment benefits could be further enhanced.	<p>SZC Co. is committed to supporting and enhancing existing skills, training, education and employment strategies for the region that would benefit the Sizewell C Project itself and the long-term future of the region's key growth sectors.</p> <p>Stage 2 set out a commitment to develop a strategy to work with the supply chain and other agencies to maximise apprenticeships for local residents and commitments to primary and secondary engagement through existing national curriculum activities, SZB activities, science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programmes and careers advice including non-STEM programmes.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in Annex A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) (Employment, Skills and Education Strategy).</p>	Y
Community Cohesion	Comments on other considerations to be	SZC Co. aims to strike a balance between using existing accommodation in the area and a purpose-built campus in order	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>taken account of in terms of local community impacts, such as achieving cohesion between workers and the community as well as the effect on mail sorting and delivery to residents.</p>	<p>to make sure that the local community derives economic benefits from worker spend in the area, while avoiding negative effects on accommodation capacity, affordability, and community cohesion.</p> <p>During construction, provision of an accommodation campus and an accommodation office as part of robust accommodation strategy would comprise a key element of SZC Co.'s project-wide approach to managing community effects. Other measures, including community liaison and SZC Co.'s own strict Worker Code of Conduct and drug and alcohol testing policies would be implemented to ensure high levels of worker behaviour are maintained and to promote community cohesion.</p> <p>Further work has since been undertaken to research community cohesion issues within the construction sector in the East of England and nationally. This includes issues related to the non-home-based workforce, use of services, housing, access to jobs, training and education, anti-social behaviour and perception issues relating to the demographic make-up of the non-home-based workforce.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Local Benefits	Support and requests for transport improvements as part of the benefits for the local community.	<p>Volume 1, Appendix 6F the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2) identifies and describes legislation, policy and guidance relevant to the assessment of likely significant transport effects of the Sizewell C Project. The following is a summary of the national and local policy of relevance to the main development site assessment.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.13.3 of NPS EN-1 requires a Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) where a project is likely to have significant transport implications. Also, paragraph 5.13.4 confirms that, where appropriate, the applicant should prepare a Travel Plan including demand management measures to mitigate transport impacts.</p> <p>If mitigation is needed to reduce impacts to “acceptable levels”, “possible demand management measures must be considered, and if feasible and operationally reasonable, required, before considering requirements for the provision of new inland transport infrastructure to deal with remaining transport impacts” (paragraph 5.13.8)</p> <p>The Transport Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.5) is assessed for its environmental effects in Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The proposed highway improvements, such as the Sizewell Link Road, Two Village Bypass and the other highway improvements, will also create long term benefits for the local area.	
Community Cohesion	Comments, concerns and suggestions about the social impacts that an influx of workers will have on the local community.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern raised by local communities and service providers over the potential effect of workers on crime and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>In order to avoid effects before they arise, SZC Co. has been working with local authorities and the emergency services to understand concerns about effects on crime and community cohesion, perceptions of safety, mental wellbeing and safeguarding issues.</p> <p>This process has led to the development of a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16), which sets out the potential effects and measures, roles and responsibilities to mitigate them, including direct funding and support, provision of information, and the enforcement of a Worker Code of Conduct which includes policies on drug and alcohol testing.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Further Information	Comments about the need for more/earlier assessment for the transport strategy and the lack of figures and information provided.	The Stage 1 consultation was very early in the Sizewell C Project. Further information was provided at subsequent consultation stages 2, 3 and 4. Full information on transport is in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Cost	Comments and suggestions about the cost, or how to save cost, for the transport proposals, such as getting funding from the government.	The highway infrastructure proposed by SZC Co., and as described in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) would be fully funded by SZC Co..	Y
Mitigation	Comments suggesting that EDF should partially or fully fund necessary infrastructure for mitigation works	The highway infrastructure proposed by SZC Co., and as described in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) would be fully funded by SZC Co..	Y
HGV Traffic	Other comments and suggestions about	SZC Co. recognise the concerns held regarding increased transport movements, particularly those made by HGV vehicles.	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	HGV management as part of the transport strategy, such as ensuring HGVs use the correct route, reducing HGV movement during rush hour and school runs.	<p>HGV movements would be restricted to defined routes, i.e. A12, Sizewell link road and the B1122 between the end of the Sizewell link road and the main construction site entrance.</p> <p>This is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7).</p>	
Park & Ride Alternative Options	Suggestions for alternative locations to proposed park and ride locations, for example at Saxmundham, at the old Leiston Airfield or at Rendlesham Airfield.	<p>A number of potential locations were considered for the proposed park and ride. The sites suggested have been considered and it was determined that they would not be preferable to those considered through the consultation process and now identified in the DCO, i.e. Darsham and Wickham Market. Saxmundham would necessitate buses using the B1119 or a longer route via the A1094 or B1122. Leiston Airfield is close to the site so does not intercept car trips sufficiently far out to reduce traffic impacts across the local road network. Access to the site is also poor. A site at Rendlesham is too remote from the A12 to be convenient for workers and would draw traffic through Melton on the A1152 unnecessarily.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) contains further information.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Concern about the negative impact on the local community of the park and ride proposals.	<p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns held by the local community regarding the negative impact of the park and ride proposals.</p> <p>SZC Co. have carried out detailed traffic modelling to understand the impacts of the park and ride proposals on adjacent roads. The purpose of the park and rides is to mitigate against the increase in trips, and to encourage the construction workforce to use shuttle buses to reach the main development site.</p> <p>At the northern park and ride a 10m buffer to the east of the site would be maintained throughout construction, operation and the removal and reinstatement phase where residential properties back onto the site.</p> <p>For both the northern and southern park and rides, 3m high landscape bunds would be provided around the operational facility, which would aid in the screening of the proposed development from public viewpoints and also provide acoustic screening.</p> <p>Once the park and rides are no longer necessary for the construction of the main development site, the land would be</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>reinstated to agricultural use. Therefore, any potential impact on the local community would be temporary.</p> <p>The impacts of the park and ride, as part of the overall transport strategy, are considered in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4 and 6.5), including the traffic modelling and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	
Decision Making	Criteria for the park and ride proposals, that the locations should have the least impact on local communities.	<p>SZC Co. have considered a number of potential locations for the proposed park and rides to ensure that the most appropriate locations have been selected.</p> <p>The northern and southern park and ride locations proposed in the DCO are both adjacent to the A12 to reduce the impacts on local communities. The Site Selection Report, Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), identifies the criteria and process applied in the identification of the proposed park and ride sites. The transport effects of the proposals are then assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4 and 6.5). Where necessary, mitigation is proposed to mitigate those impacts.</p>	Y
Decision Making	Criteria for the park and ride proposals, that the location should minimise the	<p>SZC Co. have considered a number of potential locations for the proposed park and rides to ensure that the most appropriate locations have been selected.</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	amount of worker traffic created on local roads.	The northern and southern park and ride locations proposed in the DCO are both adjacent to the A12 to reduce the amount of worker traffic on local roads. Transport impacts on all roads are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). Where necessary, mitigation is proposed to mitigate those impacts.	
Environmental Impact	Concern about the negative impact on the environment from the park and ride proposals.	All impacts are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4) and Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5). Where necessary, mitigation is proposed to mitigate those impacts.	Y
Site Restoration	Concerns that the locations used for the park and rides will not be restored to their original state and requests for reassurance that restoration will happen.	Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) requires SZC Co. to remove and restore the temporary off-site associated development sites. SZC Co. will comply with this requirement.	Y
Mitigation	Specific suggestions for improvements for the park and ride schemes, such as	SZC Co. has not yet decided on the type of vehicle that would be used. Smaller buses would be less efficient so more of them, and drivers, would be needed so this is unlikely to be attractive. More environmentally friendly buses would be considered at the	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	using smaller or environmentally friendly buses.	procurement stage. Assessments made in the Environmental Statement (Book 6) are based on conventionally-sized buses of circa 50 seats with diesel engines.	
Park & Ride Locations	Concern that the park and ride sites will be located too far from the main development site.	<p>SZC Co. have considered a number of potential locations for the proposed park and rides to ensure that the most appropriate locations have been selected.</p> <p>The northern and southern park and ride sites are located so as to reduce traffic impacts on a significant part of the local road network. This is reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). Sites closer to the main construction site would not relieve the local road network to the same extent.</p>	N
Park & Ride Traffic Flow	Concern about the negative impacts of the park and ride schemes on transport, traffic and congestion in the local area.	<p>SZC Co. have considered a number of potential locations for the proposed park and rides to ensure that the most appropriate locations have been selected.</p> <p>The transport impacts of the park and ride, as part of the overall transport strategy, are fully considered in the traffic modelling and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement, Chapter 10, Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Use of Park & Ride Facilities	Concern that workers will not use the proposed park	Workers living west of the A12, south of the River Deben or north of the River Blyth will be required to use park and ride. They would not have a permit to park at the construction site.	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and ride schemes, and that they will not adequately reduce the amount of traffic on roads.	Management processes would be in place to prevent fly parking close to the site. This forms part of the Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8). The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) takes into account the resulting traffic changes on local roads.	
Further Assessment	Comments and concerns about the transport assessment, in that it did not take account of peaks in traffic during the summer and seasonal variations.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) is based on traffic surveys in May and October, as is normal practice. However, summer traffic volumes have been considered. Generally, local traffic flows are only higher than used in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) on a few summer Friday evenings and Saturday mornings. However, at these times, the construction workforce would be lower due to the shift patterns. This analysis is reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). Suffolk County Council have agreed that this approach is reasonable.	Y
Further Assessment	Suggestions for the transport assessment, that specific roads should be avoided.	The transport strategy includes proposals to require HGV and buses to use approved routes, i.e. A12, Sizewell link road and B1122 only. It is envisaged that this will be enforced through GPS technology. Workers living west of A12, north of River Blyth or south of River Deben will be required to use park and ride, accessed from the A12. These workers would not have an on-site parking permit. Fly parking close to the site would be strictly enforced. Further information is included in the Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8), the	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7).	
Safety	Concerns about the impact on emergency access or evacuation routes due to the use of local roads as part of the transport strategy.	HGV traffic is limited to approved routes, i.e. A12, Sizewell link road and the B1122 between the end of the link road and the main construction site entrance. This will help ensure that impacts to journey times, including for emergencies are limited. The impacts of HGV traffic on the local highway network are addressed in full in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). Mitigation is proposed where needed.	Y
HGV Traffic	Concern about the impact of HGV/freight traffic on local roads as part of the transport strategy.	HGV traffic is limited to approved routes, i.e. A12, Sizewell link road and the B1122 between the end of the link road and the main construction site entrance. The impacts of HGV traffic on the local highway network are addressed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). Mitigation is proposed where needed.	Y
Community Impact	Concern about the impact on local residents resulting from the use of roads as part of the transport strategy.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) set out the transport impacts from the scheme and the proposed mitigation measures.	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The Sizewell link road would allow construction traffic to avoid the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton. The Sizewell link road would be constructed in the early years and be used for Sizewell C construction traffic travelling to the main development site.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road itself offers a range of local benefits in addition to the safe movement of traffic towards the main development site during the construction stage. It is anticipated that the existing B1122 would be downgraded by SCC to an unclassified road once the Sizewell link road is operational. As the majority of traffic would reassign to use the Sizewell link road, the existing B1122 would experience much lower traffic volumes and could become more popular among cyclists.</p> <p>The proposed route of the Two Village Bypass would be approximately 2.4km in length and would be located to the south and east of the villages of Farnham and Stratford St Andrew. The route would depart the A12 to the east of Stratford St Andrew and re-join the A12 to the east of Farnham at the A12/A1094 Friday Street junction.</p> <p>The two village bypass itself has the potential to create a significant positive legacy for Suffolk. It offers a range of local benefits including a reduction in traffic noise and traffic-related</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		emissions to the residents of Stratford St Andrew and Farnham. It also is considered to improve the setting of heritage assets within the village of Farnham. The two village bypass also offers benefit to road users and is sufficiently short enough to be considered as a viable alternative to the A12.	
Traffic Flow	Concern that the transport strategy will cause an increased amount of traffic on roads, either at specific sites or in general.	<p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement set out the transport impacts from the scheme and the proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>A number of proposals have been developed to mitigate the impact of the movement of workers and freight, and reduce HGV numbers on the local road network. This include: both a northern and southern park and ride; the two village bypass; the Sizewell link road; Yoxford roundabout and other local highway improvement works; a freight management facility, and the green rail route and improvements to the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line. These proposed associated development proposals would combine to minimise the impact on the local road network from the Sizewell C Project. Details of each can be found in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p>	Y
Transport Strategy	Comments suggesting that traffic should be	Moving freight by rail forms part of the freight management strategy set out in the DCO application. That is two trains per day taken into the LEEIE site during the Early Years phase of	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>minimised as much as possible as part of the transport strategy.</p>	<p>construction and up to three trains per day taken into the main construction site via the Green rail route at Peak Construction. This would allow for almost 40% of materials (by weight) to be transported to site during the construction phase. Bulk movements by sea were ruled out on environmental impacts that could not be mitigated. Worker car traffic is minimised by the accommodation campus and constructing the two park and rides sites. Workers living in Leiston and Knodishall would have to travel by shuttle bus, walk or cycle to the site. The transport proposals seek to minimise road traffic where possible and are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Access Road	<p>Comments suggesting that a new access road will be needed as part of the transport proposals</p>	<p>SZC Co. confirms that the Sizewell C site would need to have a separate access to that used by Sizewell B. The proposed single carriageway road runs from the B1122, just north of the Eastbridge Road junction, to the power station site.</p> <p>The new access road is described in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). It would be the main route to bring workers and materials onto the site during construction and the main access to Sizewell C for cars, buses, LGV, HGV, cyclists and pedestrians once the station is operational. Only those travelling to/from Sizewell C would be</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		permitted to use the new access road, which would not be a public highway.	
Pedestrian Safety	Concerns about safety of drivers and pedestrians resulting from the use of roads as part of the transport strategy.	<p>SZC Co. recognise that there are concerns regarding the safety of drivers and pedestrians.</p> <p>Significant traffic modelling work has been undertaken and outputs have been produced which identify impacts and mitigation requirements.</p> <p>The safety impacts of the transport strategy are set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Traffic Flow	Opposition to any increases in traffic volume as part of the transport strategy.	<p>The transport impacts have been assessed, and mitigation proposed where necessary, in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement (Book 6) that forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>SZC Co. have sought to reduce traffic increases by moving much of the bulk materials by rail through construction of the siding in the LEEIE site for the Early Years phase and the Green rail route during Peak Construction. Some Abnormal Indivisible Loads would arrive at the site by sea, using the Beach Landing Facility to access the construction site.</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>However, clearly it is not possible for all freight or all construction workers to arrive by these modes, walking or cycling. Consequently, there would be additional traffic during the Early Years, Peak Construction and Operational Phase of the Sizewell C Project. The magnitude and transport impact of these increases are clearly set out in the Transport Assessment. The environmental impacts from the additional traffic volume are assessed and reported in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p>	
Traffic Modelling	<p>Concerns that estimations for increases in traffic volume as part of the transport strategy have been underestimated and impacts will be worse in reality.</p>	<p>Significant traffic modelling work has been undertaken, working with Suffolk County Council over many years to seek to agree the inputs to the modelling and reviewing the outputs to identify impacts and mitigation requirements. Both the typical day and busiest day at peak construction have been assessed in order to assess the worst case scenario. These form the basis of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>If unforeseen transport impacts arise, then this can be addressed by the Transport Review Group, that includes SCC. A fund will be in place to address such issues as they arise during the construction process. SZC Co. have successfully</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		adopted this approach on the Hinkley Point C project for several years during construction.	
Site Suitability	Comments about the poor standards of local roads currently, highlighting the need for improvement.	<p>SZC Co. recognise that current road conditions need improving. Significant road improvements are proposed, e.g. Sizewell link road, two village bypass and numerous junction improvements as described in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>There would be a condition survey of local roads before construction starts. These would continue during and after construction so that the physical condition of local roads is maintained.</p>	Y
Marine strategy	Comments or suggestions about sea transport strategy, such as to minimise impact on coastal erosion and taking into account changes in weather.	The temporary jetty proposed at Stage 2 consultation was ruled out due to environmental impacts. The DCO does include a Beach Landing Facility to enable AILs (large loads) to be brought to site by sea. The environmental impacts of the BLF are set out in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Transport Enforcement	Comments suggesting that elements of the transport strategy should be adequately	<p>SZC Co. have considered the mechanisms by which to enforce the transport strategy.</p> <p>Worker parking on the site would be controlled by parking permit and strictly enforced. Workers would have to sign a code of</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	enforced in order to minimise transport impact of the development.	conduct that includes responsible travel behaviour. Further information is in the Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8). HGVs and buses would be on approved routes (A12, Sizewell link road and B1122 to the main site access) that would be enforced through GPS. This is addressed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7).	
Transport Strategy	Comments suggesting that rail and sea should be used more in the transport strategy.	<p>SZC Co. have considered a number of options within the transport strategy.</p> <p>The optimum solution for moving freight by rail is included in the DCO application. That is two trains per day taken into the LEEIE site during the Early Years phase of construction and up to three trains per day taken into the main construction site via the Green rail route at Peak Construction.</p> <p>Bulk movements by sea were ruled out on environmental impacts that could not be mitigated. The transport proposals use rail for freight and sea where possible and are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Transport Strategy	Support for the use of rail as part of the transport strategy.	SZC Co. welcome the support for using rail as part of the transport strategy.	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The optimum solution for moving freight by rail is included in the DCO application. That is two trains per day taken into the LEEIE site during the Early Years phase of construction and up to three trains per day taken into the main construction site via the Green rail route at Peak Construction. The transport proposals seek to use rail where possible and are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Coastal Processes	Concern about the impact on coastal processes from the sea transport options and potential flood risk to the fragile coastline.	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach Landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, indivisible loads (AILs). The BLF is much less intrusive than a jetty and no significant impacts on coastal processes or increased flood risk are predicted from its construction and operation. This includes the retention of the BLF infrastructure throughout the operational period for occasional AIL deliveries.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Marine Ecology	Concern about the impact on the environment and marine ecology from the sea transport options.	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach Landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, indivisible loads (AILs). The BLF is much less intrusive than a jetty and no significant impacts on marine ecology are predicted from its construction and operation.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Visual Impact	Concern about the intrusive, disruptive nature and resultant landscape and visual impact of the sea transport options.	<p>EDF notes the concern over landscape and visual impact of sea transport options.</p> <p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment..</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained within the Landscape and Visual Impact chapters , Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Book 6).	
Community Impact	Concern about the access to the beach because of sea transport infrastructure and impact on the visual amenity of the beach and its enjoyment as a recreational space.	<p>EDF notes the concern over the beach access and visual amenity.</p> <p>There will be a need for some temporary closures to access to construct the Coastal Defences for Sizewell C and to prepare the Beach Landing Facility although the closure will be minimised as far as possible. An inland diversion of the Coastal Path is included as part of the proposals.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 15 Amenity and Recreation of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	Y
Crime	Concern about the potential risk of the sea transport infrastructure being used for smuggling, human-trafficking and other illegal activities.	<p>All vessels arriving at the beach landing facility will be thoroughly checked by security and only licensed and reputable contractors will be utilised.</p> <p>In addition, a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) has been developed to accompany the application for development consent in consultation with local authorities, emergency services and public services, among other</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		stakeholder groups, to outline the approach to community safety in the area.	
Economic Impact	Concern about the socioeconomic effects of the sea transport infrastructure options due to the loss of tourism from impact to the landscape, beach, recreational sailing and fishing boats.	<p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns regarding the effects of sea transport infrastructure on the loss of tourism.</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) sets out potential tourism impacts and measures proposed to avoid, manage and mitigate these. Chapter 13 (Landscape Visual) of the Environmental Statement (Book 6) assesses the potential impacts on the wider landscape. Chapter 15 (Amenity and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement (Book 6) assesses the potential impacts from the temporary closures to footways, public rights of way, the coastal path and beach. Chapter 24 (Navigation) of the Environmental Statement (Book 6) assesses the potential impacts to fishing boats and recreational users of the sea.</p> <p>A Tourism Fund has been set out in the Section 106 Heads of Terms to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</p>	Y
Community Impact	Positive comments about the reduced community, tourism	SZC Co. welcome the positive comments.	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and economy impacts from sea transport, e.g. the coastal path could be kept open and fewer tourists will be kept away by road traffic.	<p>A number of measures are proposed to reduce traffic including using both sea transport and rail and an on-site accommodation campus for 2,400 workers to avoid daily commuting on local roads. For workers living outside the campus, park and rides or direct bussing will be utilised to reduce the number of car movements.</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) sets out potential tourism impacts and measures proposed to avoid, manage and mitigate these. This will include a Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</p>	

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Waste Disposal	Comments and concerns about spoil disposal and where it will be disposed	<p>Almost all of the excavated material generated on site would be retained on site. It will be used either to refill the borrow pits or to create rolling Suffolk Sandlings acid grassland across the temporary construction area, once Sizewell C has been constructed.</p> <p>The approach to the management of excavated material is described in Appendix 3B Materials Management Strategy of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Waste Management	Comments and concerns about waste management during construction	<p>The waste hierarchy would be applied to minimise disposal of waste and maximise reuse and recycling. Opportunities for re-use and recycling of waste include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • re-using excavated soils on-site in the landscaping features of the development; • Chipping green waste on-site for use in the landscaping for the development; • Composting of green waste; • Recycling of inert material by crushing, blending and subsequent re-use, as an aggregate; and • Re-using waste and materials on other nearby schemes. For example, re-using waste for uses with clear benefits to the environment, for example in the remodelling of agricultural land or in the restoration of nearby quarries or other excavation sites. 	Y

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where waste must be taken to recycling/disposal facilities, these facilities would have the appropriate permits to ensure environmental risks are minimised. The recycling/disposal facilities should be located as close to the works as possible to minimise transport, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions resulting from transportation. The Contractor will identify the closest and relevant treatment and disposal sites. <p>The Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 8.11) includes the full range of measures that would control waste management during the construction phase.</p>	

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Document	Criticism of the wording in the documentation and in the entire consultation in general.	<p>A mix of responses were received in relation to the content of the consultation material.</p> <p>The consultation material was prepared in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC)</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>and Suffolk County Council (SCC), see Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. aimed to make the Stage 1 Summary Consultation Document as accessible and clear as possible for a wider and non-technical audience. SZC Co. made the baseline environmental information and transport strategy documents available to all, see Appendices B.4 and B.5 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The Stage 2 Consultation documents were also designed to be as accessible and as clear to all as possible, in accordance with the approach agreed with SCDC and SCC in the Updated SOCC (November 2016), Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>With this feedback in mind, and as part of efforts to make the consultation as accessible as possible to hard-to-reach groups, SZC Co. commissioned Easy Read documents to be published at Stages 3 and 4.</p>	
Previous Consultations	Comments about experiences with consultation for Sizewell A/B.	Some members of the Sizewell C Project Team had worked on the planning and construction of Sizewell B.	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Along with the lessons learned from the consultation on Hinkley Point C, SZC Co. also considered the experience of the consultation activities for Sizewell B to ensure that consultation in relation to the Sizewell C Project was of the highest quality.	
Consultation Process	Comments suggesting that expert knowledge and opinion should be valued as part of the consultation, to inform proposals.	<p>This is part of the process. It is a statutory requirement for SZC Co. to consult statutory consultees, such as the Environment Agency, Marine Management Organisation, Natural England (among others), in addition to local communities.</p> <p>Several local residents also have expertise in a number of areas relevant to the proposals.</p> <p>SZC Co. consulted all persons and bodies required under the Planning Act ,see Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1), and welcomed all views and expert knowledge, which was used to inform the development of the proposals.</p>	Y
Consultation Process	Suggestion that further stages of consultation are needed.	<p>Stage 1 was followed by additional stages of public consultation, along with ongoing informal consultation with land owners, parishes and community groups.</p> <p>Full details are contained in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	Y
Consultation Document	Concern and criticisms of the	SZC Co. made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner. This was in	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	consultation materials as being biased in favour of certain options, misleading, or inaccurate.	<p>accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012), Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Care was taken to ensure that the material presented was factual, did not mislead and was not biased.</p> <p>SZC Co. have been committed to an honest and fair approach to consultation throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	
Consultation Document	Comments and criticisms about the distribution and availability of the consultation documentation.	<p>SZC Co. published the consultation material online, along with several thousand printed copies of the Stage 1 consultation documents, which were sent to all statutory stakeholders and interested parties, see Appendices B.4, B.5 and B.6 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. sent the Stage 1 newsletter to homes and businesses within ten miles of Sizewell C and a mile radius of associated development sites outside this area, see Appendix B.11 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). Where anyone was missed in distribution, we updated the distribution list.</p> <p>After this feedback at Stage 1 we extended the circulation area of the newsletter for subsequent stages of consultation to 27,879 homes and business addresses (see Updated Statement of</p>	Y

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Community Consultation (November 2016), Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>All consultation documents were available on the internet and SZC Co. distributed more documents on request (e.g. Middleton Parish Council requested that the summary documents were sent to parishioners).</p>	
Consultation Document	Comments that the current documentation does not contain enough detail in general, and that more is needed to understand impacts of the proposals	<p>The Stage 1 consultation was the first statutory stage of consultation and sought views on our initial plans for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Due to the stage that the scheme was at detail was not available for all elements of the scheme at that stage. This was to a large extent intentional to provide the community and stakeholders with the opportunity to review potential options to inform the design of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>More information and detail was provided at later stages of consultation with the benefit of the feedback received at Stage 1. Please see Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	Y
Further Information	Specific requests for more information about certain parts of	The Stage 1 consultation was the first statutory stage of consultation and sought views on our initial plans for the Sizewell C Project.	Y

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the proposals/ consultation	<p>Due to the stage that the scheme was at detail was not available for all elements of the scheme at that stage. This was to a large extent intentional to provide the community and stakeholders with the opportunity to review potential options to inform the design of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>This feedback was taken into account, and more information and detail on specific options and proposals was provided at later stages of consultation. Please see Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	
Further Assessment	Challenging the consultation process by suggesting that further assessment of proposals and their impacts is needed	<p>The Stage 1 consultation was the first statutory stage of consultation and sought views on our initial plans for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>This was to provide the community and stakeholders with the opportunity to review potential options to inform the design of the Sizewell C Project. Due to the stage that the scheme was at, further detailed assessment work needed to be undertaken as the scheme evolved.</p> <p>Stage 1 was followed by three more statutory stages of public consultation and an informal stage of consultation with parishes living close to associated development sites. These subsequent</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		stages were informed by further technical assessments and environmental surveys, being undertaken to inform the evolving Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Please see Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Consultation Publicity	Challenging the consultation for being badly publicised and communication to the public being poor in general	<p>The Stage 1 consultation material and process was prepared and undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC), see Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. printed several thousand copies of the Stage 1 consultation documents, which were sent to all statutory stakeholders and interested parties, see Appendices B.4, B.5 and B.6 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. sent the Stage 1 newsletter to homes and businesses within ten miles of Sizewell C and a mile radius of associated development sites outside this area, see Appendix B.11 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>After this feedback at Stage 1 we extended the circulation area of the newsletter for subsequent stages of consultation to 27,879 homes and business addresses (see Updated Statement of</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Community Consultation (November 2016), see Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>All consultation documents were available on the internet and SZC Co. distributed more documents on request (e.g. Middleton Parish Council requested that the summary documents were sent to parishioners).</p> <p>Within the Stage 1 feedback, some parishes suggested that other ways of publicising the consultation would be necessary.</p> <p>At Stages 2, 3 and 4 SZC Co. therefore produced posters to display on public notice boards across villages and neighbouring parishes where exhibitions would be taking place. SZC Co. also sent parish councils a ‘parish pack’ which included several publicity materials so the parish could advertise events and other consultation activities. See sample consultation material for these stages at Appendices D.11, E.9 and F.6).</p>	
Stakeholder Engagement	Suggestions of organisations that SZC Co. should consider working with as part of the consultation.	<p>The aim of the consultation was to encourage optimal levels of feedback and to be as accessible as possible.</p> <p>Where organisations were suggested to/approached SZC Co., we arranged meetings and encouraged feedback through formal consultation stages.</p>	Y

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Full details of the approach to consultation are contained in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Decision Making	Suggestion that public opinion should be valued and should help inform the proposals.	The purpose of the multi-stage approach to consultation was to take on board the feedback from respondents at each stage, in order to inform the proposals which would be the subject of the next stage of consultation, and ultimately the DCO application. As explained in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1), SZC Co. undertook four statutory stages of consultation, which fully accord with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.	Y
Further Information	Specific requests for more information to be included in later stages of consultation.	<p>The Stage 1 consultation was the first statutory stage of consultation and sought views on our initial plans for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Due to the stage that the scheme was at detail was not available for all elements of the scheme at that stage. This was to a large extent intentional to provide the community and stakeholders with the opportunity to review potential options to inform the design of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>This feedback was taken into account, and more information and detail on specific options and proposals was provided at later</p>	Y

