



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Annex B Stage 1 Section 42 Consultee Response Summaries

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



Contents

Annex B – Stage 1 Section 42 Consultee Response Summaries	1
1. Summary of Responses from Prescribed Consultees, Local Authorities and Town and Parish Councils	1
1.1 Aldeburgh Town Council.....	1
1.2 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council	1
1.3 Anglian Water Services Limited (AWSL)	2
1.4 Associated British Ports.....	3
1.5 Bawdsey Parish Council	3
1.6 Blaxhall Parish Council	3
1.7 Blythburgh with Bulcamp & Hinton Parish Council	4
1.8 Boyton Parish Council	4
1.9 Bredfield Parish Council	4
1.10 Brightwell, Foxhall and Purdis Farm Group Parish Council	5
1.11 Bromeswell Parish Council	5
1.12 Bucklesham Parish Council	6
1.13 Butley Capel and Wantisden Parish Council	6
1.14 Campsea Ashe Parish Council	6
1.15 Chediston and Linstead Parish Council	7
1.16 Chillesford Parish Council.....	7
1.17 Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	8
1.18 Darsham Parish Council	8
1.19 Dunwich Parish Meeting.....	8
1.20 East of England Ambulance Service	9
1.21 East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board.....	9
1.22 Easton Parish Council	10
1.23 Environment Agency.....	10
1.24 Essex and Suffolk Water	12
1.25 Essex County Council.....	12
1.26 Eyke Parish Council.....	13
1.27 Forestry Commission.....	13
1.28 Friston Parish Council.....	13

1.29	Galloper Wind Farm Ltd.....	13
1.30	Great Glemham Parish Council	14
1.31	Abellio Greater Anglia Limited	14
1.32	Halesworth Town Council	15
1.33	Hasketon Parish Council	15
1.34	Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard	15
1.35	Highways Agency	16
1.36	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council	17
1.37	Leiston-cum-Sizevell Town Council	17
1.38	Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council	18
1.39	Little Glemham Parish Council	19
1.40	Marine Management Organisation	19
1.41	Marlesford Parish Council.....	21
1.42	Martlesham Parish Council.....	21
1.43	Melton Parish Council.....	21
1.44	Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council	22
1.45	Nacton Parish Council	23
1.46	National Grid.....	23
1.47	NATS (En Route) Limited	24
1.48	Natural England.....	24
1.49	Network Rail	25
1.50	NHS Suffolk.....	25
1.51	Norfolk County Council.....	25
1.52	Office for Nuclear Regulation.....	25
1.53	Orford and Gedgrave Parish Council.....	26
1.54	Otley Parish Council	26
1.55	Passenger Focus.....	26
1.56	Peasenhall Parish Council.....	26
1.57	Rendlesham Parish Council	27
1.58	Royal Mail.....	28
1.59	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	28

1.60	Saxmundham Town Council.....	29
1.61	Shottisham Parish Council.....	29
1.62	Southwold Town Council	29
1.63	Sudbourne Parish Council	30
1.64	Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership.....	30
1.65	Suffolk Coastal District Council & Suffolk County Council	31
1.66	Suffolk Constabulary.....	31
1.67	Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service	32
1.68	Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT).....	33
1.69	Sweffling Parish Council	33
1.70	Swilland and Winesham grouped Parish Council	34
1.71	The Coal Authority	34
1.72	Tunstall Parish Council	34
1.73	Ufford Parish Council.....	35
1.74	Waldringfield Parish Council.....	35
1.75	Waveney District Council.....	35
1.76	Wickham Market Parish Council.....	35
1.77	Woodbridge Town Council.....	36
1.78	Yoxford Parish Council	36
2	Summary of Responses from Section 42(1)(d) Consultees by Theme.....	37
2.1	Overall Proposals	37
2.2	Main Development Site.....	44
2.3	Temporary Developments	48
2.4	Visitor Centre.....	48
2.5	Accommodation Proposals	49
2.6	Park and Ride – Principle	51
2.7	Northern Park and Ride	52
2.8	Southern Park and Ride	53
2.9	Lorry Park Site Options.....	53
2.10	Junction and Road Improvement Options.....	54
2.11	Rail Improvements.....	56

Annex B – Stage 1 Section 42 Consultee Response Summaries

1 Summary of Responses from Prescribed Consultees, Local Authorities and Town and Parish Councils

1.1 Aldeburgh Town Council

1.1.2. Aldeburgh Town Council's main concerns were the direct impacts on the town including existing facilities and housing demand and the wider impacts on tourism. They requested further exploration of sustainable development and additional information and consultation before Stage 2, commenting on the absence of traffic figures and detailed analysis.