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		stages of consultation. Please see Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Consultation Process	Comments and suggestions about specific issues which should be included in the scope of the consultation.	<p>The Stage 1 consultation was the first statutory stage of consultation and sought views on our initial plans for the Sizewell C Project, and issues which the community and stakeholders considered should be taken into account.</p> <p>Comments on issues to be further assessed were welcomed, to inform the design of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Later stages of consultation were informed by further technical assessments and environmental surveys. Full details of the approach to consultation are contained in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.</p>	Y
Consultation Timing	Criticisms of the timescale of the consultation as being too short to adequately respond	The Stage 1 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) (see Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	Y

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and at an inconvenient time of the year.	<p>Page 3 of the SOCC required that Stage 1 consultation would take place over an 11 week period. In accordance with this requirement, Stage 1 consultation ran for 11 weeks (21 November 2012 to 6 February 2013), and a high number of responses were received.</p> <p>In total, the period of formal public consultation for Sizewell C, taking into account all four statutory stages, was 44.5 weeks.</p> <p>This took place over seven years and informal consultation and community engagement continued throughout the time between formal stages of consultation. Full details of SZC Co.'s approach to consultation are contained within Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Worker Welfare	Comments and suggestions about considerations for	Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has sought to ensure that worker welfare and safety is a priority.	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>worker welfare and safety.</p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project is committed to Zero Harm and this will be reflected in the approach to health and safety and worker wellbeing.</p> <p>All contractors will be required to comply with health and safety plans and ensure project risk registers and task risk assessments and matrices are complete before work is undertaken.</p> <p>An on-site occupational health service will be available for all workers covering a wide range of services including assessment of fitness to work, on-going health surveillance, GP, pharmacy, 24-hour nurse cover and treatment services. Mental and sexual health services will be included, including a chaplain/counselling service and mental health first aiders.</p> <p>Full details can be found in Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

b. Main Development Site

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Safety	Comments about construction, such as potential dangers and guidance to be taken into consideration.	<p>Details on the proposed approach to the construction of Sizewell C are provided in the description of development chapters for each of the sites in Volumes 2 to 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Doc Ref. 6.3-6.10).</p> <p>Safety and security of the proposed development is of utmost importance for SZC Co. and has been an underlying consideration in the development of the construction proposals.</p> <p>Volumes 2 to 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3-6.10) also present an assessment of the potential environmental impact associated with construction of Sizewell C as undertaken in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017. The assessments identify mitigation, management and monitoring measures where necessary mitigate potentially significant adverse effects.</p> <p>A Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11) has also been developed for the Sizewell C development sites, and sets out that SZC Co. will require all contractors to comply with all relevant legislative controls, construction health, safety and</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		environmental standards and other relevant best practice methodologies.	
Further Information	Comments and questions about bridges, storage tanks and other elements of the main site, such as parking and crossing points.	<p>Details about the design of the main development site are provided in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p> <p>Consideration of alternative designs within the main development site are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 6, Assessment of Alternatives and Design Evolution, of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Decision Making	Comments and concerns about company profits and ownership of the Sizewell C site, and suggestions that cost should not be the most important factor for the development.	<p>NNB Generation Company (SZC) is currently a wholly owned subsidiary of NNB Holding Company (SZC) Limited.</p> <p>The Funding Statement (Doc Ref. 4.2) explains how: (i) the acquisition of the land, interests and rights necessary to build the Sizewell C Project would be funded; and (ii) how the implementation of the Sizewell C Project generally is to be funded. It should be read alongside the Statement of Reasons (Doc Ref. 4.1), which justifies the powers of compulsory acquisition that are sought and explains how SZC Co. intends to use the land which it is proposed to acquire.</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The Site Selection Report , appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.	
Water Supply	Comments and concerns about the cooling water infrastructure required for the main site, and resultant impacts on the marine ecosystem.	<p>Sizewell C will be ‘direct-cooled’ which means that it will abstract about 132 cubic metres per second from Sizewell Bay before returning it back to the same location at a warmer temperature (+11°C) having been used to cool the power station steam condensers. To do so, 4 large intake head structures and 2 large outfall head structures need to be placed on the seabed. Construction would require the area of each head to be dredged prior to placement of the heads themselves and connection to the tunnels that run back to shore 10s of metres below the seabed. Our assessments have shown that the dredging and installation of the heads will create some minor suspension of sediment (from dredging), loss of an insignificant amount of seabed where the heads are placed and some short-term, insignificant increases in underwater noise from piling.</p> <p>When operating, the cooling water infrastructure will draw in fish and other marine organisms as there is no available means to prevent this. However, mitigation in the form of a special intake head design and a Fish Recovery and Return System will</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>significantly reduce the number of fish captured and return those that are to sea (respectively).</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Water Supply	Comments and concerns about the dewatering proposals and resultant impacts on nearby designated areas.	<p>The dewatering operation will remove a significant volume of groundwater over the period of construction.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring, modelling and assessment is on-going to understand how significant this is in relation to water table and designated sites that are reliant on these conditions to maintain the existing flora and fauna.</p> <p>The current findings indicate that the dewatering operation is far less significant to the water balance than changes that will occur through climate change. However, small but potentially significant changes in the water table can be predicted from construction operations and therefore mitigation is proposed in the form of a control structure on the Sizewell Drain, to maintain water levels in the watercourse and recharge to groundwater.</p> <p>Further details are contained in Chapter 22 Marine Ecology of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Decommissioning	Comments about experiences of the Sizewell A and B main development sites, and concerns about the decommissioning of the sites.	<p>At the end of electricity generation, Sizewell C nuclear power station would be decommissioned. The process of decommissioning would be divided into a number of activities leading to the clearance and de-licensing of the site and ultimately its release for re-use. The decommissioning strategy to be employed for Sizewell C would be ‘early site clearance’ and would begin as soon as practicable after the end of electricity generation at the site. The UK EPR™ reactor units have been designed with decommissioning in mind, to minimise the amount of radioactive waste when the site is cleared and de-licensed.</p> <p>The decommissioning of Sizewell C, with the exception of the Interim Spent Fuel Store (ISFS), could be achieved within approximately 25 years of the end of generation. The ISFS would continue to operate until a UK Geological Disposal Facility is available and the spent fuel is ready for disposal.</p> <p>Before decommissioning can take place, SZC Co. would be required to undertake an EIA and prepare an ES under relevant regulations, such as Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) Regulations 1999 (Ref. 6) and the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007, in order to obtain consent from the Office of Nuclear Regulation.</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>In September 2005 Magnox Electric Ltd (now Magnox Ltd) applied for consent to decommission Sizewell A under the Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) Regulations 1999 as amended. The consent was granted by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (now Office For Nuclear Regulation (ONR)) in May 2006. There are six conditions attached to the consent, most of which relate to the preparation and maintenance of an Environmental Management Plan, which details the ongoing mitigation measures to prevent, reduce, and, if possible, offset any significant adverse environmental effects of the decommissioning work.</p> <p>Sizewell B is operational and is expected to be decommissioned in 2035. An EIA of that decommissioning stage would need to be undertaken at a later stage.</p>	
Site Size	Comments about the extent of land take required for the Sizewell C main development site, and concerns that the site is too large	<p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK's energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. The Government's Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power.</p> <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>The drawings presented at Stage 1, which showed the main development site, indicated that the power station can be adequately accommodated within the area available.</p> <p>In order to help address concerns with regards to size of the development proposed, every effort was made by SZC Co. to find solutions to limit the development. As such, buildings were deleted and facilities merged within structures to reduce the number of buildings on site. For example the deletion of the EDF Site Office building and the incorporation of these office facilities within the Operational Service Centre. Furthermore, a very significant change was the removal of the Training Centre from the Goose Hill area, by accommodating the Environmental Statements essential on-site training facilities within the Operation Service Centre. This also reduced concerns of further development in the AONB.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The Site Selection Report , appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.	
Timeline of development	Concern about the length of time the proposed temporary developments will be required for, many arguing that the use of the word 'temporary' is misleading.	<p>SZC Co. has taken steps to ensure that construction traffic impacts are mitigated as far as possible. The construction programme has sought to deliver mitigation early on in the process, whilst allowing the Sizewell C Project to be delivered in a timely manner. The construction of the off-site associated developments would be undertaken early in the construction programme. The construction period of each associated development would vary, however each is assumed to take no longer than 24 months.</p> <p>An indicative phasing schedule for the Sizewell C Project as a whole is provided in the Implementation Plan, Appendix I of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Site Restoration	Scepticism about the 'temporary' nature of the temporary developments and requests for reassurance that	The Development Consent Order will include requirements that relate to the works necessary to restore the site following construction of Sizewell C and any decommissioning works at the appropriate time. The developer will be legally required to submit further details to the local planning authority for their approval and thereafter comply with the approved details.	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	they will be removed and land restored.		

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Concern about the impact on RSPB Minsmere Reserve or other specific designated areas.	<p>The impacts on Minsmere have been assessed through the EIA, including coastal processes (to help define any changes to the beach frontage), hydrology (to define any changes to groundwater and surface water flows) and ecology (to determine any habitat or species responses to these impacts, as well as to noise and air quality changes and changes in amenity use).</p> <p>With appropriate boundary treatments, including screening as well as the measures defined within the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11), the impacts on Minsmere RSPB reserve would be minimised.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 14 Terrestrial Ecology of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 8.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Concern about the impact on Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	<p>The impacts on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) have been assessed in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Please see Chapter 13 Landscape Visual of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) for full details.</p> <p>The LVIA identifies significant adverse effects on the AONB during the construction and operation phases, albeit these effects would occur over localised sections of these designations. Impacts during the operation phase has been minimised where possible through colour and material choice, the use of bunding to screen low level structures and the use of plating to help screen or soften views.</p> <p>With appropriate boundary treatments, including screening and the measures have been proposed in order to minimise the impacts on the AONB during construction would be minimised.</p>	Y
Environmental Impact	Concern about the impact on Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest.	<p>The impacts on the Sizewell Marshes have been assessed through the EIA, across a number of workstreams. Some land take of the SSSI is necessary to provide the footprint of the new power station as well as to provide the new access road from the north. The temporary construction area is located entirely outside the SSSI, other than a few limited areas which</p>	Y

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>are required to build adjacent features, such as the diversion of the Leiston drain. The land take of the SSSI has been minimised as far as possible and mitigation / compensation for the areas to be lost is provided by the Aldhurst Farm Habitat Creation Area and the off-site Fen Meadow Strategy.</p> <p>The EIA includes assessments of hydrology (to define any changes to groundwater and surface water flows) and ecology (to determine any habitat or species responses to these impacts, as well as to noise and air quality changes and changes in amenity use.</p> <p>Further details can be found in in Chapter 14 Terrestrial Ecology of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Mitigation	Comments in supporting the proposed environmental mitigation measures as being adequate.	<p>SZC Co. notes the supportive comments in relation to the mitigation proposals. The mitigation measures have been refined throughout the EIA process in order to mitigate for any significant adverse effects that would otherwise arise.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p>	Y

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Concerns that the environmental mitigation proposals are inadequate, or it will be impossible to mitigate the impacts on the environment.	<p>SZC Co. notes the concerns in relation to the mitigation proposals. The mitigation measures have been refined throughout the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process in order to mitigate for any significant adverse effects that would otherwise arise.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Book 6) describes the mitigation measures that when implemented, will mitigate the vast majority of effects from construction which could otherwise have been significant.</p>	Y
Mitigation	Suggestions for environmental mitigation, such as reduction of light pollution, coastal protection measures and planting.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes all of the mitigation suggestions put forward by respondents.</p> <p>These suggestions as well as the views of technical specialists have helped to define the overall package of mitigation.</p> <p>Full details are contained in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p>	Y
Further Assessment	Requests and suggestions for further environmental assessment, such as about impacts on marine ecology,	<p>At Stage 1 consultation, the preliminary environmental information included in the consultation was high level.</p> <p>More detailed information was subsequently provided at Stage 2 and particularly Stage 3 and a full EIA was undertaken during the period to application.</p>	Y

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	archaeology, habitats and noise and vibration.	<p>The scope of the EIA was subject to a Scoping Opinion in 2014, Appendix G.7 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1), and a further Scoping Opinion in 2019, Appendix G.8 of the Consultation Report, and the EIA process and the technical assessments have been cognisant of these opinions.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p>	
Monitoring of Impacts	Comments and suggestions about the need for monitoring and management of environmental impacts on order to mitigate.	<p>SZC Co. notes the suggestions for monitoring and management of the impacts. The measures within the Environmental Statement (Book 6) and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) will mitigate many of the construction effects during construction.</p> <p>Where monitoring is required to help inform ongoing actions, or to confirm that measures are effective, this is specified in the CoCP (Doc Ref 8.11) and/or ES (Book 6) as appropriate.</p>	Y
Further Assessment	Comments and suggestions for other environmental considerations to be taken into account in the proposals, such as soil contamination and	<p>SZC Co. welcomes all of the mitigation suggestions put forward by respondents.</p> <p>These suggestions as well as the views of technical specialists have helped to define the overall package of mitigation.</p>	Y

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	radiological effects in food.	Full details are contained in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).	
Environmental Impact	Comments and concerns about increase in pollution (in general) from the development.	<p>SZC Co. notes the concerns in relation to the potential for pollution.</p> <p>The mitigation measures have been refined throughout the EIA process in order to mitigate for any significant adverse effects, such as pollution, that would otherwise arise. Whilst there will be some impacts which will be difficult or impossible to mitigate, for the great majority of impacts, there are effective measures to eliminate any significant adverse effects relating to pollutants</p> <p>Further details can be found in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p>	Y

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Noise and Vibration	Concerns about the increase in noise pollution and	SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact of noise from the Sizewell C Project. Chapter 11 (Noise and vibration) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)	Y

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>vibration from the development and impacts on people and wildlife.</p>	<p>includes an assessment of noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment for the main development site considers the impact on ecological receptors, including bats and birds, as well as residential and other sensitive receptors such as users of public rights of way, or Leiston Abbey.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified in the Environmental Statement (Book 6), and includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boundary treatments, including acoustic fences and landscape bunds to screen impacts; - Construction noise management and monitoring measures to control impacts arising from construction activities; and - Provision of new foraging land for marsh harriers that may be affected by noise generated from the main development site construction. <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Air Quality			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Air Quality	<p>Concern about the impact on air quality and pollution as a result of the overall development proposals and effect on people and wildlife.</p>	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact on air quality from the Sizewell C Project, including from vehicle pollution, and dust and emissions impacts during the construction phase.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Air Quality) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes the assessment of air quality impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network. The air quality, and associated impact assessments considers the impact on residential receptors as well as ecological receptors, including surrounding habitats (Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology)), and users of public rights of way and and Amenity and recreation (Chapter 15 (Amenity and recreation)).</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified and are detailed in the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p>	Y

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Visual Impact	Concern about the impact on undeveloped, unspoilt countryside and greenfield sites.	<p>The landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) within Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The LVIA process has helped inform decisions on proposed landforms (such as vertical and horizontal road alignments, cutting and embankment slopes), boundary treatments, landscape planting for main development site as well as for the off-site associated developments.</p>	Y
Site Restoration	Comments about the need for mitigation and restoration to minimise the impact of the development on the landscape.	A DCO requirement is proposed to require all temporary buildings and structures to be removed from the main development site and for the land to be restored. The design details of the landscape restoration would then be secured by a separate DCO requirement, which shall be in general accordance with the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.2).	Y
Light Pollution	Concern about the increase in light pollution and the impact on people and wildlife.	The LVIA process for the main development site has considered the night-time views in the context of the 'dark skies status'. The Lighting Management Plan, Appendix 2B of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) has identified approaches, including lighting types, which will help minimise	Y

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		light spill from the development during both construction and operation and this is considered in undertaking the night-time appraisal.	

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Ecological Impact	Concern about the impact on wildlife and protected species, such as bats and birds.	<p>Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) has identified a large number of mitigation measures which have been included within the design proposals for Sizewell C.</p> <p>These are included within the Environmental Statement (Book 6) and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) or form part of the mitigation strategies for individual protected species or species groups. Mitigation strategies have been developed for water voles, reptiles, bats and badgers and these strategies would be implemented under protected species licenses where these are necessary.</p>	Y
Ecological Impact	Concern about the potential impact and destruction of wildlife habitats.	<p>Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) has identified a large number of mitigation measures which have been included within the design proposals for Sizewell C.</p>	N

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The impacts to habitats have been minimised as far as possible through avoidance in the first instance but where this is not possible the impacts are addressed by mitigation and / or compensatory habitat provision.</p> <p>At the Main Development Site, the habitat creation scheme at Aldhurst Farm, the development of off-site proposals such as the fen meadow strategy, as well as other habitat creation opportunities, including the habitats established under the operational masterplan have provided compensatory habitats for the losses from the Sizewell Marshes SSSI associated with the SSSI crossing.</p>	

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Infrastructure	Concern about the impact on and severance of public rights of way such as footpaths and bridleways, including	SZC Co. have sought to minimize the impacts of the Sizewell C Project on amenity and recreation, including footpaths. The impacts in this regard are assessed in detail in Chapter 15 (Amenity and Recreation) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement and within the Recreational Strategy appended to the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)	Y

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the beach access footpath.	<p>A range of mitigation proposals are set out in the Environmental Statement (Book 6) to minimise the effects on PROW users including diversion proposals and enhancements in the local area, such as within the Kenton Hills car park.</p> <p>More specifically, a diversion route will be in place during times when the coast path will be closed during construction. The route will use existing and new diversion routes to enable PROW users to come inland at Minsmere sluice and following a series of paths to re-join the coast path south of the Sizewell A.</p> <p>A new off-road Bridleway will be created as a diversion route when Bridleway 19 is closed. This route will maintain and improve north to south connectivity from Eastbridge to Leiston. The route will cross a number of roads and have suitable crossing points to enable a safe off-road diversion route.</p> <p>The Sandlings walk will be closed during construction of SZC removing access from the Kenton Hills to the beach directly north of SZB due to safety concerns. The access to the Beach will now run along Sandy lane and along Sizewell Gap.</p>	

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Water Supply	Comments and concerns about the cooling water infrastructure required for the main site, and resultant impacts on the marine ecosystem.	<p>Adverse effects on marine ecology and fisheries would be not significant from the use of seawater for cooling purposes, as set out in Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology and Fisheries) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> <p>Additional mitigation measures to achieve this outcome include Low Velocity, Side Entry intake heads to minimise the number of fish entrapped in the cooling system, a Fish Recovery and Return (FRR) system, comprising one FRR tunnel per unit, to recover entrapped fish and return as many to sea as possible unharmed.</p> <p>Details of project alternatives that were considered and do not form part of this application, such as Acoustic Fish Deterrents (AFDs) and other forms of biota exclusion technology, are set out in Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc ref 6.3)."</p>	N
Water Resource	Comments and concerns about the dewatering proposals and resultant impacts on	The excavation of the main platform site requires dewatering of the groundwater at that location. This would be done within a low permeability cut-off wall constructed in order to minimise the drawdown effects and thereby minimise the impacts on the water-sensitive designated sites. The groundwater regime has	N

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	nearby designated areas.	<p>been modelled, taking account of climate change, to consider potential impacts within the designated sites.</p> <p>The impacts in this regard are assessed in detail in Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Doc Ref. 6.3). Mitigation measures are set out in this chapter, within the Monitoring and Response Strategy, Volume 2, Chapter 19, Appendix 19A of the Environmental Statement, and within the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>Control measures proposed for the realigned Sizewell Drain have the potential to offer greater control in the management of water in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. The enhanced water level control within the Sizewell Marshes SSSI would allow for fine tuning of the management regime over time, building additional resilience into the maintenance of the SSSI.</p>	
Water Pollution	Concern about water pollution as an impact of the development, such as groundwater.	The potential pollution impact on groundwater and surface water has been assessed in Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Doc Ref. 6.3). This has also been informed by the Outline Drainage Strategy, Volume 2, Chapter 2, Appendix 2A of the Environmental Statement .	N

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Mitigation measures have been incorporated that include the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and other techniques to mimic natural processes where possible, promoting infiltration and managing stormwater volumes, whilst recognising the need to manage potential pollutant loading such as sediment and hydrocarbons. These mitigation measures are described in Chapter 19 , the Outline Drainage Strategy and the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11).	
Flood Risk	Concerns about the dangers of flood risk to the development and about the potential increase in flood risk because of the development.	<p>The flood risk associated with the development has been addressed in the Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 5.2) and summarised in Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The development of the approach to these assessments and the supporting modelling has been discussed in detail with key stakeholders including the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The flood risk to the development has been assessed in relation to all forms of flooding and designed to be safe and operable under foreseeable conditions, also taking account of climate change and rising sea levels.</p>	N

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The impacts on flood risk from the development have been lessened through design development where avoidance has not been possible. Designs have been developed to minimise impacts to receptors including properties and habitats.</p> <p>A number of mitigation measures have been included within the design proposals and are set out in the Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 5.2), Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	
Hydrology and Groundwater	Concern about the impact of the development on drainage systems and flooding.	<p>The impacts from the proposed development on groundwater flow, surface water systems and natural drainage systems has been assessed and set out in Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>A number of mitigation measures have been included within the design proposals and are set out in this chapter, the Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 2, Chapter 2, Appendix 2A of the Environmental Statement), the Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 5.2) and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	N

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The proposal to realign the Sizewell Drain is assessed in this chapter and further described in Volume 2, Chapter 19, Appendix 19C of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Coastal Processes	Suggestions that the proposed jetty use should be maximised, and that the jetty should be made larger if necessary to allow this, or made permanent.	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>Our assessments demonstrated that the jetty would cause impacts on the local coastal processes (a lesson learned from the construction of SZB). Furthermore, recent environmental legislation means that the potential impacts from underwater noise on marine mammals, and the mitigation required to prevent this, was not possible.</p> <p>Thus the jetty described at Stage 2 has not been carried forward and a larger one as suggested certainly is not possible.</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained within Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Coastal Processes	Concern about the impacts of the proposed jetty, visually, on marine life, on designated areas and recreational use of the coastline.	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology, but we acknowledge that there would have been a significant visual impact too.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Coastal Processes	Comments and concern about the impact on the development of sea level rise, increasing coastal erosion and subsequent flooding in future years.	We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is potentially sensitive and we are required to assess the potential impact of natural coastal processes on the proposed power station for safety purposes. We have taken due regard of coastal processes and climate change predictions including sea-level rise and storminess over the whole life-cycle of the proposed development.	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Our assessments have used the very latest data from the UK Meteorological Office and Government – UK Climate Projections (UKCP18) to investigate potential impacts from climate change. The risk assessment for coastal flooding has allowed a worst case of 3.5m sea-level rise (which is greater than any current plausible predictions). Furthermore, the rock armour coastal defence has the ability to be increased from 10m above Ordnance Datum (OD) to 14m above OD should sea levels rise faster than predicted.</p> <p>Our assessments of coastal erosion due to climate change, as well as natural coastal processes leading to a change in the local coastline, have demonstrated that the site will be adequately protected.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and Section 5.2 of Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p>	
Coastal Processes	Concern about the impact on coastal processes and erosion resulting from the	We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is part of a changing coastline and our assessments have investigated the potential impact of the construction of the proposed power station. Whilst the jetty (proposed previously but removed from our proposals at Stage 2) would have caused	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	construction of the development.	<p>impacts on coastal processes and erosion, the construction of the remaining marine infrastructure (beach landing facility, coastal defences intake and outfall works and fish recovery and return outfalls) are not predicted to have a significant or permanent effect on coastal processes locally or further afield within the Greater Sizewell bay.</p> <p>The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised scour will occur at the piles but this is not significant. Construction of the offshore structures will not have any effect on coastal processes, nor will construction of the coastal defences (much of which will be above mean high water spring tidal limits).</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2).</p>	
Coastal Processes	Comments and concerns about the interaction of the proposed	We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is part of a changing coastline and our assessments have investigated the potential impact of the proposed power station. We have also had to assess the impacts of a potentially changing shoreline on the safety of the power station. We have a	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	development with coastal erosion.	<p>long history of coastal studies in this area as part of the ongoing shoreline management group of the adjacent power station (Sizewell B) and have a good understanding of the local system.</p> <p>Using our own studies and the opinions of independent experts our assessments show that the construction and operation of the proposed power station will not have a significant impact on coastal process to the north or south of the site. The coastal defences have been designed to allow for erosion, with sediment lost from the soft coastal defence being replaced. The presence of the hard (rock armour) sea defence will serve to restrict erosion at the north of the site some way towards Minsmere.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Marine Ecology	Concern about the impact of the development on the marine environment and ecology.	<p>Sizewell C will be ‘direct-cooled’ which means that it will abstract about 132 cubic metres per second from Sizewell Bay before returning it back to the same location at a warmer temperature (+11°C) having been used to cool the power station steam condensers.</p> <p>Our assessments have been made in-line with best practice issued by the Environment Agency and show that the ‘thermal plume’ will</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>not adversely affect the marine ecology. To abstract and return the cooling water, 4 large intake head structures and 2 large outfall head structures need to be placed on the seabed. Construction would require the area of each head to be dredged prior to placement of the heads themselves and connection to the tunnels that run back to shore 10s of metres below the seabed.</p> <p>Our assessments have shown that the dredging and installation of the heads will create some minor suspension of sediment (from dredging), loss of an insignificant amount of seabed where the heads are placed and some short-term, insignificant increases in underwater noise from piling.</p> <p>When operating, the cooling water infrastructure will draw in fish and other marine organisms as there is no available means to prevent this. However, mitigation in the form of a special intake head design and a Fish Recovery and Return System will significantly reduce the number of fish captured and return those that are to sea (respectively).</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapters 21 (Marine Water Quality and Sediments) and 22 (Marine Ecology and Fisheries) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Climate Change			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Climate Change	<p>Comments and concerns about the increase in carbon emissions because of the proposals.</p>	<p>It is well understood that both concrete production and steel manufacture make up the vast majority of carbon emissions as a result of the high amount of energy required for their production. These areas, together with fuel fabrication, are by far the highest throughout the entire life-cycle analysis which also includes operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>Sizewell C will be the same design as Hinkley Point C. From a full lifecycle perspective, the greenhouse gas emissions associated with 1 kWh of electricity generated from Hinkley Point C are calculated to be 4.75 g CO₂e/kWh.</p> <p>The CO₂ emissions from Hinkley Point C are small when compared with the emissions of CO₂ from a typical UK coal plant of around 900 g/kWh, based upon the operational stage alone. Typical emissions from a gas-fired CCGT plant are around 490 g/kWh. They are also comparable with offshore wind, which is around 5g CO₂e/kWh.</p> <p>EDF recognise the concerns held regarding the impact on the environment during construction. The EIA Regulations 2017 require that the Environmental Statement details the nature and quantity of the construction materials and natural resources (including water, land, soil and biodiversity) used.</p>	Y

Theme: Climate Change			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The descriptions of development for the main development site and the associated development sites provide details of materials types and quantities required during construction.</p> <p>Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of construction-related impacts arising from the use, including the effects arising from climate change.</p>	

Theme: Soils and agriculture			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Climate Change	Concerns about the pressure and impact on agricultural land from the development.	<p>Chapter 17 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of potential effects of the main development site on soils and agriculture.</p> <p>Construction on the main development site would use approximately 213.9ha of agricultural land. However, following construction, approximately 205.4ha of this land would be reinstated in accordance with the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.2) as pasture, arable farmland, woodland or acid grassland and heath. In addition, existing soil resource would be retained on site throughout the</p>	Y

Theme: Soils and agriculture			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>construction period and re-used during landscape restoration, further details are set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan, Volume 2, Appendix 17C (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Therefore, whilst the temporary loss of best and most versatile agricultural land within the site boundary is considered to be significant, no permanent significant adverse effects due to the loss of agricultural land have been identified</p>	

c. Temporary Developments

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Restoration	Comments supporting the need for temporary developments and emphasising the importance of restoring the site	The DCO will include requirements that relate to the works necessary to restore the site following construction of Sizewell C and any decommissioning works at the appropriate time. The developer will be legally required to submit further details to the local planning authority for their approval and thereafter comply with the approved details.	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	after the temporary developments.		

Theme: Site Suitability			
	Summary of Comments		
Site Suitability	The proposed temporary developments should be centrally located and as close as possible to the main site.	<p>The temporary elements of the associated development proposed as part of the DCO application have been located where most appropriate to mitigate the impacts of construction of Sizewell C nuclear power station.</p> <p>Please refer to the Site Selection Report appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.</p>	Y
Environmental Impact	Criteria for the temporary developments, that the proposals should have the least impact	The possible locations of the temporary developments at Stage 1 were generally on areas of intensively farmed agricultural land of relatively little value for wildlife as well as being relatively remote from most residential areas.	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
	Summary of Comments		
	on the environment and wildlife.	Environmental considerations were one of the considerations in determining the final locations chosen. Within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2) and the Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 8.11), mitigation measures are proposed. The masterplans (Book 2) also define landscape planting and ecological mitigation measures.	
Landscape & Visual Impact	Suggestions that the design of the temporary developments should minimise their visual impact.	<p>The temporary developments were subject to further design and the development of landscape proposals to ensure their landscape effects were minimised. Landscape proposals vary from site to site but typically include surface water swales and ponds, bunds at site margins and landscape planting to provide further screening.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 6 (Landscape and Visual) of Volumes 3, 4, 8 and 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4-6.10).</p>	Y
Further Information	Requests for more information about the proposed temporary developments, including how long they will be in use for.	<p>The temporary elements of the associated development proposed as part of the DCO application are required to support and mitigate the impacts of construction of the Sizewell C nuclear power station.</p> <p>At Stage 1 SZC Co. confirmed that once the site has been cleared, construction of Sizewell C would take approximately seven to nine years. It was explained that as the construction</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
	Summary of Comments		
		<p>schedule is further defined more detail can be given regarding when each temporary development will be required and how long it will be used for. Updates were provided at subsequent stages of consultation.</p> <p>Full details in this regard in connection with the DCO application are contained in Chapter 2 of Volumes 3, 4, 8 and 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4-6.10).</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

d. Visitor Centre

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the environment of Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals.	Further to consultation feedback and design evolution, SZC Co. is no longer proposing a Visitor Centre east of Lover’s Lane.	Y
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative environmental impact of Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals.	Further to consultation feedback and design evolution, SZC Co. is no longer proposing a Visitor Centre at the eastern end of Sizewell Gap road and close to Sizewell Beach.	Y
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the environment of Option 3 of the visitor centre proposals.	Further to consultation feedback and design evolution, SZC Co. is no longer proposing a Visitor Centre at Goose Hill.	Y

e. Accommodation Proposals

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Accommodation Strategy	Challenging the figures and assessment made for worker accommodation as being optimistic, such as estimates for how many workers will be local and the distance workers are expected to travel.	<p>Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) sets out the Sizewell C Project’s assumptions regarding the overall number of workers, local recruitment and the accommodation workers are likely to use. This is based on experience from other projects including Sizewell B and Hinkley Point C, and feedback from major contractors. The forecast numbers have been updated since Stage 1.</p> <p>This potential distribution of non-home-based workers across the area has been used to identify areas of sensitivity and to develop an indication of how and where the mitigation plans within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) might be implemented.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Traffic Flow	Support for the option of an accommodation	The DCO includes an accommodation campus adjacent to the site entrance to maximise the number of workers who do not need to use local roads. The impacts of the campus, as part of	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	campus next to the site entrance due to their being a need for fewer road journeys to be made as a result of its location.	the whole Sizewell C Project, are set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2).	
Landscape and Visual	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap will have a negative impact on the environment, particularly as it is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	<p>SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation and the final proposals comprise a single, on-site accommodation campus, along with a caravan site on LEEIE. This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of workers using existing local accommodation with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. has considered the alternatives to a single, on-site accommodation campus. It has concluded that an off-site campus (either as an alternative, or an addition to a smaller, on-site accommodation campus i.e. a split campus model) would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys, and wider worker management.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Providing a single, on-site accommodation campus would also help mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details on the approach to accommodation is contained in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10). Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2) sets out the evolution of the Sizewell C Project through consultation and engagement, including consideration of alternative strategies and locations for workforce accommodation.</p>	
Site Legacy	Support for the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston due to the legacy value of permanent housing.	<p>The approach to accommodating construction workers is described in the Site Selection Report (Doc Ref. 8.8).</p> <p>Leiston East campus is approximately 41 hectares in size and the main part of the site is positioned to the west of the existing rail head and dismantled railway. The northern boundary of the site lies to the rear of the Sizewell Sports and Social Club that is owned by SZC Co.. The north-western boundary abuts a school sports field with residential properties beyond the school. Within the southern end of the plot there are existing high voltage overhead power lines along with a pair of pylon</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>structures. The site is generally flat with a slight slope from west to east, and is separated by a public bridleway.</p> <p>Option 3 is partially located within the AONB and close to European designated sites, including the nearby Sandlings SPA generating the potential for direct and indirect disturbance to the habitat of protected bird species (Woodlark and Nightjar).</p> <p>An accommodation campus located away from the main development site would generate a need for shuttle bus movements along Lover’s Lane and Abbey Road (B1122) to move workers to and from the site.</p> <p>In July 2017, SCC published a “Sizewell C Accommodation Campus Study” (dated 21.6.17). This was produced by Boyer / Cannon and their purpose was to evaluate the preferred accommodation campus proposed by SZC Co. at Stage 2 and assess whether there are “any sites that might be genuine alternatives that would be better placed to accommodate the campus development”. SZC Co. reviewed this report, though considered that it did not identify any better sites that have not yet been considered by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Between Stage 2 and Stage 3 and with the benefits of feedback from the consultation; Option 1b(ii) was chosen, which locates the built form of the accommodation campus on</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the east side of Eastbridge Road. The rationale for this is that it increases the distance between Leiston Abbey and the development site, reduces landscape impacts and thereby reducing potential noise and visual impacts. Removal of the sports pitches off-site also reduces noise and lighting impacts on the Abbey complex.</p> <p>The strategy to provide a single temporary campus to the east of Eastbridge Road remained unchanged at Stage 4 consultation and in this DCO submission.</p>	
Traffic Flow	Support for the option of an accommodation campus at east of Leiston due to the less impact it will have on traffic in the area, particularly on Leiston town centre.	Option 3, Leiston East campus, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was discounted after Stage 1 consultation.	Y
Crime	Criteria for the worker accommodation. That on-site security	Further to the Stage 1 consultation, and throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has sought to ensure that security is optimised.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and policing should be provided in order to prevent anti-social behaviour.	<p>As part of the DCO application, a number of measures are proposed to be implemented to encourage good worker behaviour. All workers will be vetted and drug and alcohol tested ahead of commencing work on the Sizewell C Project and will be required to sign a Code of Conduct. If breached, this may result in dismissal from the Sizewell C Project. The Code of Conduct will be reinforced through ongoing training and workers will be subject to on-going random and for cause drug and alcohol testing throughout their time on the Sizewell C Project. On-site security will be also be provided.</p> <p>Full details can be found in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p>	

Theme: Environmental – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Visual and Landscape	Concerns about the negative impact of the campus on the environment,	The campus location chosen subsequent to Stage 1 is adjacent to Eastbridge Road and is a location which enables the workers to be accommodated on-site but minimises the impacts of the AONB in a number of ways. The accommodation campus would be temporary and removed	Y

Theme: Environmental – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	especially due to visual impact.	<p>during the commissioning and land restoration phase of the main site construction phasing. The majority of hedgerows and trees around the perimeter of the site would be retained and the hedgerows adjacent to the existing bridleway, access road to Upper Abbey Farm and Eastbridge Road would all be retained, providing screening on views from Eastbridge Road.</p> <p>The height of the accommodation blocks in the campus has been limited to four storeys with a zone of three storey blocks closest to Eastbridge Road to minimise the massing immediately adjacent to the road.</p> <p>The lighting of the campus would be in accordance with the Lighting Management Plan, Appendix 2B of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2), which defines methods to be used to minimise light spill.</p>	
Site Restoration	Concern that the sites used for worker accommodation will not be restored, and request for reassurance that this will take place.	<p>The accommodation campus is part of the temporary construction area which will be removed and the land reinstated following the completion of development.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref 8.10).</p>	N

f. Park and Ride - Principle

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Strategy	Comments stating that park and ride schemes are essential to transport workers to the main site and reduce the number of road journeys overall.	<p>SZC Co. welcome that the importance of park and ride schemes has been identified.</p> <p>The DCO proposals include the northern and southern park and ride sites. The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2) are based on them forming an important part of the DCO proposals and set out the transport impacts. Volumes 3 and 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4-6.5) set out the environmental impacts of the park and ride proposals across all topics.</p>	Y
Park & Ride Strategy	Concern about the use of the park and ride schemes by workers e.g. how they will be enforced, or that not enough workers will use them	<p>SZC Co. has considered how to ensure that the park and ride schemes are used effectively.</p> <p>Workers living west of the A12, south of the River Deben or north of the River Blyth will be required to use park and ride. They would not have a permit to park at the construction site. Management processes would be in place to prevent fly parking close to the site. This forms part of the Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8).</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Further Information	Suggestions that further assessment should be taken into the impacts of the park and ride proposals in general.	The impacts of the park and ride, as part of the overall transport strategy, are fully considered in the traffic modelling and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement Volumes 3 (Doc Ref. 6.4) and 4 (Doc Ref. 6.5).	Y
Further Information	Requests for more information about the park and ride proposals, and comments that the plans are not yet sufficiently detailed, and rules do not appear to be ‘clear and binding’.	<p>Following the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. developed the designs of the park and ride facilities and consulted further on the evolving designs.</p> <p>The proposals have been informed by operational requirements, responses to consultation and as a result of further environmental assessments.</p> <p>Further detail was presented during the Stage 2 consultation, as the needs of the facilities were further understood, the consultation responses were taken into account and as further environmental assessment work was complete.</p> <p>Full details of the proposed park and ride facilities can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p>	Y
Park & Ride Strategy	Positive comments about the proposed postal consolidation	These comments are noted. A postal consolidation facility continues to be part of the proposals at the southern park and ride site.	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	facility as part of the southern park and ride, as it would reduce the number of vehicles driving to the site.	Full details of the proposed park and ride facilities can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Chapter 2 (Description of Development) of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5).	
Park & Ride Strategy	Challenges to the Environmental Statement estimates and assumptions made about the proposed park and ride locations, including how they will be used, operational capacity assumptions and predicted impacts.	<p>Alternative park and ride locations were assessed and sites consulted upon at Stages 1 and 2 before the preferred sites at Darsham and Wickham Market were identified at Stage 3.</p> <p>All workers living south of River Deben, north of River Blyth or west of A12 will be required to use the park and rides. These workers would not be permitted to park at the construction site. This is set out in the Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8).</p> <p>The sites have been sized to accommodate the predicted demand should the workforce rise to 7,900 workers.</p> <p>The park and ride sites form part of the transport proposals considered in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Park & Ride Strategy	Challenging the need for the proposed park and rides if the accommodation proposals were improved.	<p>The transport modelling shows that two park and ride developments are needed - one for construction workers approaching Sizewell from the north on the A12, and the other for those approaching from the south on the A12.</p> <p>Further to the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. continued to review the accommodation and park and ride proposals to ensure an appropriate strategy is proposed to manage traffic flows.</p> <p>Full details of the proposed park and ride facilities can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y

g. Northern Park and Ride

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	Concern about issues relating to access to the location for Option 1	Option 1, Yoxford Road, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after the Stage 2 consultation.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	of the northern park and ride proposals, for example that it is too close to the main development site.		
Traffic Flow / Safety	Concern about the inadequacy of surrounding roads around Option 1 of the northern park and ride proposals, and consequential safety issues.	Option 1, Yoxford Road, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after the Stage 2 consultation.	Y
Site Location	Concern about the location for Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals being located too far from the main site, and because of access issues and the inadequacy of surrounding roads,	Option 2, Darsham, is the site included in the DCO. The access was modified at Stage 3 consultation to be a roundabout just north of Willow Marsh Lane. A Stage 1 road safety audit has been undertaken. The impact on the A12 is assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	causing safety issues.		
Site Location	Positive comments about access and the location of Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals, and how its location at Darsham Station encourages rail interchange.	Option 2, Darsham, is the site included in the DCO. One of the reasons for selecting the site was that it could encourage some workers to travel by train to the site given its proximity to Darsham station. The transport aspects of the northern park and ride are set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport), Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).	Y
Site Legacy	Positive comments about Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals in terms of legacy value and safety benefits.	Option 2 was selected as it was found to avoid the need for additional car movements on the B1122, and that it could operate safely in all of the traffic movement scenarios considered. More information regarding the site legacy of Option 2 can be found in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4).	Y
Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals having less of an impact on traffic and	Option 2, Darsham, is the site included in the DCO. One of the reasons for selecting the site was that it could encourage some workers to travel by train to the site and its proximity to the A12, minimising traffic on local roads. It is considered in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	transport than other options and benefitting commuters.		
Mitigation	Support for Option 3 of the northern park and ride options as long as, for example, improvements are made to the A12/A144 junction to mitigate impacts.	Option 3, at the A12/A144 junction, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation. Improvements for the A12/A144 junction are included in the DCO.	N
Site Location	Positive comments about access and the location of Option 3 of the northern park and ride proposals, for example because it is close to the main site and close to amenities, which workers would prefer.	Option 3, at the A12/A144 junction, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	Concern about the location of Option 3 of the northern park and ride proposals as being too far from the main site, having access issues and the inadequacy of surrounding roads and subsequent safety issues.	Option 3, at the A12/A144 junction, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	Y

h. Southern Park & Ride

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Traffic Flow / Safety	Concerns about the negative community impact from combining the lorry park and park and ride locations, such as the increase in	The proposed southern park and ride site still includes a lorry holding area. The transport effects of the proposal are fully assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport), Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement in (Doc Ref 6.3). Other environmental aspects of the southern	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	traffic, safety concerns and by requiring more construction work, creating disturbance.	park and ride site are considered in Volume 4, of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).	
Site Location / Suitability	Concern about the location of Option 1 for the southern park and ride proposals, for example that it is too far from the site and that adjacent roads are not adequate, with subsequent safety impacts.	<p>Option 1 at Wickham Market forms part of the DCO proposals. It is the nearest to the construction site of any park and ride site considered.</p> <p>It is adjacent to the A12, part of the primary route network, giving good access for the majority of traffic.</p> <p>Other traffic uses the B1078, where impacts identified in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) between Border Cot Lane and the River Deben bridge due to on-street parking would be mitigated through s106 funding, working with the Parish Council.</p>	Y
Site Location / Suitability	Positive comments about the location of Option 1 of the southern park and ride proposals for its good access and being close to	<p>Option 1 at Wickham Market forms part of the DCO proposals. It is the nearest to the construction site of any park and ride site considered.</p> <p>It is adjacent to the A12, part of the primary route network, giving good access for the majority of traffic. SZC Co. do not anticipate many vehicles travelling through Wickham Market</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	amenities, the main site and the train station.	<p>to use amenities on their way to the site, or many workers travelling by train to the station at Campsea Ashe, though this would be possible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the traffic impacts in the area and proposes some road marking and signage improvements on the A12.</p>	
Community Impact	Concern about the negative impact on the local community of Option 1 of the southern park and ride proposals due to negative impacts on traffic and congestion.	<p>Option 1 at Wickham Market forms part of the DCO proposals. It is adjacent to the A12, part of the primary route network, giving good access for the majority of traffic and minimising congestion.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the traffic impacts in the area and proposes some road marking and signage improvements on the A12.</p>	Y
Site Suitability	Other considerations should be taken into account with the proposals for Option 1 of the southern park and ride locations, such as the location of a	<p>Further to the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. undertook initial studies to increase its understanding of the environmental effects of developing a park and ride facility on the Wickham Market site. This included considering impacts on residential and other receptors.</p> <p>The Stage 1 consultation preferred site at Wickham Market was subject to further studies to increase understanding of</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	medium pressure gas pipeline.	<p>the implications and constraints of developing a park and ride facility in this location.</p> <p>The findings of archaeological investigations resulted in a new proposed site boundary being identified which encompasses land to the north-east of the site. SZC Co. undertook further surveys throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project to understand the location of utilities on site and evolve the designs as necessary.</p> <p>Full details can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Chapter 2 Description of the southern park and ride of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5) for full details.</p>	
Site Location / Suitability	Concern about the location of Option 2 for the southern park and ride proposals, for example that it is too far from the site and that adjacent roads are not adequate.	Option 2 at Woodbridge does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Concern about the negative impact on the local community of Option 2 of the southern park and ride proposals, for example due to negative impacts on traffic and congestion.	Option 2 at Woodbridge does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	Y
Environmental Impact	Concern about the negative environmental impact of Option 2 of the southern park and ride proposals.	Option 2 at Woodbridge does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	Y
Traffic Flow	Concern about the location of Option 3 of the southern park and ride proposals as being too far from the main site and the adjacent roads being	Option 3 at Potash Corner does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	inadequate to handle the traffic.		
Community Impact / Traffic Flow	Concern about the negative impact on the local community of Option 3 of the southern park and ride proposals, for example due to the negative impacts on traffic and transport.	Option 3 at Potash Corner does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	Y
Environmental Impact	Concern about the negative environmental impact of Option 3 of the southern park and ride proposals.	Option 3 at Potash Corner does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	Y
Environmental Impact	Suggestions and other considerations for Option 3 of the southern park and ride proposals, such as the avoidance of a	Further to the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. continued to undertake further surveys to understand the location of utilities on site and evolve the designs for the southern park and ride as necessary. SZC Co. have continued to undertake further surveys throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project to	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	high-pressure gas main.	understand the location of utilities on site and evolve the designs as necessary. Full details can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Chapter 2 (Description of the southern park and ride) of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5) for full details.	

i. Transport: Lorry Park Site Options

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Suitability	Positive comments about the location of Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park, for example that they would be the least intrusive and are already in use as a lorry park.	The Orwell Lorry park sites are no longer available to SZC Co. so do not form part of the DCO proposals.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Access / Impact on Businesses	Concern about the impact of the location and access for Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park, especially on existing businesses using the proposed location.	<p>Further to the Stage 1 consultation, Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park were not taken forward.</p> <p>This was because outline planning permission (LPA Ref. DC/17/4257/OUT) was granted in June 2018 for employment development of both the Orwell West and East sites. The land was determined to no longer be available to SZC Co. to fit the anticipated Sizewell C Project timescales.</p>	Y
Legacy Value	Positive comments about Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park as having less of an impact on the local community than other options, for example by having positive legacy value and reducing negative impact in general.	Options 1 and 2 were located close to an existing employment area. However these options are not being taken forward as part of the DCO as they are no longer available to EDF.	N
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the environmental impact of Options 1	Option 2 was recognised to be an environmentally constrained site as it was located in the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB. Option 2 has not been taken forward as part of the DCO.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park.		
Traffic Flow / Impact on Businesses	Concern about the impact of Option 3, Seven Hills Junction on existing businesses using the proposed location and on traffic and congestion especially at the A12/A14 junction	<p>The impact on the Seven Hills junction is assessed and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>There is currently moderate peak period queueing on the A12 north and A1156 approaches to the Seven Hills junction and longer queues on the A14 westbound exit slip road. The junction will become partially signal controlled, with additional traffic lanes, as part of the Adastral Park committed development, as reported in Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) Chapter 9. This would lead to a minor improvement in junction performance.</p> <p>Sizewell C would increase traffic volumes at the junction by about 2% in both the Early Years and Peak Construction scenarios. This increase is small but could lead to some additional queuing during peak periods.</p>	N
Alternative Options	Suggestions for alternative locations for the proposed lorry park, such as west of Orwell Bridge, at Leiston	<p>West of the Orwell Bridge, no preferable Freight Management Facility site to that shown in the DCO, to the east of the A14/A12 Seven Hills junction, was identified.</p> <p>The Orwell Lorry Park site alongside the A14 is unfortunately not now available to SZC Co..</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	Airfield or at other brownfield sites along the A14.	The site at Leiston Airfield has very poor highway access from Harrow Lane, Abbey Lane and the B1122 that makes it unsuitable for use as a Freight Management Facility.	
Decision Making	Criteria for the location of the lorry park, that it should avoid greenfield land.	<p>At the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. identified a potential requirement for lorry parking remote from the main development site to support the management of road deliveries to the site.</p> <p>A number of potential site options for a freight management facility were identified and included in the Stage 1 consultation. At stage 2 consultation EDF considered that heavy goods vehicle (HGV) deliveries and movements to and from the main development site can be effectively managed without the requirement for an external off-site freight management facility or lorry park. However, the consideration of both a rail-led strategy and road-led strategy at Stage 3 consultation identified the need for a Freight Management Facility. Ultimately, SZC Co. considered that whilst efforts were made to develop alternative strategies for deliveries and movements to and from the main development site and provisions for these have been made in the DCO, an external off-site freight management facility or lorry park would still be required to accommodate for and manage HGV movements.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The Site Selection Report , appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.	
Decision Making	Criteria for the location of the lorry park, that it should avoid specific given locations or roads.	<p>The Freight Management Facility needs to have good access to the A14 and A12 and be large enough to accommodate the expected demand.</p> <p>The Orwell Park sites proposed at Stage 1, the site near Seven Hills proposed at Stages 1 and 3 and a site at Innocence Farm proposed in Stage 3 all met these requirements.</p> <p>The site just east of Seven Hills, proposed at Stage 3, forms part of the DCO proposals and is considered in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Site Suggestion	Criteria for the proposed lorry park, that it should include amenities for drivers.	<p>SZC Co. confirms that the proposed Freight Management Facility near Seven Hills will include some amenities for drivers.</p> <p>Further information is set out in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Concern that a lorry park would have negative environmental impacts.	<p>The options considered were selected as they were not in close proximity to environmental designated sites. The sites proposed at Stage 1 all met this requirement.</p> <p>Further information regarding the environmental impact of the proposed options is set out in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Concern about the negative community impact of a lorry park, including comments it may not suit the area.	<p>Further to the Stage 1 consultation, proposals for a lorry park were not taken forward into Stage 2 as it was considered that freight management could be undertaken through the use of automated monitoring and communications systems.</p> <p>A Freight Management Facility was reintroduced at Stage 3 when two alternative sites were proposed. One of them, near to the Seven Hills junction, now forms part of the DCO proposals. The impacts of the FMF, across the full range of topics, are considered and reported in the Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

j. Transport: Junction and Road Improvement Options

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Four-Village Bypass	Support for a four-village bypass on the A12 to include other villages around Farnham.	<p>Further to the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. continued to assess the traffic effect on the A12 through the four villages of Marlesford, Little Glemham, Stratford St Andrew and Farnham. This was due to the expected increase in total traffic on the A12 of 3-6%.</p> <p>The assessment is contained in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement. This shows that there are no technical highway capacity issues with the A12 in three of the villages (Marlesford, Little Glemham and Stratford St Andrew), but there may be a capacity issue at Farnham bend due to the narrowing of the road.</p> <p>As such, SZC Co. considered that the impact of Sizewell C traffic would not be sufficient to justify a bypass of all four villages, but that it remained necessary to give further detailed consideration to more local issues and, particularly, issues arising from the bend in Farnham.</p> <p>It would be inappropriate for SZC Co. to include a Four Village Bypass in its application for development consent if that</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		bypass was not necessary to mitigate the effects of the nuclear power station development. Full details are contained in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement and in the Site Selection Report appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the environmental impact from Option 1, the Farnham bypass.	<p>It was considered that the most appropriate route for a bypass of Farnham would be to the north of the village.</p> <p>It was recognised that there would be some environmental impacts (in particular landscape, ecology and heritage – detailed further in Volume 5, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement) associated with constructing a short new stretch of road through an area of existing farmland and open countryside. However, it was considered that these impacts could be reduced through sensitive design and landscaping.</p> <p>Full details are contained in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y
Community Impact	Concerns about Option 2, the widening of Farnham bend, as	The widening of the Farnham bend would require the demolition of a Grade II listed building, and many respondents	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	being negative for the local community	<p>at Stage 1 felt it would have negative impact on the village of Farnham.</p> <p>However, given each of the proposals to mitigate the increase of traffic on the A12 raised differing environmental concerns, additional detail was included to inform further feedback on the issues at Stage 2.</p> <p>Whilst there would be a negative impact from the demolition of the listed building, the widening of the bend would be a medium-scale proposal to improve safety on the bend and so further feedback was sought at Stage 2.</p> <p>The feedback from Stage 2 was that the widening of the Farnham bend would be insufficient to address increased traffic volumes and safety concerns through the village, and there were still concerns over the demolition of the heritage building and housing near the bend. As such, the proposals for the bend were not progressed to Stages 3 or 4, with proposals for a two-village bypass being presented for feedback.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Full details are contained in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the environment of Option 2, the widening of Farnham bend.	<p>A more limited intervention to improve Farnham bend was considered to be to widen and smooth the existing bend to reduce the potential for traffic congestion at peak times, and remove safety concerns associated with the narrowness of the bend.</p> <p>However, to implement this option would require the acquisition and demolition of a small number of properties, including a Grade II Listed Building. Whilst it could be effective in addressing the current safety concerns associated with the bend, it would not have the effect of removing traffic from the village of Farnham.</p> <p>Full details are contained in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y
Traffic Flow	Concerns that the widening of Farnham bend (Option 2) will be insufficient in improving congestion,	The Farnham bend widening (Option 2) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application. Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and within	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and will only provide a short-term solution	Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Short-term Solution	Concerns that HGV traffic controls at Farnham (Option 3) will be insufficient in improving congestion, and will only provide a short-term solution	The HGV controls at Farnham (Option 3) were discounted after Stage 2 consultation and do not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application. Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and within Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Traffic Flow	Concerns that HGV traffic controls at Farnham (Option 3) would exacerbate existing congestion problems on the A12	The HGV controls at Farnham (Option 3) were discounted after Stage 2 consultation and do not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application. Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and within Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y

k. Transport: Rail Improvements

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Rail Strategy	Criteria for the rail transport proposals, that the line should be extended into the main development site.	<p>At the Stage 1 Consultation, SZC Co. considered that rail could play an important role in the delivery of freight during construction, offering an alternative non-road option to marine. This remained SZC Co.’s view at Stage 2 Consultation.</p> <p>Stage 1 consultation included a number of rail delivery options and these were refined for the Stage 2 consultation to two preferred options which were a new rail terminal east of Eastland Industrial Estate or the green route rail extension option for extending the Saxmundham- Leiston branch line into the construction site on a temporary basis. The green rail route was further advanced through Stages 3 and 4.</p> <p>SZC Co. have worked closely with Network Rail throughout the Sizewell C Project, including on timetable studies and infrastructure design, and as described in Network Rail’s stage 3 and 4 consultation responses, will continue to work closely to deliver the changes required to deliver the integrated transport strategy.</p> <p>Utilising the green rail route into the main site will significantly reduce the numbers of HGVs on the local roads and is the</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>most efficient way of getting materials to the main construction site.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Site Legacy	<p>Concern that the temporary rail extension option will negatively impact the local community and has no legacy value.</p>	<p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>As part of the integrated transport strategy, rail transport would be used to move construction material to build Sizewell C. The Integrated Strategy, including the green rail route, allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the Integrated Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability. • Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. 	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Once the construction of Sizewell C is complete, the green rail route would be removed and the land restored. Please refer Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10) for further details.</p>	
Environmental Impact	Concern that the temporary rail extension option will negatively impact the environment.	<p>A range of different environmental considerations are relevant to the rail options presented at the Stage 1 Consultation. The principal considerations relate to terrestrial ecology; noise and vibration; landscape and visual; and historic environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>Following Stage 1, SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route options should not be considered further and</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p> <p>The green rail route was taken forward to the Stage 3 and Stage 4 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc. Ref. 6.10) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the environment of the red rail route option.	<p>A wide range of views were expressed in relation to the three rail extension route options, with no clear preference emerging. Those favouring the red rail route tended to consider that because it was the shortest of the routes, it would have the least effect on surrounding countryside. However, some raised concerns over the potential for noise and vibration impacts arising from freight trains passing through Leiston.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route options should not be considered further and the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p> <p>The green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Comments, suggestions and concerns about the proposed passing loop at Wickham Market station and its impact on local communities.	The passing loop was not included in Stage 4 consultation as it is not needed in the integrated freight strategy. It does not form part of the DCO proposals.	N
Level-Crossings	Comments suggesting that road crossings should be considered in the rail transport proposals.	There has been extensive liaison with Network Rail and Suffolk County Council as part of the transport work. All road crossings have been considered in developing the rail proposals. New, temporary level crossings are proposed where the Green Rail Route crosses Buckleswood Road and B1122 Abbey Road in Leiston. The impact of these crossings on local traffic conditions are set out in the Transport	N

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement Chapter 10 in Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Passenger Services	Concerns that the rail proposals will negatively impact existing passenger services.	The rail proposals have been developed on the basis that they should not impact on existing passenger services. The integrated freight strategy does this without the need to increase line speed or upgrade/close any level crossings. Further information is in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N

Table A.2: Summary of Section 47 Responses and Consideration by Topic²

a. Overall Proposals

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Principle of nuclear energy	Support for nuclear energy but with certain criticisms/suggestions	The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.	N

² Note: Comments in bold and shaded grey within Table 9.4 were also raised by Section 47 consultees. They have not been repeated here to avoid unnecessary repetition.