1.1.3. They expressed concern about the use of greenfield sites for developments. They preferred the visitor centre site at Goose Hill but asked that its design is appropriate for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They expressed concern about the impact of car parking on Aldeburgh, noise and light pollution and visual impact on the sensitive landscape.

1.1.4. They expressed concern about the impact of the workforce on local facilities, health services, emergency services and amenities and the size and impact of an accommodation campus, suggesting a few smaller campuses at the site and in urban areas, and for permanent legacy benefits.

1.1.5. The council expressed support for the maximum use of rail and sea, park and ride sides at Darsham and Wickham Market, the Seven Hills Junction location for a lorry park, the blue rail route (with passenger transport and links to the Darsham park and ride), a rail extension into the main development site (with a passenger link into the site), a potential four-village bypass and for improvements for the A12/B1094 junction. They expressed concern about a potential jetty, such as impacts on coastal processes and visual amenity, beach access and fishing businesses.

1.2 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council

1.2.1. Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council commented on the difficulty of providing a detailed response to the high level of the consultation. They urged that impacted communities be given practical support to maintain their quality of life.

1.2.2. They suggested the use of the old Leiston airfield to be crossed by a link road and rail route and to be used for associated developments such as an accommodation campus, park and ride facilities or laydown areas. The parish council believed the accommodation strategy was insufficient in satisfying social needs and commented that all campus options presented major problems, suggesting dispersing the campus, the provision of campus legacy benefits and optimising the use of local rented accommodation.

- 1.2.3. Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council expressed concern that the proposed location of the development will significantly impact their community, the AONB and Heritage Coast, Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and other designated sites from noise, vibration and light pollution impacts and urged minimal loss of designated habitat, visual impact, and that historical sites and access to recreational activities are preserved.
- 1.2.4. They believed there had not been sufficient assessment of potential shoreline impacts and coastal studies, and made suggestions such as extending the assessment southward, specific impacts to be analysed and for marine ecology impacts to be avoided. They expressed concern about the design of the buildings, the long-term storage of spent fuel, the access road to the main development site, relocated buildings and the temporary construction area. They made suggestions about the design of the jetty and for land restoration.
- 1.2.5. They requested that anti-social working hours are kept to a minimum, for proposals to prevent impact on local health and education services and partnerships with stakeholders and capital investment to deliver skills, education and training. They highlighted the importance of supply chain and local business opportunities.
- 1.2.6. The council stated that they could not comment on the effectiveness of the transport strategy until options were confirmed. They expressed support for the principle of park and rides but requested detailed analysis to assess the impact of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs)/buses relative to smaller vehicles. They supported sea transport, made suggestions for rail transport including upgrading the branch line and additional train paths to the East Suffolk line. They suggested a four-village bypass and link road from the A12 to the main development site, expressed a preference for lorry park options 1 and 2 and requested that legacy value be an important consideration for the park and ride option decisions.
- 1.3 [Anglian Water Services Limited \(AWSL\)](#)
- 1.3.1. Due to the need to maintain its services to customers, Anglian Water could not support the waste water disposal for this development, and recommended the provision of a sewage treatment works for the development.
- 1.3.2. They commented that the Leiston Sewage Treatment Works would be unable to accept the additional capacity of any of the accommodation campus proposals, due to the insufficient headroom in the discharge permit to accept required wastewater disposal flows. They commented that all three campus proposals would require upgrades to the sewage network to be funded through Anglian Water Business Plan and a new permit from the Environment Agency, and instead suggested an incorporated private site plant, to allow Leiston

Sewage Treatment Works to continue serving the surrounding area and preventing impact on their customers.

1.4 Associated British Ports

1.4.1. Associated British Ports welcomed the inclusion of the ports of Lowestoft and Ipswich in the transport strategy and noted the inclusion of the temporary jetty and rail proposals. They welcomed ongoing discussions about the provision of marine facilities, port, road and rail interface, port and rail linked storage areas and potential management of the proposed jetty facilities.

1.5 Bawdsey Parish Council

1.5.1. The council was supportive of the proposals given that local people are adequately compensated by legacy benefits for the disruption and risk experienced.

1.5.2. They requested that temporary developments are avoided and facilities with long-term use be proposed where possible for the accommodation campus, road and rail improvements and the jetty. They made suggestions for the visitor centre, including its own car park and a location away from the beach.

1.5.3. They commented that there was insufficient detail to give an informed opinion on the transport strategy but supported the use of sea given that the impacts on coastal processes are fully understood, requesting a full impact assessment for the coast. They commented that road improvements would be required although use of road should be discouraged.

1.5.4. They expressed preference for the Wickham Market park and ride site, for a separate lorry park close to an existing facility and suggested an 'off-site construction site' at the Darsham park and ride site. They expressed concern about traffic on the A12 and supported a four-village bypass as the only realistic solution for the A12 and a rail extension into the main development site. They requested education, employment, sponsorship, apprenticeship and sub-contractor opportunities be provided for East Suffolk. Finally, they commented on the limited consultation time period given.

1.6 Blaxhall Parish Council

1.6.1. The council expressed concern about the storage and disposal of radioactive waste, the impacts of the development on surrounding rural communities, traffic and highways impacts during construction and the effect on local tourism and requested that the bus service within Blaxhall be increased as part of the community benefit gain.

1.7 Blythburgh with Bulcamp & Hinton Parish Council

- 1.7.1. Blythburgh with Bulcamp & Hinton Parish Council was concerned about the impacts on their village as a result of the development, including its demographics, character, heritage, tourism impact and impact on schools and local services.
- 1.7.2. Transport impacts were of serious concern, especially congestion on the A12 and rat-running on the B1125. They questioned the transport impact estimations provided so far and commented that traffic impacts through Blythburgh must be properly addressed with greater assessment of speeding and safety issues.
- 1.7.3. The parish council made transport suggestions such as traffic calming measures to mitigate some of the issues, which they hoped to discuss with SZC Co. as part of an on-going dialogue. They also expressed concern about noise, air quality, light and vibration impacts, requesting appropriate assessment. They expressed preference for a northern park and ride site at Darsham.
- 1.7.4. They requested further detailed information and additional stages of consultation before progression of Stage 2 and expected SZC Co. to learn from feedback and experiences from Hinkley Point C.

1.8 Boyton Parish Council

- 1.8.1. The council expressed concern about issues with the reactor design and security concerns from proposals to concentrate a large amount of the UK's energy generating capacity in one location (with wind farm developments). They commented on the need for coastal erosion and flood defence works more widely in the affected area and suggested environmental legacy should be a feature of the Sizewell C Project, along with controlling the level of activity within the SSSI.
- 1.8.2. They requested that accommodation facilities be retained as long-term legacy benefits, to possibly provide recreational or education facilities, and suggested that southern park and ride facilities should be south of Woodbridge to avoid pinch points on the A12 near Martlesham and Bredfield. They also requested compensation for local communities in terms of improved road and rail infrastructure and questioned how realistic the estimated worst-case scenario traffic increases were, commenting that a four-village bypass may be required.

1.9 Bredfield Parish Council

- 1.9.1. The council expressed strong opposition to the potential location of the southern park and ride at Potash Corner due to impact on properties, destruction of the rural nature of the village, safety issues from access, traffic on minor roads and on the A12, land take from agricultural land, drainage issues, proximity to a gas main, lack of evidence that workers would be brought in from this location and

noise, light and dirt pollution. They also believed all proposed southern park and ride facilities were too far from the main development site to be of value and opposed the idea of combining the site with a lorry park. They suggested a four-village bypass as a solution to A12 congestion problems.