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK’s energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK’s binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Principle of nuclear energy	Support for and positive comments about nuclear energy, including its reliability as an alternative to fossil fuels.	<p>Support welcomed. The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK’s energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK’s binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Site suggestions	Support for the temporary development proposals with concerns expressed regarding general disruption to Leiston and other surrounding areas, or suggestions that support is dependent on certain conditions such as the protection of habitats and heritage sites, the	<p>To construct Sizewell C, SZC Co. would also need to use additional land for off-site associated developments to support the movement of materials and staff to and from the main development site.</p> <p>The scale and distribution of these facilities have been informed by SZC Co.'s socio-economic and transport strategies.</p> <p>It is likely that the construction of the off-site associated developments would be undertaken early in the</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	landscape being fully restored post-construction or local infrastructure being improved.	<p>construction phase. Once these facilities are no longer required to support the construction of Sizewell C the facilities would be removed and the land restored (with the exception of the highway improvements). SZC Co. are in the process selecting suitable sites and consultation has informed these decisions.</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.</p>	

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Health concerns	Concerns over the health impacts of the site, including concerns that cancer could be caused by proximity to nuclear developments. Some also suggest there should be more assessments on	<p>The scope of local community health issues and opportunities to be explored and addressed was set out during Stage 2.</p> <p>Activities with the potential to impact upon local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines of the Environmental Statement, including radiological, and</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the health impact of the proposals.	<p>these have further informed the scope and focus of the health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the Sizewell C Project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Safety	Comments about the potential interaction of the proposed nuclear site with existing Sizewell A and B sites, and questions surrounding risks and potential synergetic planning.	The interactions between adjacent plants are required to be considered in the design and hazards analysis for both the new and the existing plants, and have been assessed as part of the construction permitting process and Nuclear Site Licence by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR).	N
Safety	Comments about the lack of safety concerns about the development of a nuclear site at Sizewell.	<p>The design of the plant has been subject to rigorous review by the regulator Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) as part of the Generic Design Assessment approved on 13 December 2013.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project meets the safety standards for nuclear plant in the UK. Any site-specific aspects will be</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>considered by the ONR Nuclear Site Licencing process for the Sizewell C site.</p> <p>Further details are contained within the Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Economic benefits	Support and requests for use of local businesses and suppliers to provide benefits for the local community.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project and notes the request for local supply chain benefits.</p> <p>There are a number of local and regional firms that may benefit from contracting opportunities on the Sizewell C Project and smaller packages and non-construction packages (such as professional and design services, business administration, hospitality, catering, security and cleaning), would have a much stronger local and regional element.</p> <p>Stage 2 committed to formulation of a supply chain strategy to form part of the Sizewell C Project's economic strategy, including measures to raise awareness and</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>distribute information to the potential supply chain, for example through ‘meet-the-buyer’ events and opportunities to tender, thereby enabling local firms to take advantage of the opportunities that the Sizewell C Project offers via links to upper tier contractors.</p> <p>The framework for this strategy was already in place at Stage 2, with around 800 businesses across a range of sectors (not just construction) registered with the Sizewell C Project’s supply chain portal (which has been developed in partnership with the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce) at that stage.</p> <p>Since then, SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy and Supply Chain Strategy that set out measures to support local people and businesses into work on the Sizewell C Project. These are appended to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	
Worker Welfare	Comments, concerns and suggestions about workers, including their	A full review of demographic benchmarks including (but not limited to) family status, nationality and religion has been undertaken to identify the likely demand for different public services and community facilities arising from the	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	safety, experiences and preferences	<p>construction workforce and this is set out in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics), Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). For example, this has allowed SZC Co. to broadly estimate the likely demand for types of community, healthcare, education (for workers with children), social service and sports and leisure facilities of people of different age and sex.</p> <p>A Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) has been developed to accompany the application for development consent in consultation with local authorities, emergency services and public services, to outline the approach to community safety in the area.</p>	
Economic Benefits	Opposition to the proposed community mitigation, that community benefits are not needed including comments that unemployment in the area is already low.	<p>SZC Co. recognises that the Sizewell C Project has the potential to lead to effects on people, communities, the housing market and public services – alongside benefits including in terms of job creation, skills and business opportunities.</p> <p>As required by National Policy Statement EN-1 and EN-6, SZC Co. has undertaken a socio-economic impact assessment that sets out the likelihood of these adverse effects, and identifies appropriate mitigation where necessary.</p>	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>It is recognised that in East Suffolk unemployment is relatively low but that there are pockets of deprivation particularly in rural areas and Leiston, and that the construction phase will likely run through at least one economic cycle.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Economic Benefits	Comments about benefits of the proposed development to local businesses.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project and notes the request for local supply chain benefits.</p> <p>There are a number of local and regional firms that may benefit from contracting opportunities on the Sizewell C Project and smaller packages and non-construction packages (such as professional and design services, business administration, hospitality, catering, security and cleaning), would have a much stronger local and regional element.</p> <p>Stage 2 committed to formulation of a supply chain strategy to form part of the Sizewell C Project's economic strategy, including measures to raise awareness and</p>	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>distribute information to the potential supply chain, for example through ‘meet-the-buyer’ events and opportunities to tender, thereby enabling local firms to take advantage of the opportunities that the Sizewell C Project offers via links to upper tier contractors.</p> <p>The framework for this strategy was already in place at Stage 2, with around 800 businesses across a range of sectors (not just construction) registered with the Sizewell C Project’s supply chain portal (which has been developed in partnership with the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce) at that stage.</p> <p>Since then, SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy and Supply Chain Strategy that set out measures to support local people and businesses into work on the Sizewell C Project. These are appended to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	
Local Employment	Comments highlighting a preference for hiring local	The construction workforce for the Sizewell C Project will comprise: ‘home-based’ workers who are already residents in the local area or region and would commute to and from	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	or British workers for the project.	<p>the site from their existing home on a daily basis; and ‘non-home-based’ workers who do not currently live in the local area or region and would find accommodation in the area.</p> <p>The number of home-based workers anticipated to work on the Sizewell C Project is calculated based on the number of jobs needed, the specific skills required, and the availability of those skills within commuting distance of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The proportion of home-based workers would vary throughout the construction phase, with the highest proportion of non-home-based workers coming at the mechanical and electrical peak, which coincides with the overall construction phase peak. While the peak of construction will create many roles for home-based workers in civil construction, management and administration and service jobs, over 30% of mechanical and electrical jobs are also estimated to be taken by home-based workers at this point, helping to deliver aspirations of the local authorities for local people to access higher skilled roles.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project will not discriminate in terms of any protected characteristic, nationality, culture or language.</p>	

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Any worker eligible to work on the Sizewell C Project will be given equal opportunity.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3), the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and the Equality Statement (Doc Ref. 5.14).</p>	
Local Services	Concern about the impact on the development on local schools due to the influx of people.	<p>As part of the assessment of impacts of the non-home-based workforce on the capacity of community facilities and public services, a detailed audit has been undertaken of existing and potential future school places, sport and leisure facilities, healthcare, social services and children’s services (see in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>This audit has taken into account the underlying (baseline) take-up of services and current capacity. It has been combined with workforce profile, demographics and distribution to ascertain where potential effects may arise as a result of concentrations of non-home-based workers.</p> <p>This approach has feed into the development of mitigation strategies to minimise any adverse effects where appropriate. The selected measures include provision of</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>recreation sports facilities and occupational health facilities associated with the accommodation campus.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Local Access	Concern about the impact of the development on residents' ability to access their properties.	<p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the transport impacts from the scheme. Mitigation has been proposed where necessary and the scheme designs have retained access to residential properties.</p> <p>For example, at the A12/A144 junction proposals, access to Stone Cottage was modified to suit the new junction layout. This and all other highway scheme designs have been subject to a Stage 1 safety audit that has been submitted to Suffolk County Council and forms part of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	Y
Balance of Benefits	Comments about balancing the benefits of the proposed development with impacts on the local community.	<p>SZC Co.'s objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts, whilst optimising local benefits that directly arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project aims to strike a balance which seeks to optimise the benefits which local facilities, amenities and services could gain from the increased activity generated by</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>all phases of the Sizewell C Project, whilst mitigating any significant adverse effects that might arise from that activity.</p> <p>SZC Co. has worked with the local authorities to develop an appropriate balance to the accommodation strategy, and the construction and enhancement of local community amenities and facilities to meet the construction workforce entertainment, recreation and health needs, supporting the uptake of socio-economic opportunities, while fostering community cohesion and supporting local regeneration objectives.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Site Legacy	Suggestions the proposed development should benefit the community by improving local facilities and infrastructure.	<p>SZC Co.'s objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts, whilst optimising local benefits that directly arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project aims to strike a balance which seeks to optimise the benefits which local facilities, amenities and services could gain from the increased activity generated by all phases of the Sizewell C Project,</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>whilst mitigating any significant adverse effects that might arise from that activity.</p> <p>As part of the assessment of impacts of the non-home-based workforce on the capacity of community facilities and public services, a detailed audit has been undertaken of existing and potential future school places, sport and leisure facilities, healthcare, social services and children’s services, see Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3). Measures include provision of recreation sports facilities and occupational health facilities associated with the accommodation campus.</p> <p>As the Sizewell C Project has evolved, further technical work has been undertaken, as has more work on the community-related aspects of the Sizewell C Project have been undertaken. This includes the effects on community facilities and public services such as health and education, emergency services, community safety, amenity and severance from transport measures, and an assessment of in-combination effects for specific local communities.</p>	

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).	
Energy Supply Benefits	Suggestions the proposed development should benefit the community by providing subsidised energy to residents, or by using the water cooling methods to benefit the community by providing cheap warm water supplies.	<p>As explained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. recognises that there would be intangible residual impacts on local communities as a result of combined environmental effects, both perceived and real. In some instances, these cannot be directly mitigated through physical design measures, and require a more reactive approach.</p> <p>As a result, SZC Co. would offer a Community Fund to help mitigate these effects through schemes, measures, and projects which promote the economic, social, or environmental well-being of those communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>The Community Fund would be secured via the Section 106 Agreement and may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an ongoing programme of small grants to charities, voluntary groups and social enterprises – awarded for projects, measures or initiatives that help to mitigate impacts felt in the community from the construction of the Sizewell C Project. • strategic grants – for example for investment in local facilities or services to address both the positive and 	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>negative impacts on the host and incoming communities.</p> <p>In general, activities receiving grants should aim to improve the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of the communities affected by the development and be relevant to the impacts identified, either by reducing or removing impacts or by helping the community to take advantage of opportunities presented by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Fund will recognise that some communities closer to the main development site such as Theberton, Eastbridge and Leiston are likely to experience more and greater effects across a wider range of social, economic and environmental areas.</p>	
Balance of Benefits	Comments and concerns about the allocation of the benefits of Sizewell C, and the areas that these benefits will (or won't) reach and the disproportionate spread of the impacts.	<p>As explained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. recognises that there would be intangible residual impacts on local communities as a result of combined environmental effects, both perceived and real. In some instances, these cannot be directly mitigated through physical design measures, and require a more reactive approach.</p> <p>As a result, SZC Co. would offer a Community Fund to help mitigate these effects through schemes, measures, and projects which promote the economic, social, or</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>environmental well-being of those communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>The Community Fund would be secured via the Section 106 Agreement and may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an ongoing programme of small grants to charities, voluntary groups and social enterprises – awarded for projects, measures or initiatives that help to mitigate impacts felt in the community from the construction of the Sizewell C Project. • strategic grants – for example for investment in local facilities or services to address both the positive and negative impacts on the host and incoming communities. <p>In general, activities receiving grants should aim to improve the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of the communities affected by the development and be relevant to the impacts identified, either by reducing or removing impacts or by helping the community to take advantage of opportunities presented by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Fund will recognise that some communities closer to the main development site such as Theberton, Eastbridge and Leiston are likely to experience more and greater effects across a wider range of social, economic and environmental areas.</p>	



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Inadequate Benefits	Concerns that the proposals are lacking in adequate benefits to the community.	<p>SZC Co.'s objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts, whilst optimising local benefits that directly arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project aims to strike a balance which seeks to optimise the benefits which local facilities, amenities and services could gain from the increased activity generated by all phases of the Sizewell C Project, whilst mitigating any significant adverse effects that might arise from that activity.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	Y
Working Hours	Concern about the long, 'unsociable' construction hours and the impact on the local community.	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has been committed to minimising construction impacts on the local community.</p> <p>The DCO application is supported by a Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13). This summarises potential impacts on the local community and proposed mitigation measures which seek to address these, as assessed fully elsewhere in the Environmental Statement.</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		This includes noise mitigation measures, full details of which are contained within the Noise and Vibration Chapters of the Environmental Statement , see Chapter 11 of Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3) and Chapter 4 of Volumes 3-9 (Book 6).	
Mitigation	Comments stating that the impacts of construction on the local community will be mitigated, and how SZC Co. plan to do this.	<p>As explained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. recognises that there would be intangible residual impacts on local communities as a result of combined environmental effects, both perceived and real. In some instances, these cannot be directly mitigated through physical design measures, and require a more reactive approach.</p> <p>As a result, SZC Co. would offer a Community Fund to help mitigate these effects through schemes, measures, and projects which promote the economic, social, or environmental well-being of those communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>The Community Fund would be secured via the Section 106 Agreement and may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an ongoing programme of small grants to charities, voluntary groups and social enterprises – awarded for projects, measures or initiatives that help to mitigate impacts felt in the community from the construction of the Sizewell C Project. 	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> strategic grants – for example for investment in local facilities or services to address both the positive and negative impacts on the host and incoming communities. <p>In general, activities receiving grants should aim to improve the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of the communities affected by the development and be relevant to the impacts identified, either by reducing or removing impacts or by helping the community to take advantage of opportunities presented by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Fund will recognise that some communities closer to the main development site such as Theberton, Eastbridge and Leiston are likely to experience more and greater effects across a wider range of social, economic and environmental areas.</p>	
Short-term Construction	Comments that the disruption of construction on the local community will only be short-term.	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has been committed to minimising construction impacts on the local community.</p> <p>The DCO application is supported by a Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13). This summarises potential impacts on the local community and proposed mitigation measures which seek to address these, as assessed fully elsewhere in the Environmental Statement.</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		This includes noise mitigation measures, full details of which are contained within the Noise and Vibration Chapters of the Environmental Statement , see Chapter 11 of Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3) and Chapter 4 of Volumes 3-9 (Doc Ref. 6.4– 6.10).	
Community Impacts	Concern that the development proposals will encourage further development in the area, causing it to become built up.	<p>SZC Co.’s Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) does not include the provision of permanent accommodation – instead it plans to use existing capacity in existing accommodation stock across different sectors, combined with project-provided temporary accommodation in the form of an accommodation campus.</p> <p>Any subsequent development would be considered as separate application, and would need to conform with the Council’s Local Plan policies. Each would be considered on its own merit, with potential adverse effects considered and mitigated.</p>	Y
Property Value	Concern about the impact of construction and the development on the value and ability to sell properties.	SZC Co. will minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls.	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and pest practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination. SZC Co. have committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.	
Further Assessment	Concern that the impacts of the proposed development on local people have not been adequately assessed.	<p>SZC CO. has undertaken an assessment of the effects on housing, public services, skills, education and the labour market, and community cohesion as part of the socio-economic chapter of the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Additionally, other environmental aspects – such as noise and air quality – have been assessed and are summarised by community within the Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13) in order to provide clarity to local people on the different elements of each part of the Sizewell C Project that have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects on people, homes and community resources.</p>	Y
Economic Benefits	Comments about the current deprivation of the local community and economy, with concerns that they will not benefit from the proposed development.	<p>SZC Co.'s objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts, whilst optimising local benefits that directly arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>The construction of Sizewell C would make a significant contribution to the Government's energy strategy to support the security of the UK's economic future, as well as</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>producing a long-term boost for the local economy through increased employment and skills provision.</p> <p>There would be a large increase in local employment and business opportunities during the construction phase and a long-term legacy of 900 new jobs once the station is operational. SZC Co. recognises that there are significant opportunities to maximise and support the uptake of local socio-economic benefits through targeted enhancement, initiatives and support.</p> <p>SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, Appendix A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9), that sets out measures to support local people into work, into higher skilled work, and to develop sustainable careers in construction, energy and other sectors that support the Sizewell C Project and the wider ambitions for growth in the region. This includes consideration of how the Sizewell C Project may deliver social value through targeting pockets of deprivation within Suffolk.</p>	

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Economic Impacts	Comments about the negative and detrimental impacts to local employment as a result of the development for example by taking skilled workers from local businesses.	<p>The Sizewell C Project would generate a significant demand for labour, in a range of employment sectors and skill levels in both construction and non-construction-related activities, and long-term operational jobs once the power station is built.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that, while the macro-level effects of the Sizewell C Project are beneficial – creating more jobs, higher skilled jobs and promoting competency in the supply chain – there are concerns about loss of staff from local businesses.</p> <p>SZC Co. has committed to an employment brokerage service to support businesses who may find that some vacancies are harder to fill. Further details are provided in the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, Annex A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	Y
Local Employment	Comments, concerns and suggestions about skilled job opportunities as part of the development that skilled workers are not available locally.	<p>The number of home-based workers anticipated to work on the Sizewell C Project is calculated based on the number of jobs needed, the specific skills required, and the availability of those skills within commuting distance of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co.'s predictions for local recruitment have been refined since the Stage 1 consultation to take into account:</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 Census data on the economic activity and skill level of existing residents; • Discussions with the Construction Workforce Management Team on the Hinkley Point C project and the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB); • Assumptions on commuting distances; • Feedback from local authorities; and • Comparative information from other power station projects including Sizewell B and Flamanville 3 in France. <p>The proportion of home-based workers would vary throughout the construction phase, with the highest proportion of non-home-based workers coming at the mechanical and electrical peak, which coincides with the overall construction phase peak.</p> <p>The Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) provide a high-level overview of the skills breakdown at peak. While the peak of construction would create many roles for home-based workers in civil construction, management and</p>	

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		administration and service jobs, more than 30% of mechanical and electrical jobs are also estimated to be taken by home-based workers at this point, helping to deliver aspirations of the local authorities for local people to access higher skilled roles.	
Local Employment	Concerns that the proposed development will not provide any local employment opportunities.	<p>The Sizewell C Project would generate a significant demand for labour, in a range of employment sectors and skill levels in both construction and non-construction-related activities, and long-term operational jobs once the power station is built.</p> <p>Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) sets out a high-level overview of the skills breakdown at peak. While the peak of construction would create many roles for home-based workers in civil construction, management and administration and service jobs, more than 30% of mechanical and electrical jobs are also estimated to be taken by home-based workers at this point, delivering on helping to deliver aspirations of the local authorities for local people to access higher skilled roles.</p>	N
Community Impacts	Comments about how the local community proposals minimise impact on vulnerable	SZC Co. has worked collaboratively with other service providers (including health, social services, and children’s services) to determine the likely impact of the Sizewell C Project and develop ways of both mitigating any effects on	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	groups including children and the elderly.	<p>the existing capacity and maximising benefits where possible.</p> <p>SZC CO. has held several meetings with these important public service providers to help develop an understanding of the potential effects of the Sizewell C Project, assessed in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). Details of potential effects and strategies to mitigate them are also set out in the Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>Further information regarding the approach to equality of potentially vulnerable groups is set out in the Equality Statement (Doc Ref. 5.14).</p>	
Mitigation	Suggestion that the government should be investing in local community benefits since they are supportive of the power station.	Noted.	N
Ongoing Assessment	Comments suggesting that local impacts and employment etc. should	The Sizewell C Project takes into account the substantial weight attached by national and local policy to the ability to build and deliver nationally important infrastructure in a	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	be monitored for the duration of construction and operation	<p>timely and cost effective manner, while also creating a strong mitigation strategy that would help to avoid and reduce adverse effects in the local area.</p> <p>SZC Co. has committed strategies to monitor and manage the potential beneficial and adverse effects of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Housing Market	Concern about the loss of homes due to demolition for the development.	No homes will be demolished as a result of the Sizewell C Project.	N
Tourism Impact	Concern about the impact of the development on the availability of tourism accommodation because of the influx of workers to the area.	<p>The Sizewell C Project offers benefits to tourist accommodation providers in off-peak seasons, generating demand for year-round use of properties at the peak of construction.</p> <p>For the DCO application, an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been developed. This includes the provision of a project campus and caravan site and a Housing Fund - to avoid harm to the sector during the peak seasons, when tourist and worker demand for accommodation may overlap.</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Mitigation	Comments about the proposed mitigation/community benefits as being a bribe for local people to accept the development.	<p>SZC Co. is committed to an objective assessment of potential effects on people, communities, community facilities, housing and housing markets, public services and the local and regional economy – these are set out in detail within Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> <p>Where potential significant adverse effects have been identified, mitigation has been proposed that is proportionate, reasonable and related to the effects – implementation strategies such as the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) set out how these mitigations will be delivered.</p>	N
Quality of Life	Concern that resident and visitors' quality of life will decrease as result of the proposed development, due to the impacts on the surrounding environment.	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has been committed to minimising adverse impacts on the local community.</p> <p>The DCO application is supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment to ensure that mitigation measures are put in place ensure no unacceptable impacts on the environment.</p>	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The DCO application is also supported by a Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13). This summarises the potential impacts on local communities and highlights the proposed mitigation measures to address them.</p> <p>The Community Impact Report draws on the health impact assessment (set out in Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement) as well as chapters such as noise and vibration (Chapter 11 of Volume 2 and Chapter 4 of Volumes 3-9), landscape and visual impact (Chapter 13 of Volume 2 and Chapter 6 of Volumes 3-9) and amenity and recreation (Chapter 15 of Volume 2 and Chapter 8 of Volumes 3-9) all contained within the Environmental Statement (Book 6).</p> <p>Employment opportunities associated with the Sizewell C Project have also been assessed as a beneficial impact of the Sizewell C Project which should improve quality of life. Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) and Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in Annex A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) (Employment, Skills and Education Strategy).</p>	



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Timing of Proposed Benefits	Comments about the timing of SZC CO.'s proposals for Sizewell C in relation to the local community	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken engagement and statutory consultation flowing the process required for an NSIP under the DCO system – this requires periods of consultation, followed by an application, which is considered and examined ahead of a decision. This process is largely governed by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>SZC Co. has developed detailed information about the timing, phasing and delivery of the Sizewell C Project following DCO decision – however some early mitigation works will be installed ahead of that process through Town and Country Planning Act 1990 applications.</p> <p>The community will be kept informed of progress on the development of the Sizewell C Project’s timelines where practicable.</p> <p>The DCO application is also supported by a Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Housing Market	Comments about the accommodation strategy, that it would reduce the impact on the property market.	<p>The Stage 2 consultation set out that SZC Co. was working with the local authorities to examine the issues around the potential for the provision of a temporary caravan site or extensions to existing sites in a managed, sustainable way to provide flexibility as part of the balanced Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p> <p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks, ensuring an efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project with worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities to promote economic benefits e.g. of off-peak tourist accommodation use.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Housing Supply	Comments about increased demand for rental properties and resulted problems/lack of supply.	It is anticipated that some ‘non-home-based’ construction workers would look to the private rented sector for temporary accommodation during the construction of Sizewell C. The private rented sector was used by	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>construction workers during the construction of Sizewell B, and offers flexible, independent accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has held discussions with East Suffolk Council to gain a better understanding of the current challenges and characteristics of the private rented market, and its function in helping to meet housing need. These discussions have highlighted that affordability is now the key reason for households joining the Housing Register in the district.</p> <p>These discussions have focused on housing need and the private rented sector in Leiston in particular, as the settlement closest to the site and therefore likely to attract the largest number of construction workers looking for accommodation at peak. It would be particularly important to ensure that the lower 30th percentile of the private rented sector remains accessible to local people as a way into the housing market. This is therefore be treated as the part of the housing market most sensitive to change in SZC Co.'s assessment.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Housing Market	Concern about the impact of the development on	SZC Co. has worked with local authorities to ensure an organised and robust approach to minimising effects from its	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the rental market, including distortion of prices, due to the influx of workers to the area.	workforce on community cohesion, accommodation capacity and a range of socio-economic concerns. The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) meets the requirements of the Sizewell C Project, while limiting any likely significant adverse effects and optimising positive effects wherever possible.	
Site Legacy	Comments suggesting that the accommodation strategy should provide legacy benefits, such as through permanent housing, or as suitable leisure facilities in the future.	SZC Co. is required to mitigate the effects of the Sizewell C Project, which in terms of accommodation issues, would occur only during the construction phase. As such, permanent accommodation would be considered disproportionate to mitigate these effects. Stage 2 consultation set out options for sports facilities, which could either be located within the campus site or remotely in Leiston with public access. Following Stage 2, it was agreed with East Suffolk Council that the campus will include an off-site 3G sports pitch and 2 MUGAs which will be located in Leiston for shared worker and community use while the campus is operational and left as a legacy for the community thereafter. Further details may be found in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Previous Experience	Comments and concerns about the worker accommodation in relation to experience of the construction of Sizewell A and B	<p>SZC Co. has developed a ‘Gravity Model’ to estimate where the construction workforce would be likely to live during peak construction. The model uses transport and socio-economic information, along with accommodation data.</p> <p>A number of other inputs are also incorporated into the model, including the distance workers are likely to travel based on research by CITB, experience from monitoring during the construction of Sizewell B, and from consultation with Suffolk County Council (SCC).</p> <p>The Gravity Model calculates where both home-based and non-home-based workers would be likely to live across the region at peak construction. It predicts the location of the permanent homes of home-based workers and temporary accommodation of non-home-based workers.</p> <p>The construction workforce is substantially different from that at Sizewell A or B – the workforce will be stringently managed, and must comply with a Worker Code of Conduct (including provisions for drug and alcohol). The accommodation provided will be safe, secure and well-maintained with facilities to reduce the likelihood of incidents of poor worker behaviour.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		In addition, a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) will be enacted to promote measures to limit adverse effects in the community.	
Cumulative Impacts	Comments about the accommodation and its interaction with other development projects, and the suggestion to consider these developments in the accommodation strategy.	<p>SZC Co. recognises that Sizewell C is one of a number of major infrastructure projects likely to be under construction in the region in the next decade.</p> <p>As such, SZC Co. has considered the cumulative effect of the non-home-based construction workforce of these projects – where information is available – as part of the Cumulative and Transboundary Effects Assessment, Volume 10, Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.11). This includes the potential labour market, housing and public services effects of the projects where they have the potential to overlap.</p>	N
Traffic Flow	Comments and suggestions that the accommodation strategy should minimise the need to use private transport and reduce the impact of traffic on local roads.	An Accommodation Strategy has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council. This is in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks. This is to ensure efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project with worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities to promote economic benefits e.g. of off-peak tourist accommodation use.	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).	
Assessments / Modelling	Comments suggesting that the accommodation strategy should be flexible in case SZC Co.'s estimates are incorrect.	<p>An Accommodation Strategy has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council. This is in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks. This is to ensure efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project with worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities to promote economic benefits e.g. of off-peak tourist accommodation use.</p> <p>SZC CO. recognises that while this balanced approach provides benefits and limits effects, there may still be some effects on local housing markets. As such, a flexible, responsive approach to enhancing supply and monitoring effects has been developed to complement the proposals set out by East Suffolk Council's Housing Strategies.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	N
Alternative Options	Other comments and suggestions such as using accommodation in Leiston instead of building new	An Accommodation Strategy has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks, ensuring an	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>sites and encouraging integration of workers with the local community.</p>	<p>efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project with worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities.</p> <p>The provision of up to 2,400 beds in an accommodation campus at the site and a 400 pitch caravan site would reduce demand from workers for accommodation in the private rented sector and available tourist accommodation. SZC Co. believes this strikes an acceptable balance between addressing the needs of the Sizewell C Project and reducing adverse effects on local accommodation.</p> <p>Reducing the size and location of the accommodation campus would be likely to have significant effects on the private rental market given workers’ preference to live close to their workplace, potentially resulting in higher take-up of PRS housing in Leiston.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Alternative Options	<p>Suggestions for the accommodation strategy, in that multiple smaller campuses should be</p>	<p>Based on evidence from contractors at Hinkley Point C, along with experience on Hinkley Point B and Sizewell B, SZC Co. has identified that it is preferable to have as many workers accommodated on-site as possible.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	provided rather than one large one, to reduce the concentration of impacts.	<p>The Sizewell C Project therefore proposes a single campus within walking distance of the site, rather than dispersed multiple campuses, or a single campus away from the site. This is because: it greatly reduces the number of journeys on local roads, as well as time associated with travelling to and from the site; it increases productivity and reduces potential health and safety risks associated with long travel and work times; and it is vital that key workers are resident on-site, so they can be flexible in terms of the out of hours working that may be necessary to respond to emerging site needs and maintain construction productivity and progress.</p> <p>The single on-site accommodation campus would make a large contribution to limiting traffic and adverse socio-economic effects. SZC Co. will work with local authorities to ensure an organised and robust approach to minimising effects from its workforce on community cohesion, accommodation capacity and a range of socio-economic concerns.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Tourism Impact	Suggestions that the worker accommodation	The provision of up to 2,400 beds in an accommodation campus at the site and a 400 pitch caravan site would	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	strategy should avoid the use of tourist accommodation to reduce impacts on the tourism industry.	<p>reduce demand from workers for accommodation in the private rented sector and available tourist accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. believes this strikes an acceptable balance between addressing the needs of the Sizewell C Project and reducing adverse effects on local accommodation. This also considers the Environmental Statement estimated level of ‘spare’ accommodation capacity in the area - striking a balance between placing too much pressure on existing stock, and maximising the economic benefits of a non-home-based workforce in the area by using otherwise spare tourist accommodation.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Local Employment	Suggestions that local workers should be used as much as possible to minimise the amount of housing required for workers, and that workers use local accommodation.	SZC Co. has developed a ‘Gravity Model’ to estimate where the construction workforce would be likely to live during peak construction. The key socio-economic inputs that inform the Gravity Model include a home-based workforce of around 2,000 workers at peak, distributed based on skills availability in the area, and a non-home-based workforce of just under 6,000. At peak construction, up to 3,000 non-home-based workers would be resident at SZC Co.’s accommodation campus and caravan site, located within the main development site.	N