1.10 Brightwell, Foxhall and Purdis Farm Group Parish Council

1.10.1. The council's prime concern was the traffic management proposals, particularly traffic on the A14 between Copdock and Seven Hills which would be exacerbated by other developments alongside Sizewell C. They commented on the proximity of residences to a lorry park location at Orwell east and west as being a disadvantage, however they opposed a site at Seven Hills interchange due to danger from additional traffic and disturbance to the crematorium. They commented on the air, light, noise and dust pollution and nitrogen dioxide effects of all lorry park options.

1.10.2. The council expressed support for locating the lorry park with the southern park and ride at Wickham Market as it is closer to the main development site, further from housing and has greater legacy potential.

1.11 Bromeswell Parish Council

1.11.1. The council objected to the proposal to site the southern park and ride at Woodbridge at the A12/A1152 junction due to its use as a main route for villagers and businesses, due to existing congestion and the potential for rat-running though small villages to avoid this junction. They requested funding for 'road marshals' to police rat-runs should this route be chosen, and for the land to be returned to agricultural use after construction. They commented that additional train transport would increase delays at the Melton level crossing and a lorry park would create further congestion. Furthermore, they commented on the proximity of the proposed site to a school and residential properties, requesting full environmental assessment.

1.11.2. They highlighted key priorities for the Sizewell C Project as listed below:

- Improvements to safety and road journey times.
- A passenger rail link to Leiston/Sizewell.
- Investment in digital communication technology such as broadband and mobile coverage and for a 'technology park' to attract small businesses.
- Funding for science facilities at Alde Valley High School.
- Socio-economic benefits to Leiston to encourage young people to stay.
- A greater 'legacy' budget of £100m to ensure partnership between SZC Co. and local communities.

1.12 Bucklesham Parish Council

- 1.12.1. Bucklesham Parish Council objected to the lorry park at Seven Hills because there would be no direct access to the A12/14 so local roads would become congested. They commented that traffic would be slowed on the Old Felixstowe Road and improvements were needed on the main junctions on the A12 south from A12/14 up to and including the Seven Hills Interchange. It would exacerbate danger on the A1156 and have negative impacts on the environment and road infrastructure.
- 1.12.2. They noted that the Orwell Lorry Park benefited from direct access to the A14, being outside the AONB, had 24-hour facilities and was suitable for Operation Stack but that a Public Right of Way would need to be rerouted and that residences and the AONB are in close proximity.
- 1.12.3. They supported the combined lorry park and park and ride adjacent to Wickham Market because it reduced the environmental impact, was closer to the construction, the road layout was better and it was further from houses.

1.13 Butley Capel and Wantisden Parish Council

- 1.13.1. Butley Capel and Wantisden Parish Council commented that the consultation documentation was inadequate for making any informed decisions as details were missing particularly those regarding traffic volume. Their main points of concern were:
- That a system of apprenticeships should be introduced as soon as possible.
 - That contractor and supplier needs should be sourced locally.
 - Maximum use of rail should be given, linking straight into the main development site.
 - Campus accommodation should be split to prevent impact on small areas.
 - Impacts of sea defences had not been discussed.
 - Impacts of traffic on the A12 and subsequent effects on businesses and tourism.

1.14 Campsea Ashe Parish Council

- 1.14.1. Campsea Ashe Parish Council commented that there was insufficient detailed information to base a sound response to the consultation and that by stating their preferred options, SZC Co. had already made decisions. They advised against the use of the word ‘temporary’ for temporary developments and that landscape and environmental changes had not been considered past the construction phase. They suggested that the visitor centre should be part of the

nuclear power station itself and that more campus accommodation should be built, located as close to the main development site as possible, to reduce effects on tourist and rental accommodation.

- 1.14.2. They believed that the transport information was too limited especially considering the use of park and rides and HGV journeys, impacts on local roads and sea transport impacts on coastal erosion and Minsmere Sluice, and questioned estimated traffic figures. They strongly objected to the southern park and ride location at Wickham Market due to traffic impacts and believed a lorry park should not be combined with the park and ride, supporting a location at Orwell Lorry Park. They suggested consideration for a 'major' bypass on the A12 and expressed concerns about the location of a passing loop at Campsea Ashe. They requested better opportunities for local employment, apprenticeships and training. They commented that, in some cases, SZC Co. had already decided their preferred options, as indicated by entering into irrevocable partnerships such as with Network Rail, and would not make changes based on public feedback.