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Additionally, the scale of the construction workforce, and the number of non-home-based workers who would be likely to seek accommodation in the local area, needs to be seen in the context of the wider residential population. The workforce would be a relatively small number in the context of the existing population of Suffolk (1.1% of approximately 525,000 working age residents) and of the nearest districts of Suffolk Coastal and Waveney (around 3.3%).</p> <p>The campus and caravan site would reduce demand from workers for accommodation in the private rented sector and available tourist accommodation. SZC Co. believes this strikes an acceptable balance between addressing the needs of the Sizewell C Project and reducing adverse effects on local accommodation. This also considers the Environmental Statement estimated level of 'spare' accommodation capacity in the area - striking a balance between placing too much pressure on existing stock, and maximising the economic benefits of a non-home-based workforce in the area by using otherwise spare tourist accommodation.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	

Theme: Accommodation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Housing Supply	Comments about the location of accommodation away from the proposed campus and caravan site, and potential insufficiency of rental accommodation within the local community.	<p>SZC Co. have worked with local authorities to ensure an organised and robust approach to minimising effects from its workforce on community cohesion, accommodation capacity and a range of socio-economic concerns. An Accommodation Strategy has been developed and limits any likely significant adverse effects and optimising positive effects wherever possible.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Transport Strategy	Comments about profit making and about SZC CO. in relation to the transport proposals	<p>Additional information on the transport strategy was provided at public consultation Stages 2, 3 and 4. Further information on how transport impacts will be managed may be found in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
HGV Traffic	Comments suggesting that freight and HGV traffic should be	<p>The optimum solution for moving freight by rail is included in the DCO application. That is two trains per day taken into the LEEIE site during the Early Years phase of construction and up to three trains per day</p>	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	minimised as part of the transport strategy	taken into the main construction site via the Green rail route at Peak Construction. Up to five trains per day were explored as part of the rail-led strategy presented at Stage 3. However, there was insufficient confidence that Network Rail could complete the necessary upgrades to the East Suffolk line in time. Also, the rail-led option would necessitate an extensive programme of level crossing upgrades and some closures. This presented a significant risk to the Sizewell C Project and could not be taken forward by SZC Co.. The Transport Strategy is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Mitigation	Comments suggesting that SZC Co. should not be responsible for the funding/works beyond infrastructure needed for the project for example extensive road improvements not needed for the development site itself.	The highway infrastructure proposed by SZC Co., and described in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) is to be fully funded by SZC Co.. Additional measures beyond that those needed to mitigate the predicted impacts would not be funded by SZC Co..	N
Other Projects	Comments and concerns about the interaction of this development with	Committed developments and traffic growth are included in the traffic modelling that forms the basis of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	other energy developments and the impact on traffic congestion and transport strategy, including Galloper Windfarm.	Environmental Statement impact assessments and mitigation proposals.	
Transport Strategy	Opposition to the proposed transport strategy for lacking foresight, logistics and practical use, as well as lacking in evidence and detail.	Additional information on the transport strategy was provided at public consultation Stages 2, 3 and 4. The impacts of the strategy are set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement (Book 6).	Y
Site Suitability	Concern about the inadequacy of surrounding local roads around the potential park and rides, and consequential safety issues.	Option 1 at Wickham Market forms part of the DCO proposals. It is adjacent to the A12 and part of the primary route network, giving good access for the majority of traffic and minimising congestion. Option 3 at Potash Corner was eliminated after Stage 1 consultation and Option 2 at Woodbridge after Stage 2 consultation. The capacity and safety of surrounding local roads are fully assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and mitigation proposed where necessary.	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Site Options	Suggestions for an alternative to park and rides as worker transport, including rail links directly to the main development site.	<p>The use of rail to transport workers was considered prior to Stage 2 consultation. However, SZC Co. considered that a rail-based solution would not offer the flexibility of a bus-based system.</p> <p>It would also use scarce train paths that were better used for freight to remove HGV movements from the local road network.</p> <p>Rail transport for workers was thus discounted from further consideration at Stage 2 and does not form part of the DCO proposals.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Alternative Site Options	Suggestions for the park and rides to avoid particular locations such as Haw Wood, Woodbridge or near the B1122.	<p>Northern park and ride site options on the B1122 east of Yoxford (option 1), at Darsham station (option 2) and at the A12/A144 junction (option 3) were considered at Stage 2 consultation.</p> <p>Following analysis of the consultation responses and further technical work, the Darsham site was selected and forms part of the DCO proposals. The other site options were discounted.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Similarly, options for the southern park and ride at Wickham Market (option 1), Woodbridge (option 2) and Potash Corner (option 3) were considered at Stage 2. Through a similar exercise, the site at Wickham Market was preferred and forms part of the DCO proposals. The other sites were discounted. No site at Haw Wood was proposed as it was too remote from the A12.</p> <p>Both the northern (Darsham) and southern (Wickham Market) sites are considered in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5)</p>	
Funding	Comments about the cost-effectiveness and funding for the park and ride schemes.	<p>Park and ride forms an integral element of our Transport Strategy to minimise road traffic and provide an efficient method of transporting workers to the construction site. The cost of these facilities are therefore necessary in order to ensure that the impacts of the Sizewell C Project are minimised as much as practicable.</p> <p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. have taken steps to ensure the cost-effectiveness of the park and ride schemes, and are confident that they will provide effective mitigation.</p>	Y
Mitigation	Criteria for the park and ride proposals, that they	Park and ride facilities will play an important role in reducing the amount of additional traffic generated by	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	should be open to use by locals/non-construction workers.	<p>the construction workforce on local roads and through local villages.</p> <p>The park and ride facilities are proposed to mitigate the impacts of Sizewell C and as such are not open to locals/non-construction workers.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapters 2 of Volume 3 and Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
Site Location	Park and ride proposals should be located close to the main development site.	<p>SZC Co. consider that the geographic distribution of the workforce estimated by the gravity modelling work supports the justification for two park and ride developments to help reduce traffic from construction workforce movements.</p> <p>One would intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the south, and one would intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the north. Both park and ride developments would intercept traffic movements from locations west of the A12. The park and ride facilities need to be located a sufficient distance from the main site to intercept optimum levels of traffic in order to reduce traffic levels on roads close to the main development site.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The purpose of both park and ride sites is to reduce construction worker traffic on the A12 between the park and ride sites at Wickham Market and Darsham and on the B1122 between Yoxford and the construction site, including at Theberton and Middleton. The northern park and ride would also reduce construction worker flows through the villages of Blythburgh and Westleton. Similarly, the southern park and ride would reduce these flows through Snape and Tunstall on the B1069, Leiston and surrounding settlements.</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.</p>	
Site Location	Park and ride proposals should be located close to railway links.	<p>The purpose of both park and ride sites is to reduce construction worker traffic on the A12 between the park and ride sites at Wickham Market and Darsham and on the B1122 between Yoxford and the construction site, including at Theberton and Middleton.</p> <p>The northern park and ride would also reduce construction worker flows through the villages of</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Blythburgh and Westleton. Similarly, the southern park and ride would reduce these flows through Snape and Tunstall on the B1069, Leiston and surrounding settlements.</p> <p>The park and ride proposals will also facilitate railway users to access the main development site without use of a car. This is particularly the case at Darsham where the proposed site is located adjacent to Darsham railway station.</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.</p>	
Integration of Proposals	Park and ride proposals should integrate with other developments as part of the project, such as the accommodation.	The proposals for the park and ride facilities have been developed as part of a holistic transport strategy. They are proposed alongside a range of other measures (such as accommodation on site and a freight management facility) to mitigate the impacts of construction Sizewell C.	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained within the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Environmental Impact	Park and ride proposals should be that which is least intrusive, visually and to residents and the environment.	The impact on landscape and visual amenity was a key consideration in selecting which sites should contain the park and ride facilities. Please refer to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.	N
Site Legacy	Park and ride proposals should be those with the greatest amount of legacy value.	The potential for legacy station car parking is considered a benefit at the site proposed at Darsham. Should the sites be returned to their existing use once the need associated with Sizewell C has ceased however, this would not prevent others from applying for planning permission for alternative uses in the future. Further information is contained within Chapter 2 of Volume 3 and Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Book 6).	N
Site Location	Park and ride proposals should be as close as possible to major roads for example the A12 and roundabouts that lead onto major routes to	The proximity to major roads, for example, the A12 was a key consideration when proposing sites to contain the park and ride facilities. It is important that they are located close to the A12 to intercept construction workers approaching Sizewell from the north and south on the A12.	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	minimise disruption to the traffic flow.	The Site Selection Report , appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme.	
Site Legacy	Concerns that the proposed park and ride schemes will have no legacy value or use after construction of Sizewell C	<p>The potential for legacy station car parking is considered a benefit at the site proposed at Darsham.</p> <p>Further information is contained within Chapters 2 of Volume 3 and Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4 and 6.5).</p> <p>Should the sites be returned to their existing use once the need associated with Sizewell C has ceased however, this would not prevent others from applying for planning permission for alternative uses in the future.</p>	N

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Sourcing of Materials	Comments and concerns about the sourcing of gravel/aggregate and the lack of information	The Sizewell C Project would require around 10.1 million tonnes of material to be imported to the main development site during the construction period.	Y

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	provided about where it will be sourced and impacts.	Sufficient supply is likely to exist within the UK to source construction materials, with some very specialist and specific materials needing to be sourced from elsewhere in Europe. Due to the strict requirements for nuclear standard concrete, the approach taken for sourcing concrete supply is likely to replicate that used for Hinkley Point C, which sourced most material from within the UK. Chapter 8 (Conventional Waste) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents an assessment of the likely significant effects as a result of resource use.	

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Cost	Comments and concerns about the cost of conducting consultations.	Under the Planning Act 2008, public consultation is a statutory obligation for developers promoting Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). SZC Co.'s aim was to organise an accessible public consultation providing local communities and statutory stakeholders the fullest opportunity to provide their feedback.	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		To deliver that aim, SZC Co. made the necessary investment to conduct Stage 1 consultation in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) (see Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Decision Making	Comments suggesting the project and the developments proposed have already been decided upon and are going to go ahead regardless.	<p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>The Planning Act 2008 requires that the design of the Sizewell C Project is informed by consultation with key stakeholders and the local community. The Stage 1 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC), see Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Subsequent stages of formal consultation clearly showed that changes to the emerging proposals were made and informed by Stage 1 feedback and further technical assessments. Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Events	Negative comments and criticisms about the consultation events including on staff knowledge and behaviour.	<p>On the rare occasion that a specific criticism was raised, this was addressed by the team in pre-briefings before each consultation event.</p> <p>SZC Co. selected team members with the specific experience and expertise required to be helpful to the public. Many of the team members were also from the local area and so know the area well.</p> <p>In order to have a fair and independent measure of the quality of the consultation, including literature, exhibition materials and the conduct of staff, SZC Co. commissioned independent market research organisations to survey people who attended the exhibitions as they left. Exhibition staff were found to be helpful in the majority of responses.</p>	N
Consultation Events	Positive comments about the consultation events including on staff knowledge and behaviour.	<p>SZC Co. selected team members with the specific experience and expertise required to be helpful to the public. Many of the team members were also from the local area and so know the area well.</p> <p>In order to have a fair and independent measure of the quality of the consultation, including literature, exhibition materials and the conduct of staff, SZC Co. commissioned independent market research organisations to survey</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		people who attended the exhibitions as they left. Exhibition staff were found to be helpful in the majority of responses.	
Consultation Questionnaire	Criticisms about the feedback form/questionnaire, including structure and wording.	A mix of positive and negative comments were received in relation to the content of the Stage 1 Consultation Questionnaire, Appendix B.10 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). SZC Co. took on board constructive feedback in the drafting of questionnaires for future stages of statutory consultation, see Appendices D.12, E.6 and F.7 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Consultation Process	Positive comments about the consultation documentation as being clear, well presented and useful	Positive feedback welcomed.	N
Consultation Process	Criticisms of the consultation documentation as being uninformative or too complex to easily understand.	SZC Co. aimed to make the Stage 1 Summary Consultation Document as accessible and clear as possible for a wide and non-technical audience, see Appendix B.3 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). SZC Co. made the baseline Environmental Report and Transport Strategy Supporting Documents available to all, see Appendices B.5 and B.6 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Stage 2 Public Consultation followed the approach published in the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2016), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC).</p> <p>With this feedback in mind, and as part of efforts to make the consultation as accessible to hard-to-reach groups as possible, SZC Co. commissioned Easy Read documents to be published at Stages 3 and 4.</p>	
Stakeholder Engagement	Comments on other considerations being taken as part of the consultation process for example by working with other stakeholders or taking into account independent reports.	<p>Under the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, SZC Co. is required to consult statutory consultees such as the Environment Agency, Marine Management Organisation, Natural England as well as local communities.</p> <p>Following Stage 1 the Suffolk local authorities commissioned independent reports into transport and socioeconomics which SZC Co. took into account as it developed its proposals for consultation at subsequent statutory stages.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Process	Comments about actions that have been undertaken as part of the development before consultation and DCO submission for example removal of reptiles on land in preparation for the development without any consultation.	<p>All activities that required planning consent, such as ground investigative works which required rigging to select core samples, were subject to the correct planning regime.</p> <p>Technical assessments are a necessary part of the process to determine if proposals subject to consultation are deliverable.</p> <p>Any activities such as the translocation of reptiles were undertaken on SZC Co. property or in agreement with other landowners. This was timely pre-emptive action to mitigate the impact of construction should Sizewell C achieve a DCO.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology chapters of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Consultation Accessibility	Challenging the consultation process as not being accessible to all for example due to timing of events and rural nature of area.	<p>The Stage 1 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) (see Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. printed several thousand copies of the Stage 1 consultation documents, which were sent to all statutory</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>stakeholders and interested parties, see Appendices B.4, B.5 and B.6 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. sent the Stage 1 newsletter to homes and businesses within ten miles of Sizewell C and a mile radius of associated development sites outside this area, see Appendix B.11 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>All consultation documents were available on the internet and SZC Co. distributed more documents on request (e.g. Middleton Parish Council requested that the summary documents were sent to parishioners). SZC Co. also provided a Freephone line and offered transport and home visits.</p> <p>Within the Stage 1 feedback, some parishes suggested that other ways of publicising the consultation would be necessary.</p> <p>At Stages 2, 3 and 4 SZC Co. therefore produced posters to display on public notice boards across villages and neighbouring parishes where exhibitions would be taking place. SZC Co. also sent parish councils a ‘parish pack’ which included several publicity materials so the parish</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>could advertise events and other consultation activities. See sample consultation material for these stages at Appendices D.11, E.9 and F.6.</p> <p>We also extended the circulation area of the newsletter for subsequent stages of consultation to 38,000 homes and business addresses, see Updated Statement of Community Consultation (November 2016) (Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1)).</p>	
Consultation Process	Challenging the consultation process as being run in an unfair/undemocratic way, and therefore invalid	<p>SZC Co. have been committed to the consultation process being fair and democratic throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Stage 1 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the methods set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2012).</p> <p>The SOCC was subject to consultation with and agreement with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) prior to its publication, see Appendix B.3 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>All parties required to be consulted in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 have been consulted.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Publicity	Positive comments about the consultation being well publicised.	Positive comments welcomed.	N
Consultation Publication	Requests and suggestion that the results and reports from the consultation should be made public.	Annexes A, D, G and J of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) comprise issues tables which summarise the consultation feedback received at Stages 1-4, how SZC Co. responded and whether the scheme changed in response.	Y
Consultation Scope	Comments that the scope of the consultation should also include wider nuclear issues, as well as the limited scope of the consultation.	<p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has already been established by the Government and was therefore outside of the scope of the Stage 1 consultation.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK's energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK's binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government's Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Consultation Timing	Criticisms of the timing of the consultation, that it is too slow and taking too long for decisions to be made/development to start.	<p>Public consultation is a statutory obligation for developers promoting Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>SZC Co. is required to work with local communities and statutory consultees to mitigate the negative impacts of</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>construction and maximise the benefits in order to arrive at the best way to build Sizewell C.</p> <p>Full details are contained in Chapter 2 (Approach to Consultation) of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	
Consultation Timing	Comments that the development proposals are not far enough along with a currently inadequate amount of information available to consult on.	<p>The Stage 1 consultation was the first statutory stage of consultation and sought views on our initial plans for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Due to the stage that the scheme was at detail was not available for all elements of the scheme at that stage. This was to a large extent intentional to provide the community and stakeholders with the opportunity to review potential options to inform the design of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>More information and detail was provided at later stages of consultation with the benefit of the feedback received at Stage 1. Please see Chapter 2 (Approach to Consultation) of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N

b. Main development site

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Pre-Construction works	Comments that pre-construction works should be undertaken before planning applications.	<p>The Sizewell C Project has been submitted as an application for development consent.</p> <p>SZC Co. has progressed two separate early works planning applications under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that are related to the Sizewell C Project – the Aldhurst Farm habitat creation scheme (application Ref. DC/14/4224/FUL – granted permission in March 2015) and the Sizewell B relocated facilities project (application Ref. DC/19/1637/FUL – granted permission in November 2019, however, the decision is currently the subject of a legal challenge).</p> <p>Works at Aldhurst Farm are now part complete, including the completion of new reedbed and ditch habitat.</p> <p>As the Sizewell B relocated facilities project is a critical element to facilitate the construction of Sizewell C, it is important for SZC Co. to be sure that these works will be consented. Therefore, the proposals for the above facilities are also included in the application for development consent for the Sizewell C Project and have been considered to form part of the Sizewell C Project in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Access Road	Comments and concerns about the proposed access road to the site, including the impact on designated areas.	<p>The Sizewell C site would need to have a separate access to that used by Sizewell B. The proposed single carriageway road runs from the B1122, just north of the Eastbridge Road junction, to the power station site. The environmental impact of the access road has been assessed and mitigation identified where necessary, as reported in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The transport impact of the development proposals on the surrounding road network and the proposed mitigation have been addressed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement transport Chapter 10 in Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Access Road	Concerns about the ability for traffic to access the main development site, due to the access route proposals and insufficiency of surrounding road network	<p>The Sizewell C site would need to have a separate access to that used by Sizewell B. The proposed single carriageway road runs from the B1122, just north of the Eastbridge Road junction, to the power station site. The environmental impact of the access road has been assessed and mitigation identified where necessary, as reported in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p> <p>The transport impact of the development proposals on the surrounding road network and the proposed mitigation</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		have been addressed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Volume 2 Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)	
Airspace	Comments about issues relating to airspace requirements for the main site, and the proposed Helipad.	<p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 contains the Strategic Siting Assessment for Sizewell C, which identified that the site passed the assessment for proximity to military activities and proximity to civil aircraft movements. Limited helicopter trips already take place for Sizewell B and Sizewell C would have a similarly infrequent requirement.</p> <p>It has therefore been determined following the Stage 3 consultation that there is sufficient and suitable space elsewhere on the Sizewell estate to land a helicopter, should it be required, and the proposed Helipad is no longer necessary.</p>	Y
Cost / Funding	Comments about the cost effectiveness and funding of the main development site.	The Funding Statement (Doc Ref. 4.2) explains how: (i) the acquisition of the land, interests and rights necessary to build the Sizewell C Project would be funded; and (ii) how the implementation of the Sizewell C Project generally is to be funded. It should be read alongside the Statement of Reasons (Doc Ref. 4.1), which justifies the powers of	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		compulsory acquisition that are sought and explains how SZC Co. intends to use the land which it is proposed to acquire.	
Grid Connection	Comments about the connection to the main development site of National Grid, including comments about pylons.	<p>Electricity from the generators would be stepped up to 400 kilovolts (kV) via the main transformer, and then transferred via overhead lines to a new National Grid 400kV substation, which would be required to accommodate the additional generation output of Sizewell C. The new substation would be built alongside, and would be interconnected with, the existing National Grid 400kV substation which currently connects Sizewell B power station to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS).</p> <p>The overhead lines that currently terminate at the existing National Grid 400kV substation would be diverted into the new National Grid 400kV substation, so that the electricity generated by both the existing Sizewell B and new Sizewell C power stations can be exported to the NETS.</p> <p>Connections are also provided from the proposed new National Grid 400kV substation back to each UK EPRTM reactor unit via underground cables. These connections act as a back-up to the auxiliary supply function of the main connection in both a planned and unplanned</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>situation. Further detail on the grid connection are set out in the Grid Connection Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1).</p> <p>Further details on the proposed pylons are set out in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref 8.1).</p>	
Site Suitability	Suggestions that the main development site should make use of existing facilities, for example those part of the Sizewell A and B sites.	<p>No available brownfield sites at Sizewell exist other than those parts re-used in the Sizewell B relocated facilities project. The Sizewell B relocated facilities project (application Ref. DC/19/1637/FUL) was granted planning permission in November 2019, however, the decision is currently the subject of a legal challenge.</p> <p>As the Sizewell B relocated facilities project is a critical element to facilitate the construction of Sizewell C, it is important for SZC Co. to be sure that these works will be consented. Therefore, the proposals for the above facilities are also included in the application for development consent for the Sizewell C Project and have been considered to form part of the Sizewell C Project in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2).</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Land within the Sizewell A is not currently available, due to their land requirements during the decommissioning process.	
Site Location	Comments about the use of this site for nuclear facilities already and the existence of required infrastructure, making it a suitable location.	<p>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 is clear that that nuclear power generation is <i>“anticipated to play an increasingly important role as we move to diversify and decarbonise our sources of electricity”</i>. This is further supported by the Statement on Energy Infrastructure on 7 December 2017 (the ‘ministerial statement’) which states that <i>“with a number of the existing coal and nuclear fleet due to close by 2030, new nuclear power generation remains key to meeting our 2050 obligations”</i> and that the Government <i>“believes that it is important that there is a strong pipeline of new nuclear power to contribute to the UK’s future energy system”</i></p> <p>The Government’s National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) is clear that any new nuclear power stations consented under the Planning Act 2008 will play a vitally important role in providing reliable electricity supplies and a secure and diverse energy mix as the UK makes the transition to a low carbon economy.</p> <p>The Government’s policy on the siting of new nuclear power stations is set out in NPS EN-6. This followed a</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Strategic Siting Assessment to identify sites potentially suitable for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Sizewell C was identified as a site considered to be suitable and was included in the NPS.</p> <p>The ministerial statement states that whilst NPS EN-6 only has effect for projects which are able to demonstrate expected deployment by the end of 2025, the Government continues to give its strong in principle support to project proposals at those sites listed in EN-6, i.e. including Sizewell C.</p> <p>A full justification for the proposals in the context of planning policy is set out within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the impact of the main development site in general on the environment, including	Proposed development within the main development site has evolved in tandem with the EIA process and an understanding of potential impacts addressed through an iterative design process. The Sizewell C Project design stages have been informed by early environmental information which informed stage 1 and 2 design,	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	wildlife, ecology and designated areas.	<p>Preliminary Environmental Information which informed stage 3 design and a full EIA which has supported ongoing design development of the proposals which are submitted in this application for development consent.</p> <p>A summary of the environmental impacts of development at the main development site are set out in the Non-Technical Summary of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>	
Greenfield Land	Comments and concerns about the proposed induction centre and post centre, including the siting on greenfield land.	<p>SZC Co. continue to propose a postal consolidation facility at the site of the southern park and ride at Wickham Market. The induction centre has since been relocated within the main development site due to operational efficiencies.</p> <p>This is considered to offer efficiencies for the Sizewell C Project. The postal consolidation facility will provide a helpful role in reducing traffic by eliminating many Light Goods Vehicle movements and is therefore considered necessary to propose.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5).</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Other Projects	Comments and concerns about the interaction of the main site with other development projects, such as Galloper windfarm, and suggestions for how they can be built holistically to minimise impacts on the surrounding area	Volume 10 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.11) contains a cumulative assessment of the proposed development in combination with other projects that are either planned or under construction in the vicinity of the site.	N
Environmental Impacts	Comments and concern about operational impacts and impacts created by changes during the construction of the site.	Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes a detailed assessment of the proposed development at the main development site.	N
Previous experience	Comments about experiences of impact on the environment from Sizewell A and B	The decommissioning of Sizewell A is the responsibility of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA). Sizewell B is operated by SZC CO. and the industry regulator is the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and regulation relating to various environmental permits is overseen by the Environmental Agency. Sizewell A and Sizewell B reports regularly to the Sizewell Site Stakeholder Group (SSG) which is made up of members of the local	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		community and the EA and ONR also provide reports on both sites to the SSG.	
Protected areas	Concern about the impact on Sandlings Special Protection Area.	The proposed development has evolved with the aim of minimising impacts on Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA), alongside other considerations. Chapter 14, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) concludes that there would be no significant adverse effects on the SPA.	N
Mitigation	Comments about which options would (or suggestions for how to) minimise impact on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.	The proposed development has sought to reduce the impact on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB as far as reasonably practicable. Further details on the impacts of the proposed development are set out in Chapter 13, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Balance of Benefits	Comments and suggestions about the need to balance the environmental impacts of the development with impacts on people and	Sections 7, 8 and 9 of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.5) considers relevant national and local planning policies within the overarching context of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. They demonstrate that, when assessed against these relevant policies and material considerations, the Sizewell	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	with the benefits of the project	<p>C Project benefits from strong policy support and is acceptable in land use planning terms.</p> <p>The contribution that the Sizewell C Project will make to meet the national need for low carbon, secure and reliable energy is substantial and should be given considerable weight. When operational, the new Power Station would help to bring a stable supply of low-carbon electricity to the UK. SZC Co. is also committed to take all reasonable steps to limit the adverse environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project. Mitigation and good practice measures are proposed in order to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse impacts wherever possible.</p> <p>Even with mitigation in place the Sizewell C Project is, however, likely to result in some residual adverse effects, as would be expected with any nationally significant infrastructure and as anticipated in the NPSs, These effects do not outweigh the significant local, regional and national benefits.</p> <p>It is therefore the conclusion that the benefits of the scheme, particularly the delivery of new nuclear power generating capacity, are overwhelmingly greater than the residual adverse effects. There is no case to set aside the</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		presumption in favour of granting consent. Instead, there is a clear and compelling case in favour of the DCO being made	

Theme: Air Quality			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Suggestion that SZC Co. should seek to reduce or minimise the amount of air pollution caused by the development.	<p>Air quality has been assessed at Volume 2, Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement. The Sizewell C Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part B: Main Development Site (Doc Ref. 8.11) also sets out air quality and dust mitigation measures which will manage and control the construction activities at the main development site.</p> <p>Following these measures, the assessment concludes that the only potential source of significant air pollution would arise from construction dust. Secondary mitigation measures would be applied, including regular site inspections, logging of complaints, dust and particulate monitoring and reviewing of weather conditions ahead of works to determine the need for further mitigation. With these measures in place, no residual effects are anticipated.</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Air Quality			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Therefore, as the proposals would not lead to a breach in national air quality limits at construction, operation or decommissioning, they are in accordance with paragraph 5.2.10 of NPS EN-1. Adverse effects on air quality are not significant and therefore paragraph 5.2.9 of EN-1 does not apply because there would be no “substantial changes in air quality levels”.	