1.15 Chediston and Linstead Parish Council

- 1.15.1. Chediston and Linstead Parish Council was supportive of the benefits to the local economy. They preferred the Leiston east site for the accommodation campus for proximity to Leiston and commented that public order and security issues for the strategy should have been addressed.
- 1.15.2. They were supportive of maximum use of rail and sea and for a rail extension into the main development site, provided that the land is restored post-construction. They agreed with a combined lorry park and park and ride facility at Wickham Market and a northern site at Yoxford Road, for proximity to the main development site. They expressed concern about the adverse effect of traffic on the local road network and believed the Farnham Bypass would not be adequate in addressing traffic issues.

1.16 Chillesford Parish Council

- 1.16.1. Chillesford Parish Council commented that information should have been provided about community benefits including local employment, impacts on traffic, mitigation for the A12 and B1122 and minor roads, environmental impacts and storage of radioactive waste.
- 1.16.2. Chillesford Parish Council supported Option 2 for the visitor centre because of proximity to existing facilities. They strongly supported Option 3 for the accommodation campus and strongly opposed SZC Co.'s preferred Option 1. They supported Option 2 for the temporary rail extension and the green rail route. They strongly urged that a lorry park would be needed to control HGVs, either at the southern park and ride location or Option 1 or 2, as an extension

of Orwell Lorry Park. They strongly supported Option 1 for the southern park and ride at Wickham Market due to its most northerly location and Option 2 for the northern park and ride at Darsham to avoid traffic being diverted onto minor roads. Finally, they expressed support for a jetty for delivery of material by sea.

1.17 Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)

1.17.1. CAA commented that an area of restricted airspace would be needed around the main development site which could impact airspace availability to aviation and should be assessed considering aerodrome related operations, aviation activity associated with the power station itself and current usage of airspace.

1.17.2. They highlighted a potential need for tall structures to be equipped with aviation warning lighting. They noted that the height of structures was not specified in the documentation and raised a safety concern about potential venting and flaring from the main development site. They requested that the Defence Geographic Agency be notified of any structures 300 feet or more and for temporary structures to be publicised via a notice to airmen. Additionally, they called on the Ministry of Defence to advise on the impact on military aviation.

1.18 Darsham Parish Council

1.18.1. Darsham Parish Council stated that they were divided on the proposals but stated that the consultation document lacked the information needed to form a proper view. They approved of the jetty but noted that the sites of temporary constructions currently attracted a lot of visitors. They asked for more evidence regarding the predicted number of workers but supported locating the campus close to Leiston because this would lessen the impact on Theberton and Eastbridge.

1.18.2. They commented that the overall transport strategy was unclear but accepted the Darsham site on the condition that it would only be accessed from the north. They stated that only a four-village bypass would be acceptable due to traffic concerns and opposed the use of the B1122 due to traffic and called for a new road. They stated that proposals around education, training and supply chain were unclear.

1.19 Dunwich Parish Meeting

1.19.1. Dunwich Parish Meeting expressed concern about the long-term siting of nuclear waste and about the impact of temporary developments on communities, sensitive environments and areas of natural beauty, calling for appropriate mitigation and compensatory measures.

1.19.2. They commented that the transport strategy should aim to relieve traffic on local roads, particularly the B1122 which the Dunwich Parish Meeting considered to

be unsuitable, and stated that a four-village bypass and 'D2' relief road should be given consideration. They were particularly concerned about traffic through Blythburgh and Westleton on the B1125 and about the A12/A1120 junction in Yoxford, and suggested that the main development site should have little parking space, making workers use the park and ride schemes. They supported sites at Darsham and Wickham Market, proposals for a lorry park (but had no views about the specific options), a rail extension into the main development site and construction of a jetty. They suggested improvements to the rail passenger service between Ipswich and Lowestoft and expressed concern about potential danger to the A1122/Lover's Lane junction from the green rail route and the lack of assessment of operating risk, environmental degradation and waste management in the consultation.