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Landscape and Visual	Concern about the landscape and visual impacts of the development on the countryside.	<p>The landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) within Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The LVIA process has helped inform decisions on proposed landforms boundary treatments and landscape planting for main development site</p>	N

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Ecology Impact	Comments and suggestions about how the development would/could have less impact on wildlife.	We welcome the comments made and through our proposals will make every effort to mitigate the impacts on wildlife and habitats through our proposals. More details are provided in the following response.	N
Mitigation	Comments about the need for mitigation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife to minimise impact from the development.	<p>We welcome the comments made and through our proposals will make every effort to mitigate the impacts on wildlife and habitats through our proposals.</p> <p>For example, Sizewell C will lead to the loss of a small part of the SSSI but SZC Co. is confident that the Aldhurst Farm habitat creation area provides acceptable compensation for the loss of reedbed and ditch habitats which will be lost from the Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>Aldhurst Farm does not however provide compensation for the permanent loss of about 0.5 ha fen meadow habitats from the SSSI and for this reason an off-site compensation strategy has been developed. Two sites have now been identified where new fen meadow habitats could be created and these will be subject to further detailed investigation to determine whether one or both are progressed to deliver an appropriate area of compensatory habitat</p>	N

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>In addition, a large number of mitigation measures for wildlife have been included within the proposals for Sizewell C. For the construction phase, these are included within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11) or form part of the mitigation strategies for individual protected species or species groups. Mitigation strategies have been developed for water voles, reptiles, bats and badgers and these strategies would be implemented under protected species licenses where these are necessary.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Public Rights of Way	Comments about which options would avoid impacts on footpaths and public rights of way.	Impacts on PRow have been considered in the design proposals and reported in the Amenity and Recreation chapters of the Environmental Statement . For example,	N

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		those relating to the Main Development Site are reported in Chapter 15, Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Traffic Flow	Criteria for the location of the proposed visitor centre, that it should minimise impact on traffic and transport.	Assessing the impact on traffic and transport was an important consideration in relocating the visitor centre to just west of the Sizewell A site. It would continue to be accessed via Sizewell Gap, which is an uncongested road. The site selection process is described within the Site Selection Report, Appendix A to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4)	N

Theme: Historic Environment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Heritage Impact	Concern about the impact on the cultural heritage of the area and heritage assets such as Leiston Abbey.	SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the Sizewell C Project, including on designated heritage assets such as Leiston Abbey. Where possible, impacts are proposed to be avoided or reduced by design or by embedded mitigation measures such as screening.	N

Theme: Historic Environment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Where required, additional mitigation will take the form of agreed schemes of archaeological investigation of s106 commitments.</p> <p>Please see the historic environment chapters of the Environmental Statement, Chapters 16 and 23 of Volume 2 and Chapter 4 of Volumes 3-9, for full details.</p>	
Archaeological Impact	Concern about the impact on archaeological sites and their setting, particularly a site near Wickham Market.	<p>The proposed site of the southern park and ride at Wickham Market was moved between Stage 1 and 2 to avoid impacts on the Romano-British town of Hacheston, which largely underlies the Stage 1 site.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation of the proposed site presented at Stage 2 / 3 indicated far less archaeology is present and this will be mitigated by set-piece excavation and preservation by record.</p> <p>Full details are contained within Chapter 9 (Historic Environment) of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Jetty Impacts	Comments about the proposed location of the jetty as part of the main site and factors that should be taken into consideration when deciding the location.	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology, but we acknowledge that there would have been a significant visual impact too.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 6 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	Y
Jetty Impacts	Opposition to the use of a jetty as part of the main development site.	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology,</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>but we acknowledge that there would have been a significant visual impact too.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 6 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
Jetty Suggestion	Suggestions that the jetty construction should be temporary.	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 6 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	Y
Marine Ecology	Comments about the impact of the development on marine life, marine management, navigation of marine transport and users of the sea.	<p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals following Stage 2, the beach Landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, indivisible loads (AILs). The BLF is much less intrusive than a jetty and no significant impacts on marine ecology are predicted from its construction and operation.</p> <p>During construction transport of materials to site by sea will be managed within a temporary harbour authority to</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>ensure safe and managed vessel movements during delivery of materials by sea and construction of the offshore infrastructure.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology) and Chapter 24 (Marine Navigation) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Climate Change			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Carbon Emissions	Comments suggesting that the construction strategy should aim to minimise the carbon footprint of the project.	<p>The Climate Change Assessment included within Chapter 26 (Climate Change) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the carbon footprint of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>A number of features of the Construction Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.12), such as retaining excavated materials on site and minimising the distance any wastes are taken for management, help to reduce carbon footprint. Maximising the contribution of rail and marine transport, whilst taking account of wider environmental and delivery constraints, may also help to minimise the carbon footprint depending on the origins and of the imported materials.</p>	N

Theme: Soils and Agriculture			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Farming Impact	Concern about the impact of the development on farmland and farming.	<p>SZC Co. will minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the 'Compensation Code' based on legislation, case law and best practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are</p>	N

Theme: Soils and Agriculture			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>entitled to compensation under the aforementioned 'Compensation Code'. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p>	

c. Temporary Developments

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Criteria for the temporary developments, that the proposals should have the least impact on local communities.	SZC Co. aims to strike a balance between using existing accommodation in the area and a purpose-built campus in order to make sure that the local community derives economic benefits from worker spend in the area, while avoiding negative effects on accommodation capacity, affordability, and community cohesion.	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The proposed accommodation campus and caravan site, along with the park and ride sites are proposed in order to reduce the effects on local communities. Design has aimed to further reduce local effects e.g. on traffic, noise, lighting and visual amenity as a result of all elements of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and the Site Selection Report that is appended to it.</p>	
Mitigation	Specific suggestions for the construction of the temporary developments, such as landscape mitigation.	<p>The specific suggestions were welcomed and helped inform the further development of design and landscape proposals to ensure landscape and visual impacts were minimised.</p> <p>Landscape proposals vary from site to site but typically include surface water swales and ponds, bunds at site margins and landscape planting to provide further screening.</p> <p>Lighting plans have been prepared that illustrate operational layouts to minimise light spill at site margins and minimise impacts on night-time views.</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.2) and The Landscape and Visual chapters of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4).	
Site Legacy	Concerns that the construction of temporary developments is wasteful, and that it would provide greater legacy benefit to build permanent structures for use post-construction.	<p>A number of temporary sites were considered to have potential for legacy benefits, notably the park and ride site at Darsham. However, the park and ride facility is only required to mitigate the impact of construction worker traffic on the local roads during the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Retaining the proposal as a legacy car park for Darsham train station (as suggested by some respondents), would go beyond the scope of the mitigation required for the Sizewell C Project and would require further justification for this permanent land take.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 3 concerning the Darsham Park and Ride of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	Suggestions that temporary developments should be kept within the main development site.	<p>Temporary developments, such as park and ride and freight management facilities are strategically located away from the main development site to allow the flow of freight traffic to be regulated and the number of construction worker vehicles to be reduced on the local highway network.</p> <p>Following refinement through successive stages of consultation, the accommodation campus is now proposed within the main development site.</p> <p>Further details on temporary development are set out in the Planning Statement (Doc. Ref. 8.4)</p>	N
Alternative Options	Suggested alternatives for locations of the temporary developments.	<p>Following the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. continued to collect preliminary environmental information to identify any significant environmental effects that may arise in connection with the Sizewell C Project. In doing so it considered how these effects may be addressed, for example through the identification of mitigation measures or the use of alternative sites.</p> <p>An outline of the main alternatives considered and the main reasons for the choices made, taking into account potential environmental effects, was presented in Stage 2.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The environmental considerations for the options chosen were also presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) at Stage 2, see Appendices E.2, E.3 and E.4 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Full details of the alternatives assessed can be found in Chapters 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volumes 3, 4, 8 and 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3-6.10).</p>	

d. Visitor Centre

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Visitor Centre	Support for the proposals for a visitor centre as a chance to educate people about the project and nuclear power, as well as being a suitable and efficient proposal.	<p>The support for the proposed Visitor Centre is welcomed.</p> <p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 have been taken forward. A combined facility for the Sizewell B and C power stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>Further information is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Existing Facilities	Suggestions that a visitor centre is not a priority for local concerns, and that if people feel it is needed, they could visit the existing one.	<p>The Sizewell B visitor centre provides a useful and interesting resource for visitors and local schools and we believe there is value in extending this resource to include information on the Sizewell C station.</p> <p>The DCO application proposes a combined Sizewell B and C Visitor Centre and this will avoid development on any of the locations proposed at Stage 1.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p>	N



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)	
Need Case	Concerns that the proposed visitor centre is just a 'PR exercise' to make people more accepting of the Sizewell C development, as well as suggesting further consideration of the purpose of the site should be undertaken.	<p>The visitor centre is not a PR exercise. All of the operating nuclear power stations in the SZC Co. fleet have visitor centres. The visitor centres are an important way for the industry to demonstrate openness and transparency about our operations.</p> <p>Visitor Centres provide an opportunity for the local community to get to know SZC Co., understand what we are doing at the station and provide a useful local facility. They are a point of reference for nuclear and energy information. The Visitor Centre for Sizewell B plays a crucial role in our Education strategy, we engage with schools and colleges across Suffolk to aid curriculum requirements, promote STEM and encourage the next generation of potential employees in the energy sector.</p> <p>Regards the proposed site for the visitor centre, it remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Access	The location of the proposed visitor centre should have the best access and location.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 have been taken forward. A combined facility for the Sizewell B and C power stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations. This location is considered to be highly accessible and well suited for its purpose.</p> <p>Further information is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	Y
Beach Access	The location of the proposed visitor centre should be the furthest away from/avoid impacting the beach	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 have been taken forward. A combined facility for the Sizewell B and C power stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations. The option to locate the Visitor Centre close to the Sizewell Beach car park and café has not been taken forward.</p> <p>Further information is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Community Impact	The location of the proposed visitor centre should minimise impact on the community.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 have been taken forward. A combined facility for the Sizewell B and C power stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations. This option is therefore considered to minimise impacts on the community</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)	
Environmental Impact	The location of the proposed visitor centre should be the furthest away from/avoid impacting undeveloped countryside.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 have been taken forward. A combined facility for the Sizewell B and C power stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations. Options proposed at Stage 1 were located further away from the power stations on greenfield land.</p> <p>Further information is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	Y
Site Suitability	The location of the proposed visitor centre should be the closest to the main development site or have the best view of the development site.	The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 have been taken forward. A combined facility for the Sizewell B and C power stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations. This location is therefore as close to the power stations as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>Further information is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Traffic Flow	The location of the proposed visitor centre should minimise impact on traffic and transport.	<p>Assessing the impact on traffic and transport was an important consideration in relocating the visitor centre to just west of the Sizewell A site.</p> <p>It would continue to be accessed via Sizewell Gap, which is an uncongested road, as the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) confirms.</p>	Y
Site Security	Security issues should be considered in relation to the location of the proposed visitor centre.	The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>Security is always a high priority for SZC Co. and visitors will not be able to access either the power station or the construction site directly from the Visitor Centre. Sizewell B power station offers site tours but these are subject to prior security vetting and with visitors accompanied at all times.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Site Facilities	Specific suggestions/information should be taken into consideration in relation to the location of the proposed visitor centre,	The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	such as facilities and amenities.	<p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>The Visitor Centre would be located at the north end of Coronation Wood, adjacent to the new training centre and comprise exhibition spaces, viewing area, auditorium, classrooms, offices and welfare amenities.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Site Suggestion	The proposed Visitor Centre should help the public with understanding of the development.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>One of the aims of the visitor centre will be to help the public with their understanding of the development.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Alternative Options	Suggestions for an alternative location for the proposed visitor centre, such as combining with the Sizewell B visitor centre	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations. This location is therefore as close to the power stations as reasonably practicable</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The existing Visitor Centre would be replaced with a new educational facility for visitors, including school groups, including additional information on Sizewell C power station.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3)</p>	
Site Access	Concern about the location for Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals, including access to the site, the inadequacy of the roads and potential danger and that it is too far from the main site.	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Lover's Lane but is now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y
Site Access	Positive comments about the location of Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals, because it is easily accessible, close to the main site and will attract more visitors.	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Lover's Lane but is now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Positive comments about Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals having less of an impact on the local community in comparison to other options.	<p>SZC Co. consulted on three potential sites for a new Sizewell visitor centre in its Stage 1 consultation, namely Option 1: Lover’s Lane; Option 2: Sizewell Beach; and Option 3: Goose Hill.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed during the Stage 1 consultation about the potential landscape and visual impacts of siting a new visitor centre off Lover’s Lane (Option 1) in a relatively open and elevated area of the AONB.</p> <p>The potential impact of a new visitor centre on Sizewell village (Option 2) was also a concern; and local residents questioned the adequacy of the road to accommodate an increase in traffic associated with the operation of a visitor centre. The Goose Hill site (Option 3) was seen as a more appropriate location, with its main advantage being its proximity to the new power station and being near to the new access road/car park.</p> <p>Further consideration was given to the potential of a visitor centre for the Sizewell power station complex by SZC Co. Nuclear Generation Limited (as the operator of the Sizewell B Station) and SZC Co. Sizewell C. Further details on the proposals for a visitor centre was consulted</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>upon prior to submission of an application for development consent.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the local community of Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals.	<p>The provision of a visitor centre for Sizewell C was identified in the Stage 1 consultation. This provision was generally supported by respondents to that consultation, recognising the ability of a visitor centre to illustrate the contribution of Sizewell C to carbon reduction and its role as part of the Suffolk Energy Coast, and demonstrate the importance of the surrounding AONB.</p> <p>SZC Co. consulted on three potential sites for a new Sizewell visitor centre in its Stage 1 consultation, namely Option 1: Lover’s Lane; Option 2: Sizewell Beach; and Option 3: Goose Hill.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed during the Stage 1 consultation about the potential landscape and visual impacts of siting a new visitor centre off Lover’s Lane (Option 1) in a relatively open and elevated area of the AONB. The potential impact of a new visitor centre on Sizewell village (Option 2) was also a concern; and local residents questioned the adequacy of the road to accommodate an</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>increase in traffic associated with the operation of a visitor centre. The Goose Hill site (Option 3) was seen as a more appropriate location, with its main advantage being its proximity to the new power station and being near to the new access road/car park.</p> <p>Further consideration was given to the potential of a visitor centre for the Sizewell power station complex by SZC Co. Nuclear Generation Limited (as the operator of the Sizewell B Station) and SZC Co. Sizewell C. Further details on the proposals for a visitor centre was consulted upon prior to submission of an application for development consent.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals having less of an impact on the environment compared to other options.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Site Facilities	Specific suggestions for Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals, such as an attached meeting/conference facility	The visitor centre would have meeting facilities as does that currently serving Sizewell B.	Y
Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals having less of an impact on traffic and transport than other options.	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Lover's Lane but would now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	N
Traffic Flow	Concern about the negative impact of Option 1 of the visitor centre proposals on transport/traffic/congestion	Assessing the impact on traffic and transport was an important consideration in relocating the visitor centre to just west of the Sizewell A site. It would continue to be accessed via Sizewell Gap, which is an uncongested	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	for Lovers Lane and Sizewell Beach.	road, as the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 8.5) confirms.	
Site Access	Concern about the location for Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals, including access issues and concern that it is too close to Sizewell Beach.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	Y
Site Access	Positive comments about the location of Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals, including good access, being located closer to the main site and	The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	being located to attract more visitors.	<p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the local community of Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).	
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals having less environmental and visual impact compared to other options.	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Site Legacy	Positive comments about Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals integrating well with beach	The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	amenities and providing potential legacy benefits.	<p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.</p> <p>Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals having less of an impact on traffic and transport than other options.	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Sizewell Beach but would now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y
Traffic Flow	Concern about the negative impact of Option 2 of the visitor centre proposals on transport/traffic/congestion	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Sizewell Beach but would now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y
	Concern about the location for Option 3 of the	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Goose Hill but would now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	visitor centre proposals, including access issues and being either too close or too far from the main site.		
Site Access	Positive comments about the location of Option 3 of the visitor centre proposals, for being easily accessible and close to the main site, to amenities, communities and recreation facilities and to the site car park.	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Goose Hill but would now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y
Community Impact	Positive comments about Option 3 of the visitor centre proposals having less of an impact on the local community in comparison to other options.	<p>SZC Co. consulted on three potential sites for a new Sizewell visitor centre in its Stage 1 consultation, namely Option 1: Lover’s Lane; Option 2: Sizewell Beach; and Option 3: Goose Hill.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed during the Stage 1 consultation about the potential landscape and visual impacts of siting a new visitor centre off Lover’s Lane (Option 1) in a relatively open and elevated area of the AONB. The potential impact of a new visitor centre on Sizewell village (Option 2) was also a concern; and local residents</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>questioned the adequacy of the road to accommodate an increase in traffic associated with the operation of a visitor centre. The Goose Hill site (Option 3) was seen as a more appropriate location, with its main advantage being its proximity to the new power station and being near to the new access road/car park.</p> <p>Further consideration was given to the potential of a visitor centre for the Sizewell power station complex by SZC Co. Nuclear Generation Limited (as the operator of the Sizewell B Station) and SZC Co. Sizewell C.</p> <p>Further details on the proposals for a visitor centre was consulted upon prior to submission of an application for development consent. Further details can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p>	
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the local community of Option 3 of the visitor centre proposals.	<p>SZC Co. consulted on three potential sites for a new Sizewell visitor centre in its Stage 1 consultation, namely Option 1: Lover’s Lane; Option 2: Sizewell Beach; and Option 3: Goose Hill.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed during the Stage 1 consultation about the potential landscape and visual impacts of siting a new visitor centre off Lover’s Lane (Option 1) in a relatively open and elevated area of the AONB. The</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>potential impact of a new visitor centre on Sizewell village (Option 2) was also a concern; and local residents questioned the adequacy of the road to accommodate an increase in traffic associated with the operation of a visitor centre. The Goose Hill site (Option 3) was seen as a more appropriate location, with its main advantage being its proximity to the new power station and being near to the new access road/car park.</p> <p>Further consideration was given to the potential of a visitor centre for the Sizewell power station complex by SZC Co. Nuclear Generation Limited (as the operator of the Sizewell B Station) and SZC Co. Sizewell C. Further details on the proposals for a visitor centre was consulted upon prior to submission of an application for development consent. Further details can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Comments about Option 3 of the visitor centre proposals having less of an impact on the environment compared to other options, including less of a visual impact. Some commenting on a	<p>The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility.</p> <p>Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	positive environmental impact for example by integrating nature walks.	development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations. Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Cumulative Impact	Positive comments about Option 3 of the visitor centre proposals spreading the potential impact on existing developments.	The Visitor Centre remains part of the proposals, although none of the locations proposed in Stage 1 will be taken forward. A combined facility for the B and C stations is now proposed, close to the current B station facility. Locating the Visitor Centre adjacent to the Sizewell B training centre and associated car parking contains the development within the expanded built footprint of Sizewell B. It is also considered to enhance the visitor experience by creating a direct relationship between the Visitor Centre and short-range views to the power stations.	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information on the location of the Visitor Centre is set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Traffic Flow	Comments about Option 3 of the visitor centre proposals having less of an impact on transport and traffic than other options.	The visitor centre is no longer proposed to be at Goose Hill but would now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y

e. Accommodation Proposals

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Further Assessment	Comments suggesting more detailed assessment is required for the accommodation proposals as there are concerns about implementation of the strategy based on the current figures.	<p>SZC Co. has worked closely with East Suffolk Council to identify and plan for the potential local effects of the Sizewell C Project's non-home-based workforce on the local housing market, housing services and vulnerability.</p> <p>As part of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has developed a plan for project accommodation (an on-site accommodation campus and caravan site) in order to balance the potential negative effects of workers on housing with the economic benefit of workers living in communities.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>A full assessment of the likely significant effects of the Sizewell C Project is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement (Socio-economics).</p> <p>SZC Co. has developed a suite of additional measures for the mitigation of effects including a Housing Fund and Accommodation Management System, set out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Use of Campus	Suggestions and requests that as much staff as possible should live on the campus, and stay on the campus wherever possible to reduce the impact of workers driving on local roads.	The DCO includes an accommodation campus adjacent to the site entrance to maximise the number of workers who do not need to use local roads. The campus includes a range of facilities to encourage workers to stay on campus. However, the impacts of trips off the campus, for example for leisure, are included in the traffic modelling work and impacts set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement, Chapter 10, Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Landscape and Visual Impact	Concern that the proposed campus is too large/tall and for too many people, being inappropriate for its rural surroundings.	The accommodation campus is limited to up 3 and 4 storeys (excluding roof mounted plant), and accommodation blocks would be orientated east-west to minimise visual effects (including at night). Structures that are lower in height than the accommodation blocks are located to the north (car deck) and south (amenity hub and	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>ancillary/servicing buildings) to reduce visual effects from in the vicinity of Leiston Abbey and from elevated locations to the north.</p> <p>Collectively these measures seek to constitute good design and the design has evolved since Stage 1 consultation. Further information is set out in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p> <p>Further details on the location of the accommodation campus are set out in the Site Selection Report at Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Cost	Comments and concerns about the cost effectiveness of the temporary accommodation strategy, or that SZC Co. are putting profits first in relation to their proposals.	SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation and the final proposals comprise a single, on-site accommodation campus, along with a caravan site on LEEIE. This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of workers using existing local accommodation with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	Support for the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance due to its proximity to the site.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the main development site campus and this option was taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>SZC Co. has identified that it is preferable to have as many workers accommodated on-site as possible. This is because: it greatly reduces the number of journeys on local roads, as well as time associated with travelling to and from the site; it increases productivity and reduces potential health and safety risks associated with long travel and work times; and it is vital that key workers are resident on-site, so they can be flexible in terms of the out of hours working that may be necessary to respond to emerging site needs and maintain construction productivity and progress. Providing</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>a single, on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Community Impact	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance is too close to the local communities and schools in Theberton and Eastbridge.	<p>SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation and the final proposals comprise a single, on-site accommodation campus, along with a caravan site on LEEIE. This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of workers using existing local accommodation with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. has considered the alternatives to a single, on-site accommodation campus. It has concluded that an off-site campus (either as an alternative, or an addition to a smaller, on-site accommodation campus i.e. a split campus model) would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys, and wider worker management.</p> <p>Providing a single, on-site accommodation campus would also help mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details on the approach to accommodation is contained in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10). Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement sets out the evolution of the Sizewell C Project through consultation and engagement, including consideration of alternative strategies and locations for workforce accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has also specified how it would deal with community issues in the context of the wider socio-economic strategy, see Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Following Stage 1, detailed measures have been proposed and consulted upon including a Worker Code of Conduct to set expectations and provide a means of addressing poor</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>behaviour. These standards would apply to all workers across the Sizewell C Project, within the site and accommodation campus, and in the community. The Code of Conduct has been developed in partnership with contractors and would be imposed through all main contracts, to ensure that prompt and effective action is taken to address any cases of unacceptable behaviour.</p> <p>A similar code of conduct has been developed and implemented at Hinkley Point C and West Burton B (SZC Co.'s combined cycle gas turbine power station) and these have proved to be highly effective.</p>	
Community Impact	Support for the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance due to it having less of an impact on surrounding communities.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the main development site campus and this option was taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>This would greatly reduce the number of journeys on local roads and help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Legacy	Concern about how the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance would have a negative impact on the community in general and for providing no legacy benefits.	<p>Option 1 (main development site campus) was taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>SZC Co. considered the alternatives to a single, on-site accommodation campus and concluded that an off-site campus (either as an alternative, or an addition to a smaller, on-site accommodation campus) would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management. Providing a single, on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>At Stage 2, SZC Co. consulted on the location of the campus sports pitches and at Stage 3 set out that these would be located off-site in Leiston. A 3G pitch and two MUGAs will be provided with shared worker and community use during the construction phase. These will be left as a legacy for the community once Sizewell C is operational.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Support for the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance due to its having a smaller environmental impact than other options, for example by combining sites would have a smaller footprint.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the siting of the accommodation campus next to the main development site entrance.</p> <p>Further information on the accommodation campus is set out in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p>	Y
Environmental Impact	Concern that the environmental impact of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance will be severe.	<p>The accommodation campus is limited to up 3 and 4 storeys (excluding roof mounted plant), and accommodation blocks would be orientated east-west to minimise visual effects (including at night). Structures that are lower in height than the accommodation blocks are located to the north (car deck) and south (amenity hub and ancillary/servicing buildings) to reduce visual effects from in the vicinity of Leiston Abbey and from elevated locations to the north.</p> <p>Collectively these measures seek to constitute good design and the design has evolved since Stage 1 consultation. Further information is set out in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Further details on the location of the accommodation campus are set out in the Site Selection Report at Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) contains further details on environmental impacts associated with the main development site.</p>	
Ecological Impact	Other topics about the accommodation site next to the site entrance including the need to link it to parking facilities, the lack of lighting and drainage in the area or the effect it could have on wildlife.	<p>Parking facilities alongside appropriate lighting and drainage would be provided within the accommodation campus.</p> <p>Further details on the design of the accommodation campus are set out in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p> <p>Further details relating to lighting are set out in the Lighting Management Plan at Appendix 2C of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Further details relating to drainage are set out in the Outline Drainage Strategy at Appendix 2B of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) contains further details on environmental impacts associated with the main development site.	
Site Location	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance is positioned too far away from the main site and recreational amenities for the staff who would be based there.	As set out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10), the campus would provide a range of recreational amenities for workers, including a range of high quality food options, opportunities to mix in the evenings through the on-site bar, and a range of organised events such as quiz nights, and access to the on-site gym, and (by bus) the off-site sports pitches. Separately, the main development site would contain the amenities required for the workforce, including office accommodation, an occupational health service and site canteens.	N
Traffic Flow	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance will generate a lot of traffic on the local roads.	SZC Co. recognise the concerns relating to the impact of the accommodation campus on the local road network. The traffic associated with the campus has been included in the traffic modelling. This forms the basis of the impact assessments and mitigation proposals in the Transport	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement , which are part of the DCO application.	
Worker Welfare	Support for the option of an accommodation campus next to the site entrance due to it being preferable for the workers based there.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the main development site campus and this option was taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>Hinkley Point C contractors have advised that benefits to both physical and mental health may be derived from minimising travel time (thereby the length of the working day).</p> <p>A single campus, within walking distance of the temporary construction area (TCA), would therefore play an important role in attracting the high quality workforce required to deliver such a large and complex project. It would meet worker needs and aspirations and help manage worker behaviour and impacts on the wider community, including traffic impacts.</p> <p>Further detail is out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Amenity and Recreation	Support for the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap, due to its site being closer to amenities and recreational facilities and the main site.	<p>This option was not taken forward following Stage 1 but the option taken forward is closer to the main development site than Sizewell Gap would have been.</p> <p>As set out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10), the campus would provide a range of recreational amenities for workers, including a range of high quality food options, opportunities to mix in the evenings through the on-site bar, and a range of organised events such as quiz nights, and access to the on-site gym, and (by bus) the off-site sports pitches.</p> <p>Further detail is out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y
Community Impact	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap is situated to close to existing schools and local communities.	<p>Concern noted and this option was not taken forward to Stage 2.</p> <p>Further detail is out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y
Site Legacy	Support for the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap,	This option was not taken forward following Stage 1.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	due to it having less of an impact on local communities due to it being further away than other options, and potentially positive impacts such as economic and legacy benefits for Leiston.	<p>However, the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10), seeks to strike a balance between the economic benefits of workers using existing local accommodation with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The campus will include off-site 3G sports pitches and 2 MUGAs which will be located in Leiston for shared worker and community use while the campus is operational and left as a legacy for the community thereafter.</p> <p>Further detail is out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Community Impact	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap will have a negative impact on the local community and provide no legacy benefit.	<p>Concern noted and this option (2) was not taken forward after Stage 1.</p> <p>The campus option (1) taken forward includes off-site 3G sports pitches and 2 MUGAs which will be located in Leiston for shared worker and community use while the campus is operational and left as a legacy for the community thereafter.</p> <p>Further detail is out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Support for the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap, due to it having less of an environmental impact than other options, for example by reducing the footprint of the development as it uses land already owned by SZC Co..	<p>This option was not taken forward following Stage 1. The campus location chosen subsequent to Stage 1 is adjacent to Eastbridge Road and is a location which enables the workers to be accommodated on-site. This location is closer to the main development site than Sizewell Gap would have been, and within walking distance of the site.</p> <p>Further details on the approach to accommodation is contained in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10). Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.2) sets out the evolution of the Sizewell C Project through consultation and engagement, including consideration of alternative strategies and locations for workforce accommodation.</p>	N
Site Access	Other topics about the accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap such as that it could block the visitor's centre or the need to consider its impact on other properties.	The visitor centre was not proposed at Sizewell Gap, but at Lover's Lane. However, it would now be located west of the Sizewell A site.	Y
Amenity and Recreation	Concern that the option of an accommodation	Concern noted and this option was not taken forward following Stage 1 - the option taken forward is closer to the	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	campus at Sizewell Gap is a long way from amenities and recreational facilities and the main site.	main development site than Sizewell Gap would have been. As set out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10), the campus would provide a range of recreational amenities for workers, including a range of high quality food options, opportunities to mix in the evenings through the on-site bar, and a range of organised events such as quiz nights, and access to the on-site gym, and (by bus) the off-site sports pitches.	
Traffic Flow	Support for the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap due to the less impact it will have on traffic in the area, particularly on Leiston town centre.	Option 2, Sizewell Gap campus, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was discounted after Stage 1 consultation.	Y
Traffic Flow	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus at Sizewell Gap will increase traffic around Lovers Lane.	Option 2, Sizewell Gap campus, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was discounted after Stage 1 consultation.	Y
Worker Welfare	Support for the option of an accommodation	This option (2) was not taken forward following Stage 1.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	campus at Sizewell Gap due to it being better for Sizewell workers.	<p>The option (1) taken forward is closer to the main development site than Sizewell Gap. Contractors have also advised that the provision of good quality campus accommodation can help contribute to SZC Co.'s aspirations for Zero Harm. Benefits to both physical and mental health may be derived from minimising travel time (thereby the length of the working day), access to comfortable rooms and a range of high quality food options, opportunities to mix in the evenings through the on-site bar, and a range of organised events such as quiz nights, and access to the on-site gym, and (by bus) the off-site sports pitches.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Amenities and Recreation	Support for the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston due to its proximity to local amenities and recreational facilities and the main site.	<p>This option (3) was not taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>The option (1) taken forward is closer to the main development site than Leiston East. SZC Co. has concluded that an off-site campus would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management. Providing an on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>As set out in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10), the campus would provide a range of recreational amenities for workers, including a range of high quality food options, opportunities to mix in the evenings through the on-site bar, and a range of organised events such as quiz nights, and access to the on-site gym, and (by bus) the off-site sports pitches.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Community Impact	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston is too close to the town of Leiston and local schools.	<p>This option (3) was not taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>Further details on the campus option selected (option 1 at stage 1 with design refinements at stages 2 and 3) may be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y
Community Impact	Support for the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston due to its smaller impact to communities such as Theberton and	<p>This option (3) was not taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>SZC Co. has concluded that an off-site campus would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	Eastbridge, and potential positive impact through economic benefits to Leiston.	<p>the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management. Providing an on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Community Impact	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston will result in workers in negative impacts on the local community and a lack of legacy benefits.	Based on evidence from contractors at Hinkley Point C, along with experience on Hinkley Point B and Sizewell B, SZC Co. has identified that it is preferable to have as many workers accommodated on-site as possible. SZC Co. has concluded that an off-site campus would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management. Providing an on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).	
Environmental Impact	Support for the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston, due to it having less of an environmental impact than other options.	<p>Leiston East Campus (Option 3) was not taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>The Development Site Campus (Option 1) taken forward is closer to the main development site than Leiston East, and within walking distance. SZC Co. has concluded that an off-site campus would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Site Selection Report, Appendix A to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y
Environmental Impact	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston will have a negative impact on the environment, particularly as it is in an Area of	Leiston East Campus (Option 3) was not taken forward following Stage 1. The Option (1) (Development Site Campus) lies outside the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	Outstanding Natural Beauty.		
Site Location	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston is a long way from the main development site.	<p>This option (3) was not taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>SZC Co. has concluded that an off-site campus would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management. Providing an on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y
Traffic Flow	Concern that the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston will increase traffic, particularly on Sizewell Gap, Lovers' Lane and junctions.	Option 3, Leiston East campus, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was discounted after Stage 1 consultation.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Worker Welfare	Support for the option of an accommodation campus east of Leiston due to it being better for Sizewell workers.	<p>Based on evidence from contractors at Hinkley Point C, along with experience on Hinkley Point B and Sizewell B, SZC Co. has identified that it is preferable to have as many workers accommodated on-site as possible. SZC Co. has concluded that an off-site campus would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management. Providing an on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	Y
Community Impact	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it should be located far away from local communities to minimise the impact on them.	<p>Providing a single, on-site accommodation campus approach would help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Experience from other projects indicates that locations that are too far from the site to be attractive to non-home-based-workers (at least 36 minutes to Lowestoft and 46</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>minutes to Ipswich by car but considerably longer via park and ride or direct bus services). As SZC Co. cannot enforce workers accommodation choice, it is likely that a campus(es) in these locations would be under-utilised. In turn, this could lead to increased pressure on tourist and private-rented sector accommodation close to site.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Alternative Options	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it should be located close to existing population centres and amenities, such as Leiston, or Ipswich or Lowestoft.	<p>Option 3 (a campus in Leiston) was not taken forward after Stage 1. SZC Co. concluded that an off-site campus would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management.</p> <p>Experience from other projects indicates that locations that are too far from the site to be attractive to non-home-based-workers (at least 36 minutes to Lowestoft and 46 minutes to Ipswich by car but considerably longer via park and ride or direct bus services). As SZC Co. cannot enforce workers accommodation choice, it is likely that a campus(es) in these locations would be under-utilised. In</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>turn, this could lead to increased pressure on tourist and private-rented sector accommodation close to site.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Site Location	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it should be located close to the main development site.	<p>Option 1 was chosen to be taken forward following Stage 1 – this comprises the main development site campus so is the closest option to the site.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	N
Site Legacy	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it should have long-term legacy value and bring future benefits to the local community.	<p>Following Stage 1, SZC Co. considered how the accommodation campus could provide a legacy benefit to the local community.</p> <p>Stage 2 set out options for sports facilities, which could either be located within the campus site or remotely in Leiston with public access. These plans were refined through consultation to identify proposals for permanent, shared sports facilities including a full-size 3G pitch and two MUGAs in Leiston. These will be left as a legacy for the community once Sizewell C is operational and will be available for shared community and worker use during the construction phase.</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).	
Integration with Other Sites	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it should integrate with other sites as part of the development proposals, such as the park and rides.	<p>The proposed Sizewell C Project accommodation – including campus and caravan sites – has been designed to provide a high-quality, safe living environment to attract a high-quality workforce.</p> <p>It is an integral part of the accommodation, socio-economic and transport strategies to ensure that the Sizewell C Project does not overload existing infrastructure and housing markets, and adversely affect community cohesion.</p> <p>The accommodation is closely integrated with other components of the Sizewell C Project – including influencing the sizing of park and ride facilities, development of off-site sports facilities in Leiston, and on-site worker welfare such as the occupational healthcare provision.</p> <p>More information about the context for SZC Co.’s accommodation proposals is included within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Amenity and Recreation	Criteria for the worker accommodation, that on-site amenities should be provided for workers, such as entertainment facilities.	<p>The accommodation campus would be competitively priced, and would be linked to access to a number of key facilities and characteristics to make it attractive to workers. Facilities and services are likely to include: sports facilities, a bar and occupational health, and security and administration services, which would also help to reduce potential community impacts.</p> <p>SZC CO. have worked with the local authorities to develop an appropriate balance to the accommodation strategy, and the construction and enhancement of local community amenities and facilities to meet the construction workforce entertainment, recreation and health needs, supporting the uptake of socio-economic opportunities, while fostering community cohesion and supporting local regeneration objectives.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Use of Land	Criteria for the worker accommodation, that land already owned by SZC Co. should be used, such as Sizewell A and B sites.	Option 1 (main development site campus) was taken forward following Stage 1. The layout of this option was consulted on further at Stage 2 and, following this, the campus footprint was reduced thereby minimising land take.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Visual Design	Suggestions for the design of the worker accommodation, that it should be built to a high standard, or other specifications such as an aesthetically pleasing design.	<p>SZC CO. note and welcome suggestions for campus accommodation that is well-designed.</p> <p>The height of the accommodation blocks in the campus has been limited to four storeys with a zone of three storey blocks closest to Eastbridge Road to minimise the massing immediately adjacent to the road. Orientation of the campus buildings east to west will minimise the extent of elevations and built mass along the western edge of the site.</p> <p>The design also incorporates a series of landscape buffers to enhance screening. The majority of hedgerows and trees around the perimeter of the site would be retained and the hedgerows adjacent to the existing bridleway, access road to Upper Abbey Farm and Eastbridge Road would all be retained, providing screening on views from Eastbridge Road.</p> <p>Full details can be found in Chapter 13 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Restoration	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it must be temporary, and the land restored afterwards.	The accommodation campus is part of the temporary construction area which will be removed and the land reinstated following the completion of development.	N
Site Location	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it should be located far away from designated areas to avoid impact on the environment.	<p>Chapter 13 (Landscape and visual) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) assesses the landscape and visual impact of the Sizewell C Project, including the campus, in detail.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement acknowledges that there would be some significant adverse effects on landscape character of the AONB arising as a result of the development, including the campus, although the effects have been minimized as far as possible.</p> <p>The effects on the AONB are minimised by restricting accommodation blocks to four storeys in height (three storeys along western edge), strengthening the hedgerow planting along the eastern side of Eastbridge Road to screen the campus and by minimising lighting spill. The Sizewell C Project is therefore considered appropriate in this regard, and in the context of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6.</p>	Y

Theme: Environment – General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Criteria for the worker accommodation, in that it should not be located on undeveloped countryside to avoid negative environmental impact.	<p>The campus location chosen subsequent to Stage 1 is adjacent to Eastbridge Road and is a location which enables the workers to be accommodated on-site but minimises the impacts on the AONB in a number of ways. The accommodation campus would be temporary and removed during the commissioning and land restoration phase of the main site construction phasing. An on-site accommodation campus has been selected and is proposed, which offers a number of benefits, notably: reduced number of journeys on local roads and travelling time to and from the construction site; increased productivity and reduced health and safety risks associated with long travel and work times; and flexibility in terms of the out of hours working that may be necessary to respond to emerging site needs and maintain construction productivity and progress. The chosen option is the only site at Stage 1 consultation located wholly outside of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.</p> <p>Further details are set out in Chapter 6, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Comments supporting the campus proposals because of its distance from the local community.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the main development site campus and this option was taken forward following Stage 1.</p> <p>SZC Co. has identified that it is preferable to have as many workers accommodated on-site as possible. This is because: it greatly reduces the number of journeys on local roads, as well as time associated with travelling to and from the site; it increases productivity and reduces potential health and safety risks associated with long travel and work times; and it is vital that key workers are resident on-site, so they can be flexible in terms of the out of hours working that may be necessary to respond to emerging site needs and maintain construction productivity and progress. Providing a single, on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	N
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative impact of the campus on the local	SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation and the final proposals comprise a single, on-site accommodation	N

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	community, because of its size and proximity to small rural communities.	<p>campus, along with a caravan site on LEEIE. This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of workers using existing local accommodation with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details on the approach to accommodation is contained in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p> <p>SZC Co. has also specified how it would deal with community issues in the context of the wider socio-economic strategy, see Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Following Stage 1, detailed measures have been proposed and consulted upon including a Worker Code of Conduct to set expectations and provide a means of addressing poor behaviour. These standards would apply to all workers across the Sizewell C Project, within the site and accommodation campus, and in the community. The Code of Conduct has been developed in partnership with contractors and would be imposed through all main</p>	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>contracts, to ensure that prompt and effective action is taken to address any cases of unacceptable behaviour.</p> <p>A similar code of conduct has been developed and implemented at Hinkley Point C and West Burton B (SZC Co.'s combined cycle gas turbine power station) and these have proved to be highly effective.</p>	
Site Legacy	Concern that the accommodation campus will have little legacy value	<p>Following Stage 1, SZC Co. considered how the accommodation campus could provide a legacy benefit to the local community.</p> <p>Stage 2 set out options for sports facilities, which could either be located within the campus site or remotely in Leiston with public access. These plans were refined through consultation to identify proposals for permanent, shared sports facilities including a full-size 3G pitch and two MUGAs in Leiston. These will be left as a legacy for the community once Sizewell C is operational and will be available for shared community and worker use during the construction phase.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	N
Site Location	Concern that all of the proposed campus sites	Option 1 was chosen to be taken forward following Stage 1 – this comprises the main development site campus so is	N

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	are located too far from the main development site.	the closest option to the site. Workers will be able to walk to the site entrance turnstiles from the campus. Further details can be found within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).	
Traffic Flow	Concern that an accommodation campus will generate a lot of traffic on the local roads.	SZC Co. recognise the concerns relating to traffic on the local roads that is generated by the accommodation campus. The traffic associated with the campus has been included in the traffic modelling. This forms the basis of the impact assessments and mitigation proposals in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement , which are part of the DCO application.	N

f. Northern Park and Ride

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Need Case	Suggestion that all three proposed park and ride options should be built.	SZC Co. welcome support for the concept of a park and ride.	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		All three sites proposed at Stage 1 for the northern park and ride are not needed and nor would all three southern sites be. Workers would be drawn to the one nearest to the construction site to minimise their travel time, while the other two would be underused. Multiple stops would increase bus journeys times, meaning additional buses and drivers would be needed to carry the same number of passengers. The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) is based on a single northern and a single southern park and ride site, at Darsham and Wickham Market respectively.	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	Positive comments about access and the location of Option 1 of the northern park and ride proposals, for example, that it is close to the main development site.	<p>These comments are noted. It is important that the park and ride site chosen to proceed with is a suitable distance away from the main development site to offer benefits of reducing SZC traffic on roads near to the main development site.</p> <p>Following Stage 1 SZC Co. however selected Option 2 (Darsham) as its preferred northern park and ride site. This is because it was considered to be preferable over the other two site options in terms of consultation</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>feedback, transport and socio-economics. Option 3 (A12/A144 Junction) was held in reserve. At Stage 2 SZC CO. stated that it would only be taken forward if the Darsham site proved to be unsuitable in light of feedback from consultations or further environmental or technical studies. At Stage 2 Option 1 (Yoxford Road) was considered least favourable in terms of consultation feedback, environmental considerations, socio-economics and planning policy.</p> <p>Full details and justification for the park and ride sites proposed as part of the DCO application are contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Chapters 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 3 and 4 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 1 of the northern park and ride proposals being a benefit to commuters on local roads and having less of an impact on road transport than other options.	Option 1, Yoxford Road, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Positive comments about Option 1 of the northern park and ride proposals having less of an impact on or benefitting the local community compared to other options.	<p>SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including park and ride – as part of an integrated plan to attract a high quality workforce for the Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport the workforce to the site using park and ride facilities.</p> <p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of construction and operation on local communities in terms of environmental change such as noise, air quality and traffic, and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate.</p> <p>Details of the design development of Associated Development sites are included within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Site Legacy	Concern about the negative impact on the local community, including lack of legacy value, of Option 1 of the	SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including park and ride – as part of an integrated plan to attract a high quality workforce for the	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	northern park and ride proposals.	<p>Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport the workforce to the site using park and ride facilities.</p> <p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of construction and operation on local communities in terms of environmental change such as noise, air quality and traffic, and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate.</p> <p>Details of the design development of Associated Development sites are included within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>SZC Co. included the proposals for a park and ride as a means to contribute towards the reduction of the amount of additional traffic generated by the construction workforce on local roads and through local villages and thereby minimise the impact on the local communities.</p> <p>Following completion of construction of the power station, the use of both park and ride sites would cease and the sites would be restored to agricultural use.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the northern park and ride at Darsham has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement. The assessment considers the potential construction, operation and removal and reinstatement impacts of the development.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed. This includes the implementation of a Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 8.11) to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution. In addition, landscaping and buffer zones are proposed to protect receptors and screen the development.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4) provides a description of the proposed development and explains how the site would be used. This chapter confirms that once the need for the park and ride facility has ceased, the buildings and associated infrastructure, would be removed in accordance with a demolition and restoration plan. This would maximise the potential for re-use of building modules and materials.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		When the site has been cleared, the area would be returned to agricultural use.	
Environmental Impact	Concern about the negative environmental impact of Option 1 of the northern park and ride proposals.	Option 1, Yoxford Road, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N
Traffic Flow	Concern about the negative impact of Option 1 of the northern park and ride proposals on traffic and transport	Option 1, Yoxford Road, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N
Site Location	Concern that Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals is located too close to the main development site.	Option 2, Darsham, is the site included in the DCO and Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). The site location allows traffic from the A12, A144, A145 and A146 corridors to be intercepted before reaching Yoxford. A site further north would not pick up A144 traffic and would therefore have less of a mitigating effect.	N
Amenities	Positive comments about Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals being located close to amenities for example	SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including park and ride – as part of an integrated plan to attract a high quality workforce for the	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the petrol station and close to the development site, which workers would prefer.	<p>Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport the workforce to the site using park and ride facilities.</p> <p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of construction and operation on local communities in terms of environmental change such as noise, air quality and traffic, and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate. SZC Co. has also considered the practicalities and amenities required by workers, and the potential effects on local businesses.</p> <p>Details of the design development of Associated Development sites are included within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Community Impact	Positive comments about Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals having less of an impact, or a beneficial impact, on the local community.	SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including park and ride – as part of an integrated plan to attract a high quality workforce for the Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport the workforce to the site using park and ride facilities.</p> <p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of construction and operation on local communities in terms of environmental change such as noise, air quality and traffic, and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate.</p> <p>Details of the design development of Associated Development sites are included within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Community Impact	Concern about the negative impact on the local community of Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals, for example by causing a greater amount of road traffic issues.	Option 2, Darsham, is the site included in the DCO. The impact on the A12 is assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals	This comment has been considered however the Option 2 site is green field and does not contain industrial uses. There are however small-scale industrial uses nearby.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	having less of an impact on the local environment than other options, especially because the location is already industrial/brownfield land.		
Environmental Impact	Concern about the negative environmental impact of Option 2 of the northern park and ride proposals.	<p>These comments are noted. It was found following the Stage 1 consultation that greater impacts on the environment would be had from Option 1, which was closer to woodland, and Option 3, which was more intrusive in the open countryside.</p> <p>Detailed mitigation measures to mitigate environmental impacts of the proposals are set out in Chapters 4-12 Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4).</p>	N
Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 3 of the northern park and ride proposals being a benefit to commuters on local roads and having less of an impact on road traffic.	Option 3, at the A12/A144 junction, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N
Community Impact	Positive comments about Option 3 of the northern	These comments are noted.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	park and ride proposals having less of an impact on the local community than other options, by being safer and having greater legacy value	<p>At Stage 2 SZC Co. found that Option 3 (A12/A144 Junction) may generate some increased business activity in the surrounding area, although to a lesser extent compared to Option 2 (Darsham).</p> <p>Businesses with the potential to benefit could include the nearby caravan park and golf course, and, to some extent, Darsham businesses.</p> <p>Please see Chapters 4-12 of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5) for further details regarding the potential impacts of the northern park and ride at Darsham.</p>	
Community Impact	Concern about the negative impact on the local community, such as increased traffic and congestion, and lack of legacy benefits of Option 3 of the northern park and ride proposals	<p>SZC Co. are committed to minimising adverse impacts on the local community as far as possible.</p> <p>The Park and Ride Option 3 presented at Stage 1 Consultation was held in reserve at Stage 2 Consultation in case the Darsham site (Option 2) proved to be unsuitable in light of feedback from consultations or further environmental or technical studies.</p> <p>By the Stage 3 Consultation SZC Co. had sufficient confidence in the site at Darsham and its suitability that</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the site at A12/A144 junction (Option 3) was no longer required to be held in reserve.</p> <p>Full details and justification for the park and ride sites proposed as part of the DCO application are contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about Option 3 of the northern park and ride proposals having less of an impact on the local environment than other options, for example because the location is already industrial/brownfield site	<p>This comment is noted.</p> <p>Further to the Stage 1 consultation, Option 2 (Darsham) was however considered to be preferable over the other two site options in terms of consultation feedback, transport and socio-economics.</p> <p>Full details and justification for the park and ride sites proposed as part of the DCO application are contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Environmental Impact	Concern about the negative environmental impact of Option 3 of the northern park and ride proposals	Option 3, at the A12/A144 junction, does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N

g. Southern Park and Ride

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Need Case	Suggestions that all three southern park and ride options should be built.	<p>All three sites proposed at Stage 1 for the southern park and ride are not needed. Workers would be drawn to the one nearest to the construction site to minimise their travel time, while the other two would be underused.</p> <p>Multiple stops would increase bus journeys times, meaning additional buses and drivers would be needed to carry the same number of passengers. The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) is based on a single southern park and ride site at Wickham Market.</p>	N
Traffic Flow	Support for the southern park and ride to reduce local traffic impact.	<p>SZC Co. are keen to reduce local traffic impacts on the A12 through Marlesford, Little Glemham, Stratford St Andrew and Farnham.</p> <p>The southern park and ride site intercepts construction worker traffic before it reaches these settlements, so reducing traffic impacts, as reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	Comments about the benefits of the location of the combined lorry park and park and ride facility option, for having good access and should be closest to the main site.	<p>The southern park and ride site included a lorry holding area in early stages of the proposals. Whilst this has been removed and a separate Freight Management Facility proposed elsewhere, the park and ride still benefits from having good access to/from the A12, and is located to reduce the traffic impacts on the A12 through Marlesford, Little Glemham, Stratford St Andrew and Farnham.</p> <p>The transport effects of the facility are fully assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Environmental Impact	Comments about the benefits of having a combined lorry park and park and ride facility, such as positive legacy value, being more secure, the most environmentally friendly by requiring less land take and minimising visual intrusion, and reducing traffic.	<p>Following the Stage 1 consultation, these comments were given further consideration by SZC Co..</p> <p>At Stage 2 SZC Co. considered that HGV deliveries and movements to and from the main development site could be effectively managed without the requirements for an external off site freight management facility or lorry park.</p> <p>At Stage 3 SZC Co. considered that proposing a standalone freight management facility was more appropriate than proposing a combined site with a park and ride facility as the two facilities have different location</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>requirements. A park and ride facility would need to be attractive and convenient for construction workers travelling from a specific area whereas to optimise the benefit to the local road network, the freight management facility would be best located where it could intercept longer distance HGV traffic before they enter the more restricted lengths of the A12. On this basis a location for the freight management facility close to the original area of search used at Stage 1 was proposed at the Stage 3 consultation.</p> <p>The DCO application proposes a standalone freight management facility at Seven Hills. The DCO application also proposed that the southern park and ride facility will also include a postal consolidation facility and an area at the north of the site for a Traffic Incident Management Area to enable heavy good vehicles (HGVs) to be held in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>Further assessment work is contained within Chapters 4-12 of Volume 4 and 8 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative environmental impact from combining	Following the Stage 1 consultation, these comments were given further consideration by SZC Co..	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the lorry park and park and ride locations, as it would be too large and visually intrusive.	At Stage 2 consultation the lorry park was removed from the proposals. The location of Wickham Market is the optimal site as it is closest to the A12, and all structures have been proposed at a single storey level as to reduce visual obtrusiveness. Mitigation has been further developed for the proposed park and ride, and full details can be found in Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement .	
Lorry Park / Park and Ride Combination	Concerns that a combined lorry park and park and ride facility would interfere with each other, and should not be mixed.	<p>The southern park and ride site included a lorry holding area at early stages, but this has now been removed and a separate Freight Management Facility proposed.</p> <p>The transport effects of the facility as part of the wider transport strategy are fully assessed in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). There was however no evidence at early stages that combining the two uses onto a single site would exacerbate these effects or compromise their operation.</p>	Y
Lorry Park / Park and Ride Combination	Specific suggestions and requests for a combined lorry park and park and ride facility, for example access from the roundabout, separate	<p>The southern park and ride site included a lorry holding area at early stages, but this has now been removed and a separate Freight Management Facility proposed.</p> <p>The transport effects of the facility as part of the wider transport strategy are fully assessed in Chapter 10</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	access for cars and lorries and café facilities.	(Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). There is a single point of access from the A12 northbound on slip road as a roundabout is not required given the predicted traffic flows. The site includes some amenities for use by workers waiting for a bus.	
Site Legacy / Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 1 of the southern park and ride proposals as having less of an impact or benefitting the local community, for example by providing legacy benefits, safety, less impact on traffic and benefitting commuters.	SZC Co. welcome support for the Option 1 of the southern park and ride proposals. The southern park and ride site has good access from the A12, minimising congestion and road safety impacts on local roads. Further information is in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 8.5).	N
Site Legacy	Concern about the negative impact on the local community of Option 1 of the southern park and ride proposals, for example due to lack of legacy value.	SZC Co. recognise the concerns regarding the impact of the park and ride on the local community. The impacts of the southern park and ride site, as part of the overall transport strategy, are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Environmental Statement, Volumes 3 and 4 , (Doc Ref. 6.4 - 6.5).	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Mitigation is proposed where appropriate. There is no legacy value in any of the park and ride sites since their use is only temporary during the Sizewell C construction period, as the DCO process requires.	
Site Suitability	Positive comments about Option 1 of the southern park and ride proposals having less of an impact on the environment, for example because they believed the location to already be industrialised.	This comment has been considered however the Option 1 site is green field and does not contain industrial uses.	N
Environmental Impact	Concern about the negative environmental impact of Option 1 of the southern park and ride proposals.	This comment has been noted. Option 3 was discounted after Stage 2 consultation as it was considered to have greater environmental impacts than Option 1. Nonetheless, SZC CO. are committed to mitigating the impacts of the proposal. Further information can be found at Chapters 4-12 of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5).	N
Amenities / Worker Welfare	Positive comments about the location of Option 2 of the southern park and ride proposals for its good access and being close to amenities, the	Option 2 at Woodbridge does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	main site and the train station, which workers would prefer.		
Community Impacts / Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 2 of the southern park and ride proposals as having less of an impact or benefitting the local community, for example by providing legacy benefits, safety, less impact on traffic and benefitting commuters.	Option 2 at Woodbridge does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N
Site Suitability	Positive comments about Option 2 of the southern park and ride proposals having less of an impact on the local environment than other options, for example because the location is already near developments.	<p>Three options for the siting of the southern park and ride were proposed at the Stage 1 consultation. These were located at Wickham Market (Option 1, which was the preferred option), Woodbridge (Option 2) and Potash Corner (Option 3). Of the three options presented, Option 1 (Wickham Market) was generally supported by respondents.</p> <p>At Stage 2, we consulted on the Wickham Market site as our preferred location for the southern park and ride facility, with Woodbridge held in reserve. At subsequent stages of consultation the site at Wickham Market</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>continued to be our preferred site and it is proposed as the site of the southern park and ride in the DCO application.</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explains how further technical assessment work combined with consultation feedback led to the selection of the DCO application scheme. The Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed development is contained within Chapters 4-12 of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
Site Location	Positive comments about access and the location of Option 3 of the southern park and ride proposals, for example by being closer to the main site.	<p>Following the Stage 1 consultation, this comment was noted in SZC Co.'s further assessment of appropriate locations for park and ride facilities.</p> <p>The location of the park and ride is driven partly by the need to ensure that they can intercept traffic on the way to the Sizewell C main development site.</p> <p>Option 3 (Potash Corner) was however the least preferred of all three options in the questionnaire responses at the Stage 1 consultation.</p> <p>At Stage 2, the Wickham Market site was consulted on (Option 1) as the preferred location for the southern park</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>and ride facility, with Woodbridge (Option 2) held in reserve. Option 3 (Potash Corner) was not progressed further.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Traffic Flow	Positive comments about Option 3 of the southern park and ride proposals having less of an impact on the local community by being located further away from communities than other options and by having less of an impact on traffic and congestion.	Option 3 at Potash Corner does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was eliminated after Stage 2 consultation.	N

h. Lorry Park Site Options

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Need Case	Comments stating that a lorry park will reduce the impact of the development on the amount of traffic and congestion in the area.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the identification of the benefits of a lorry park.</p> <p>The Freight Management Facility at Seven Hills would regulate the flow of HGVs towards the construction site and seek to reduce congestion on the A12 and at the main construction site entrance. The lorry holding area at southern park and ride is to provide an area for HGV to wait should there be a traffic incident on the local highway network. The transport aspects of each scheme are assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	Concerns about access and the location of all options for the proposed lorry park, for example	The proposed Freight Management Facility site has good access to A12 and A14. It is positioned to allow SZC CO. to regulate the HGV flow on the A12 to reduce congestion so needs to be south of the single carriageway section around Woodbridge. Sites closer to the main site would	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	being too far from the main site.	<p>not achieve this and would mean unregulated HGV flows across a larger part of the local highway network.</p> <p>The Freight Management Facility has been incorporated into the traffic modelling that forms part of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Site Access	Comments about the beneficial access and good location of all options for the location of the proposed lorry park.	<p>SZC Co. welcome the identification of the benefits of the proposed location of the lorry park.</p> <p>Both the Freight Management Facility at Seven Hills and the lorry holding area at the southern park and ride have good highway access, an important requirement for these sites. The capacity of the accesses to these sites, the impact on the surrounding road network and whether there is any need for mitigation are all addressed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Lack of Options	Comments stating that all Options of the lorry park proposals are very similar to each other, providing little distinction or choice.	<p>The Freight Management Facility site must have good access to A12 and A14 and be south of the single carriageway section of A12 at Woodbridge.</p> <p>Several sites were proposed that met this requirement, e.g. Orwell Lorry Park, near Seven Hills and, at Stage 3, Innocence Farm, which all exhibit this characteristic.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The site just east Seven Hills, proposed at Stage 3, forms part of the DCO proposals and is considered in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Site Location	Concerns about the locations of Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park, in regards to access issues and being too far from the main site.	<p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns about the access issues to the Option 1 and 2 locations. However, the access to these sites was ideal as it is already in use for A14 lorry movements. The site is well located to the south of the single carriageway A12 at Woodbridge.</p> <p>Unfortunately the site is no longer available to SZC Co. so does not form part of the DCO proposals.</p>	N
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative community impact of Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park.	Concerns are noted. The sites were not taken forward to Stage 2 and do not form part of the DCO proposals.	Y
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park as having less of an impact on the local environment than other options.	Comments are noted. The sites were not taken forward to Stage 2 and do not form part of the DCO proposals.	Y
HGV Controls	Comments about how Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park would	These sites were ideal for controlling A14 lorry movements. Unfortunately the site is no longer available to SZC Co. so do not form part of the DCO proposals.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	be better for controls and management of HGVs to be put in place.		
Traffic Flow	Concern about the impact on traffic and congestion in the area around Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park.	The Orwell Lorry park sites are no longer available to SZC Co. so do not form part of the DCO proposals.	N
Site Suggestions	Suggestions for the construction or use of Options 1 and 2 for the Orwell Lorry Park, such as adequate space for dock delay stack and addressing the poor visibility joining the A12 eastbound from the lorry park.	The Orwell Lorry park sites are no longer available to SZC Co. so do not form part of the DCO proposals.	N
Site Location	Positive comments about Option 2 of the Orwell Lorry Park locations being close to the development site.	<p>The principal requirement of the lorry park is that it is located on the strategic road network and close enough to the main development site to allow the accurate management of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).</p> <p>Option 1 and 2 were however not taken forward to Stage 2 consultation. This is because since Stage 1 consultation</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>planning permission has been granted for employment development of both sites (for B1, B2 and B8 purposes) and discussions with the landowner strongly suggest that the land would no longer be available to SZC Co. by the time development consent for the Sizewell C Project is granted.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Site Location	Concerns about access and the location for Option 3, Seven Hills Junction, for example being too far from the main site.	<p>The principal requirement of the lorry park is that it is located on the strategic road network and close enough to the main development site to allow the accurate management of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).</p> <p>Option 3 meets this criteria and was taken forward to Stage 2 consultation and ultimately proposed as part of the DCO application. Further information regarding site selection is contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Site Location	Positive comments about the location of Option 3, Seven Hills Junction lorry	The principal requirement of the lorry park is that it is located on the strategic road network and close enough to the main development site to allow the accurate management of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	park, for example being closer to the main site.	Option 3 meets this criteria and was taken forward to Stage 2 consultation and ultimately proposed as part of the DCO application. Further information regarding site selection is contained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Community Impact / Benefit	Positive comments about the lack of community impact and beneficial legacy value of Option 3, Seven Hills Junction lorry park.	<p>SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including lorry parks – as part of an integrated plan to efficiently deliver the Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport materials to the site using lorry park facilities. A site just to the east of that proposed at Stage 1 therefore forms part of the DCO proposals to control and manage HGV movements, see Volume 8 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.9) (Freight Management).</p> <p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of construction and operation on local communities in terms of environmental change such as noise, air quality and traffic,</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate.</p> <p>Details of the design development of Associated Development sites are included within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
HGV Controls	Comments about how Option 3, Seven Hills Junction lorry park would be a better location for HGV controls and management.	A site just to the east of that proposed at Stage 1 forms part of the DCO proposals to control and manage HGV movements and is considered in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	Y
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about Option 3, Seven Hills Junction having less of an impact on the local environment than other options.	SZC Co. welcomes the positive feedback regarding Option 3, and have worked to develop proposals for associated development as part of an integrated plan to efficiently deliver the Sizewell C Project, whilst having their impact mitigated on the environment.	N
Size of Site / Environmental Impact	Concerns about the impact on the environment of Option 3, Seven Hills Junction, including its large size and intrusiveness.	SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including lorry parks – as part of an integrated plan to efficiently deliver the Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport materials to the site using lorry park facilities.</p> <p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of construction and operation on the local landscape character, and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate.</p> <p>Further information is contained within Chapter 6 (Landscape and Visual) of Volume 8 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.9).</p>	
Economic Impacts / Benefits	Positive comments about Option 3, Seven Hills Junction as being the least intrusive and having less of an impact on existing businesses and users of the location compared to the Orwell Lorry Park	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the positive feedback regarding Option 3 (Seven Hills Junction) in terms of effects on existing businesses.</p> <p>SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including lorry parks – as part of an integrated plan to efficiently deliver the Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport materials to the site using lorry park facilities.</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of construction and operation on local communities in terms of environmental change such as noise, air quality and traffic, and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the Site Selection Report attached to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Site Legacy	Concern that Option 3, Seven Hills Junction, will have no legacy value for the local community.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concerns regarding Option 3 (Seven Hills Junction) in terms of effects on legacy and the local community.</p> <p>SZC Co. have developed proposals for associated development – including lorry parks – as part of an integrated plan to efficiently deliver the Sizewell C Project, while minimising adverse effects on transport and housing markets, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Part of this strategy is developing sustainable ways to transport materials to the site using lorry park facilities.</p> <p>In selecting the options for locations, scale and operation of these sites, SZC Co. has considered the potential effects of</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>construction and operation on local communities in terms of environmental change such as noise, air quality and traffic, and designed in mitigation features where considered appropriate.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the Site Selection Report attached to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Site Access	Criteria for the location of the lorry park, that it should be located somewhere with good access.	<p>The proposed Freight Management Facility site has good access to the A12 and A14.</p> <p>The Freight Management Facility has been incorporated into the traffic modelling that forms part of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	N
Traffic Flow	Criteria for the location of the lorry park, that it should be located wherever has the least impact, on traffic and congestion or in general.	<p>The proposed site just to the east of Seven Hills has good access to the A14 and A12.</p> <p>It was selected as it minimises "dead mileage" since all movements are possible at the Seven Hills junction.</p> <p>The site is considered in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Safety	Criteria for the proposed lorry park, that it should uphold safety standards.	<p>The lorry park evolved into the Freight Management Facility over the course of the consultation process.</p> <p>The chosen option at Seven Hills introduced a ghost island junction allowing HGVs to safely enter and exit the site without impacting on the safety of other traffic. Further details regarding the potential impacts of the proposals on the existing transport network, including a consideration of safety, can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Legacy	Comments about the legacy benefits associated with all options for the location of the proposed lorry park.	<p>As the Sizewell C Project has evolved following the Stage 1 consultation, further environmental impact assessment work has been undertaken for related topics such as noise, landscape and visual, transport and air quality, and more work has been carried out on the community-related aspects of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>This has included the effects on community facilities and public services such as health and education, emergency services, community safety, amenity and severance from transport measures, and an assessment of in-combination</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>effects for specific local communities. Engagement with relevant service providers has been undertaken and more information was provided through subsequent stages of consultation.</p> <p>Further details are contained in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Traffic Flow	Concern about the impact on the A12/A14 junction and surrounding traffic form all options for the location of the proposed lorry park.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concerns relating to traffic impacts at the A12/A14 junction.</p> <p>The impacts of the Freight Management Facility on the A12/A14 Seven Hills junction are fully assessed in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>There is currently peak period queueing at the junction. It will become partially signal controlled as part of the Adastral Park committed development, leading to a minor improvement in junction performance. Sizewell C would increase traffic volumes by about 2%, which could lead to some additional queueing during peak periods.</p>	N
Site Restoration	Concern that any location for the lorry park facility will not be restored to its	These comments are noted.	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	original state, and need for further reassurance that restoration will happen.	<p>As the Sizewell C Project has evolved, the impacts on the soils, agricultural land, geology and land quality have been assessed.</p> <p>The mitigation proposals for the Sizewell C Project includes land remediation following the cessation of the use. Further information is available at Chapter 10 (Soils and Agriculture) of Volume 8 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.9).</p>	
Community Impact	Comments suggesting that any lorry park should reduce the impact of the proposals on the local community.	<p>As the Sizewell C Project has evolved, the impact assessments have been developed for related topics such as noise, landscape and visual, transport and air quality, significant work on the community-related aspects of the Sizewell C Project have been undertaken.</p> <p>This includes the effects on community facilities and public services such as health and education, emergency services, community safety, amenity and severance from transport measures, and an assessment of in-combination effects for specific local communities. Engagement with relevant service providers has been undertaken.</p> <p>Details are set out in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	N

i. Transport: Junction and Road Improvement Options

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Four-Village Bypass	Opposition to a four-village bypass on the A12 as suggested by some groups.	The four village bypass was discounted after the Stage 1 consultation and does not form part of the DCO.	Y
Community Impacts	Concerns about the community impact from the Farnham bypass option, with comments that it will exacerbate current traffic issues by moving congestion further up the A12.	<p>The Farnham bypass (Option 1) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and within Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 and in Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y
Community Impacts / Benefits	Positive comments and community benefits of Option 1, the Farnham bypass, for providing legacy value and being the least intrusive to the community.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the positive feedback regarding Option 1 (Farnham Bypass) in terms of effects on legacy and intrusiveness to the community.</p> <p>This consideration has been part of a wider set of planning, social, economic and environmental considerations when determining a preferred option to take forward to the DCO. On balance, the Farnham bypass was</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and design evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	
Short-term Solution	Comments that Option 1, the Farnham bypass is the minimum requirement for improvements and will be insufficient in improving congestion, only providing a short term solution.	<p>The Farnham bypass (Option 1) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Alternative Options	Suggestions for an alternative to the Option 1 Farnham bypass, for example different routes for the bypass or a longer	This consideration has been part of a wider set of planning, social, economic and environmental considerations when determining a preferred option to take forward to the DCO.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	three or four village bypass.	<p>On balance, the Farnham bypass was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Safety Benefits	Comments stating that Option 1, the Farnham bypass would improve existing safety issues on the A12, such as the Farnham bend.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the positive feedback regarding Option 1 (Farnham Bypass) in terms of its effects on improving safety issues on the A12.</p> <p>The Farnham bypass (Option 1) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Site Legacy	Positive comments about Option 2, the widening of Farnham bend, as being the least	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the positive feedback regarding Option 2 (Farnham bend).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	intrusive with the most legacy benefits.	<p>Consideration was given to a wide range of socio-economic, environmental and planning factors. The Farnham bend would have required the demolition of a number of buildings, including a Grade II Listed building. As such, the Farnham bend widening (Option 2) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Traffic Flow	Comments that the widening of Farnham bend (Option 2) would exacerbate existing congestion problems on the A12.	<p>Consideration was given to a wide range of socio-economic, environmental and planning factors. The Farnham bend would have required the demolition of a number of buildings, including a Grade II Listed building. As such, the Farnham bend widening (Option 2) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport)</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		of Volume 2 , and Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the environment from Option 3, HGV traffic controls at Farnham.	<p>The HGV controls at Farnham (Option 3) were discounted after Stage 2 consultation and do not form part of the DCO application. It was judged that whilst the controls would improve safety at the junction, they would do nothing to mitigate the increased traffic flow through the bend, and so could have led to congestion and potential adverse air quality effects. The two village bypass scheme forms part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further transport information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2, and Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y

j. Rail Improvements

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Opposition to the rail proposals because of imposition on the locality	The rail proposals, together with the marine strategy, were proposed to minimise the number of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements on the local roads. Work to evaluate	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and countryside and the belief that they are not needed.	<p>both the marine and rail ‘maximised’ scenarios was ongoing following Stage 1 to establish whether a marine-led or rail-led scenario (or a combined approach) would be suitable for the delivery of bulk freight.</p> <p>Whilst rail proposals would impact on the locality and countryside, they would carry the benefit of reducing the amount of road traffic during the construction of Sizewell C. The proposed rail extension route would also be a temporary piece of infrastructure that would be removed once its use has ceased. The land, including the agricultural fields and temporary level crossings, would be reinstated to its existing use.</p> <p>Full details of the rail proposals and the environmental impacts associated with them can be found in Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6. 10).</p>	
Environmental Impact / Benefits	Support for rail proposals to improve rail links and provide sustainable transport.	<p>Following Stage 1, these comments were welcomed and considered as further assessment on the freight transport strategies were developed.</p> <p>The proposed rail improvement works to the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line would be permanent upgrades to the existing rail infrastructure.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information can be found in Chapter 2 (Description of Development) Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).	
Alternative Options	Alternative suggestions for the rail transport proposals, such as a railway station at Saxmundham or providing a halt at Martlesham.	<p>There is already a station at Saxmundham and SZC Co. would pick up construction workers from there, subject to demand. There are no proposals to use rail to transport workers since a bus-based system provides greater flexibility to meet the site demands.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 2 (Description of Development) Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	N
Cost	Comments about the cost of proposed rail options.	<p>The rail-led strategy proposed would require significant improvement works to the East Suffolk line, with approximately 50 level crossings requiring upgrades.</p> <p>Due to the complexity of these works Network Rail are unable to give SZC Co. the necessary level of assurance regarding the programme for the East Suffolk line. This means that sufficient certainty regarding cost or programme cannot be given to government or investors on the expected funding requirements, or completion date for construction.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>This uncertainty would affect SZC Co.’s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed by 2035, and meet the urgent need for new Nuclear Power Generation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has therefore concluded that the Stage 3 rail-led strategy would not be deliverable. Instead, an integrated strategy was developed and presented at the Stage 4 consultation to seek to secure the best practical rail outcome, whilst addressing the concerns expressed in relation to the Stage 3 road-led strategy. The integrated strategy forms part of the DCO proposals and are set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Alternative Options	Comments suggesting that the railway line should extend into the main development site.	<p>Following Stage 1, the blue and red rail route options were discounted and the green rail route progressed.</p> <p>The green rail route would be extended into the main construction site as part of the integrated freight strategy. The impacts resulting from it are set out in Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The route would be temporary and removed once it is no longer needed for construction of the Sizewell C main development site.	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Cost / Funding	Criteria for the rail transport proposals, that the cost of improvements should be considered.	<p>The rail-led strategy proposed at Stage 3 (but essentially the same as the Stage 1 and 2 proposals) requires significant improvement works to the East Suffolk Line. Due to the complexity of these works Network Rail are unable to give SZC Co. the necessary level of assurance regarding the programme for the East Suffolk Line. This means that sufficient certainty regarding cost or programme cannot be given to government or investors on the expected funding requirements, or completion date for construction.</p> <p>This uncertainty would affect SZC Co.’s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed by 2035, and meet the urgent need for new Nuclear Power Generation.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		SZC Co. has therefore concluded that the Stage 3 rail-led strategy would not be deliverable. Instead, an integrated strategy was developed and presented at Stage 4 consultation to seek to secure the best practical rail outcome, whilst addressing the concerns expressed in relation to the Stage 3 road-led strategy. The integrated strategy forms part of the DCO proposals and are set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Community Impact	Criteria for the rail transport proposals, that it should minimise negative impact on the local community.	<p>SZC Co. have considered the effects on local communities as part of the optioneering process for determining transport proposals for freight. This consideration has been part of a wider set of planning, social, economic and environmental considerations when determining a preferred option to take forward to the DCO.</p> <p>The rail proposals were proposed to minimise the number of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements on the local roads. The freight management strategy has progressed through the subsequent rounds of consultation to ensure a deliverable approach to the associated development proposals in a manner which would minimise the impacts on the local community. The integrated transport strategy proposed at Stage 4 would</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>reduce impacts on the locality whilst involving deliverable rail proposals and permanent upgrades to the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Criteria for the rail transport proposals, that it should minimise negative impact on the environment.	<p>SZC Co. has evaluated the possibility of moving bulk materials and containerised goods by sea or by rail. This has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluating the capability of the options for sea and rail deliveries, including assessment of potential constraints on delivery (e.g. weather and navigational constraints in respect of sea delivery and rail pathing/infrastructure constraints in respect of rail deliveries); assessing the key material requirements that would arise over time during the construction phase, for each key area of the Sizewell C Project build, and from this identifying the periods during which demand for materials is greatest; considering the scope to move each major category of materials by sea and rail, taking account of the nature of the materials and possible supply sources; and 	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consideration of the environmental impact of each of the main strategies. <p>Based on the above principles, the Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> beach landing facility green rail route Two village bypass; and Sizewell Link road <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Site Legacy / Community Impact	Concern that the new rail terminal option will negatively impact the local community and have little legacy value.	<p>Use of the rail terminal at Sizewell Halt would require freight trains to travel through Leiston. A new rail terminal would avoid use of the King George’s Avenue level crossing and it would allow for more unloading space, which would be further from residential areas. As such, the impact on the local community has positives when compared to use of the existing rail terminal.</p> <p>Given the new rail terminal would principally be used for the construction of the Sizewell C Project, with only limited use expected once operational, the comments regarding its legacy value are noted. However, the need for the new nuclear power station, as established by NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6, and the role the rail terminal would play in the construction of Sizewell C in the early years outweighs its limited legacy value.</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Changes to the rail terminal options were proposed during the Stage 2 consultation. These included two options: the option of a new rail terminal at Sizewell Halt and the selection of the green rail route for transportation of construction materials to the main development site. These options were proposed because the rail terminal would avoid most the environmental impacts of the green rail route but it would have a greater impact on residents of Leiston, whilst the green rail route would avoid the double handling of materials by delivering materials directly into the main development site, bypassing Leiston.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Concern the new rail terminal option will negatively impact the environment.	<p>A range of different environmental considerations are relevant to the rail options presented at the Stage 1 Consultation. The principal considerations relate to terrestrial ecology; noise and vibration; landscape and visual; and historic environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Less Impact / Use of Existing Facilities	Comments stating that new rail terminal option will have the least impact in general, partly because it uses the existing rail line.	<p>The option of the new rail spur at Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE), which is the chosen option following Stage 4 consultation, would use the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line.</p> <p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the rail terminal option. However, the integrated strategy requires both the LEEIE and the green rail route, with the LEEIE being used for deliveries of freight by rail prior to the completion of the green rail route.</p> <p>Utilising the green rail route into the main site will significantly reduce the numbers of HGVs on the local roads and is the most efficient way of getting materials to the main construction site.</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The green rail route and the siding in LEEIE are important features of the integrated freight strategy introduced at Stage 4, since they make use of the existing rail line. The impacts resulting from it are set out in the Environmental Statement, Volume 9 (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p> <p>The green rail route would however be temporary and removed once it is no longer needed for construction.</p>	
Traffic Flow	Comments that the new rail terminal option would consolidate services into one area and create the least amount of traffic movements.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the rail terminal option. However, the integrated strategy requires both the LEEIE and the green rail route, with the LEEIE being used for deliveries of freight by rail prior to the completion of the green rail route.</p> <p>Utilising the green rail route into the main site will significantly reduce the numbers of HGVs on the local roads and is the most efficient way of getting materials to the main construction site.</p> <p>The green rail route and the siding in LEEIE are important features of the integrated freight strategy. The latter does require HGV movements on Lover's Lane to/from the secondary site access. The impacts</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		resulting from it are set out in the Environmental Statement, Volume 9 (Doc Ref. 6.10). The route would however be temporary and removed once it is no longer needed for construction.	
HGV Traffic	Concerns that the new rail terminal option will cause unnecessary road traffic by creating additional HGV journeys, and is an unnecessary development in general.	<p>During the Early Years phase, SZC Co. must bring a significant amount of bulk materials to the site. By building the LEEIE rail terminal and running two trains in per day, the number of HGVs needed on the local road network is reduced by about 300 per day.</p> <p>It is still necessary, during this phase, to move these materials by HGV along Lover's Lane and into the site via the secondary site access. When the Green rail route is completed, all rail movements would continue in to the main construction site. The three trains per day proposed at peak construction would remove some 450 HGV deliveries (some 900 HGV movements) from the local road network.</p> <p>This reduction forms part of the traffic modelling work that informs the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Environmental Statement, transport, Chapter 10 in Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Less Community Impact	Positive comments about the temporary rail extension option having less of an impact on the community than other options.	<p>SZC Co. welcome the recognition of the benefits of the temporary rail extension.</p> <p>The rail proposals would reduce HGV movements on the local roads and are an important component of the integrated freight strategy. They are described in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Environmental Impact / Benefits	Positive comments about the temporary rail extension option having less of an impact on the environment than other options/	<p>SZC Co. welcome the support for the temporary rail extension option and the recognition that the environmental impacts of it are less than other options.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Use of Existing Facilities	Comments stating that the temporary rail extension option will be the more cost effective of the two options, partly because it uses the existing line.	<p>The rail-led strategy proposed at Stage 3 (but essentially the same as the Stage 1 and 2 proposals as it includes both the LEEIE siding and the green rail route) requires significant improvement works to the East Suffolk Line.</p> <p>Due to the complexity of these works Network Rail are unable to give SZC Co. the necessary level of assurance regarding the programme for the East Suffolk Line. This means that sufficient certainty regarding cost or programme cannot be given to government or investors on the expected funding requirements, or completion date for construction.</p> <p>This uncertainty would affect SZC Co.’s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed by 2035, and meet the urgent need for new Nuclear Power Generation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has therefore concluded that the Stage 3 rail-led strategy would not be deliverable. Instead, an integrated strategy was developed and presented at Stage 4 consultation to seek to secure the best practical rail outcome, whilst addressing the concerns expressed in</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		relation to the Stage 3 road-led strategy. The integrated strategy forms part of the DCO proposals.	
Site Legacy	Suggestions that the temporary rail extension option should be permanent to make it useful in the long-term.	<p>The rail extension would have little purpose following completion of the construction of the Sizewell C Project. As such, the permanent land-take required for the temporary rail extension would not be justified permanently.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Reduced HGV Traffic Flow	Comments about the benefit of the temporary rail extension option to take freight directly to the main development site, which reduces the use of HGVs.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the temporary rail extension.</p> <p>During the Early Years phase, SZC Co. must bring a significant amount of bulk materials to the site. By building the LEEIE rail terminal and running two trains in per day, the number of HGVs needed on the local road network is reduced by about 300 per day.</p> <p>It is still necessary, during this phase, to move these materials by HGV along Lover's Lane and into the site via the secondary site access. When the Green rail route is completed, all rail movements would continue in to the</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>main construction site. The three trains per day proposed at peak construction would remove some 450 HGV deliveries (some 900 HGV movements) from the local road network.</p> <p>This reduction forms part of the traffic modelling work that informs the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 8.5) and the Environmental Statement, transport, Chapter 10 in Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Temporary Developments	Comments that express a preference for the temporary rail extension option because it will be temporary.	Both the green rail route and the LEEIE siding would be temporary and removed when no longer needed for construction purposes. Both are described in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	N
Site Location	Comments about the benefits of the blue rail route option as being close to the main development site.	<p>The blue rail route was not preferred as it was considered to have a greater visual impact on the surrounding countryside due to its length (1.3km longer than the green rail route) and it would need to enter the main development site at the preferred location for the accommodation campus.</p> <p>The blue route was therefore discounted at Stage 2. Further information can be found in Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the local community of the blue rail route option.	<p>SZC Co. have considered the effects on local communities as part of the optioneering process for determining rail transport proposals. This consideration has been part of a wider set of planning, social, economic and environmental considerations when determining a preferred option to take forward to the DCO.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Community Impact / Site Legacy	Positive comments about the blue rail route option having less of an impact on the local community and greater legacy value in comparison to other options.	<p>Whilst the blue rail route would not be close to concentrations of residential properties, it would be closer to the Cakes and Ale Caravan Park and the Pro Corda Music School at the second Leiston Abbey site, potentially impacting on these receptors in noise terms.</p> <p>It would also be a longer route that would take over a greater area of open countryside. It would be difficult to justify such a large landtake for only a temporary period, with little scope for any legacy benefits due to the likely limited use following completion of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The blue route was therefore discounted at Stage 2. Further information can be found in Chapter 3</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		(Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).	
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about the blue rail route option having less of an impact on the environment in comparison to other options.	<p>A wide range of views were expressed in relation to the three rail extension route options, with no clear preference emerging. Those favouring the red rail route tended to consider that because it was the shortest of the routes, it would have the least effect on surrounding countryside. However, some raised concerns over the potential for noise and vibration impacts arising from freight trains passing through Leiston.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route options should not be considered further and the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the environment of the blue rail route option.	<p>A wide range of views were expressed in relation to the three rail extension route options, with no clear preference emerging. Those favouring the red rail route tended to consider that because it was the shortest of the routes, it would have the least effect on surrounding countryside. However, some raised concerns over the potential for noise and vibration impacts arising from freight trains passing through Leiston.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route options should not be considered further and the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p> <p>The green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact / Site Legacy	Positive comments about the green rail route option having less of an impact on the local community and in general in comparison to other options, as well as having greater legacy value	The green rail route forms part of the DCO proposals. The impacts resulting from it are set out in the Environmental Statement, Volume 9 (Doc Ref. 6.10). The route would however be temporary and removed once it is no longer needed for construction.	Y
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the local community of the green rail route option	SZC Co. have considered the effects on local communities as part of the optioneering process for determining rail transport proposals. This consideration has been part of a wider set of planning, social, economic and environmental considerations when determining a preferred option to take forward to the DCO. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	N
Environmental Impact	Positive comments about the green rail route option having less of an impact on the environment compared to other options	A wide range of views were expressed in relation to the three rail extension route options, with no clear preference emerging. Those favouring the red rail route tended to consider that because it was the shortest of the routes, it would have the least effect on surrounding countryside. However, some raised concerns over the	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>potential for noise and vibration impacts arising from freight trains passing through Leiston.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route options should not be considered further and the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p> <p>The green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the environment of the green rail route option	<p>A wide range of views were expressed in relation to the three rail extension route options, with no clear preference emerging. Those favouring the red rail route tended to consider that because it was the shortest of the routes, it would have the least effect on surrounding countryside. However, some raised concerns over the potential for noise and vibration impacts arising from freight trains passing through Leiston.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route options should not be considered further and the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p> <p>The green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Use of Existing Facilities	Positive comments about the green rail route using the existing rail line	<p>The green rail route forms part of the DCO proposals. The impacts resulting from it are set out in the Environmental Statement, Volume 9 (Doc Ref. 6.10). The route would however be temporary and removed once it is no longer needed for construction.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact / Site Legacy	Comments about the red rail route option having less of an impact, or a positive impact, on the local community compared to other options, with greater potential for legacy value.	<p>SZC Co. have considered the effects on local communities as part of the optioneering process for determining rail transport proposals. This consideration has been part of a wider set of planning, social, economic and environmental considerations when determining a preferred option to take forward to the DCO.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Community Impact	Concerns about the negative impact on the local community of the red rail route option.	<p>SZC Co. have considered the effects on local communities as part of the optioneering process for determining rail transport proposals. This consideration has been part of a wider set of planning, social, economic and environmental considerations when determining a preferred option to take forward to the DCO.</p> <p>Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Community Impact	Positive comments about the red rail route option having less of an impact on the environment compared to other options.	A wide range of views were expressed in relation to the three rail extension route options, with no clear preference emerging. Those favouring the red rail route tended to consider that because it was the shortest of the routes, it would have the least effect on surrounding	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>countryside. However, some raised concerns over the potential for noise and vibration impacts arising from freight trains passing through Leiston.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all Sizewell C Project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route options should not be considered further and the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p> <p>The green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route,</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Traffic Flow	Concern about the negative impact of the red rail route on transport/traffic/congestion.	The red route does not form part of the DCO proposals. It was discounted after Stage 1 consultation.	Y

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Noise	Concern about the impact of noise, especially at night, from an increase in rail freight as part of the rail proposals.	SZC Co. recognises that the Stage 1 consultation responses raised concerns about noise from rail freight deliveries, particularly if rail movements were to occur during the night. It is expected that the majority of rail movements would take place during the day and the aim would be to minimise the need for night-time movements. However, discussions with Network Rail suggest that rail timetabling issues and uncertainties mean that the requirement for some night-time rail movements cannot be ruled out. The noise assessment work has considered	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		these issues along with the requirement and scope for mitigation. Further information can be found in the Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Legacy	Comments about a potential new rail station or rail line for local people as part of a legacy benefit of the proposals.	The DCO process requires SZC Co. to mitigate the transport impacts expected during construction and operation. Additional transport improvements are outside the scope of policy NPS-EN1, as explained in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	N