1.20 East of England Ambulance Service

- 1.20.1. East of England Ambulance Service raised concerns about the impact on emergency response and resourcing and requested that more information be provided. They stated that traffic on the B1122 would be a safety concern and called for a general traffic management plan.
- 1.20.2. They preferred a worker campus at the main development site as this would negate the need for workers to use the public highway. They commented that the northern park and ride should be located at A12/A144 junction as this would lessen the traffic impact and preferred Wickham Market for the southern site. They preferred the Farnham bypass option and locating the lorry park at Orwell Lorry Park East.
- 1.20.3. They felt that Sizewell Beach would be the best location for the visitor centre to minimise the impact of emergency deployments and supported the red rail route. They advocated extensive first response training to staff with the inclusion of a medical station at each significant construction, but called for liaison with the Primary Care Trust in relation to potassium iodine stocks. They advised regular liaison with the ambulance service regarding safety on site and emergency planning.

1.21 East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board

- 1.21.1. East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board commented on how the proposals might impact the East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board and what would be needed to address the board's requirements and concerns. The issues of primary interest were how the proposals may be affected by the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws, whether they would meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in terms of surface water disposal and how works may impact landowners and the environment.
- 1.21.2. Their concerns and comments included the following issues:

- Alterations to watercourses, including the requirement for the Board's consent for new access culverts and bridges. They suggest this would be granted if the culverts would not have an adverse effect on flood risk and drainage, and SZC Co. comply with the stipulations laid down by the East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board.
- Development and easements alongside Board-maintained watercourses, as access needs to be maintained to these watercourses during and after construction.
- Surface water disposal, including the impact of impermeable surfaces and the difficulty of providing drainage solutions for these surfaces. This is given their size and the local soil characteristics and the resulting impacts on flood risk and changes to watercourse flow.
- Hydraulic modelling - this is necessary to assess the impact on surface water systems and groundwater flows, and if existing studies are used then their compatibility must be considered.
- The impacts of the proposed A12 road improvement, including severing of the flood plain, consideration of compensatory storage and for flood routes to be incorporated under the road to retain hydraulic connectivity.
- Flood risk assessments - the East Suffolk Internal Board requested involvement in the scoping process, and consideration for the assessments and highlighted potential errors surrounding catchment areas, and the need for flood risk assessments for every site potentially impacted by flooding.
- Environment in Minsmere Levels and Sizewell Marshes SSSI, especially the impact of surface water drainage and flood risk on the Minsmere Sluice and areas of the SSSI not required for the development.

1.22 Easton Parish Council

- 1.22.1. The council commented that the development of a park and ride site at Wickham Market would have adverse effects on Easton residents because of a build-up of traffic on the B1166 and Easton Road. They requested that the Wickham Market roundabout, A12 slip roads and the B1166 and Easton Road Junction all receive improvements to mitigate the impacts. They also expressed concern about the impact of the design of the development on the Suffolk Coast skyline.

1.23 Environment Agency

- 1.23.1. The Environment Agency set out headline matters on which they expected further assessment for future stages of consultation, including:
- A flood risk assessment over the lifetime of the development.
 - Details of the proposed jetty, cooling water tunnels, associated foreshore works and impacts on coastal processes.

- The siting and design of the temporary and permanent bridges.
- Water availability and supply needs and associated impacts.
- Information on the possible re-use and disposal of excavated material.
- Loss of land from Sizewell Marshes SSSI and effects on the ecological corridor.
- Means of foul water disposal from the main and associated sites.
- A work programme that specifically identifies the matters to be further refined ahead of the Stage 2 consultation.

1.23.2. They the following further comments:

- requesting that the Environment Agency be involved at the earliest stages of temporary and permanent designs to ensure minimum impact;
- suggesting consultation with the East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board about works that may impact watercourses;
- suggestions regarding how to avoid impact on surface water, groundwater, Sizewell Marshes SSSI, potential sources of contamination, flooding and marine water quality;
- suggesting changes be made to the consultation documentation in order to correct errors as the European Directive on the waste hierarchy is referred to even though this does not exist and full compliance with the waste hierarchy is a legal obligation;
- suggesting the extension of the Saxmundham-Leiston branch line into the main development site must be fully justified due to its environmental impact and the limited number of freight movements it enables;
- requesting that the CL:AIRE code of practice is followed;
- suggesting that the development should be compliant with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010, the Water Framework Directive and the Coast Protection Act 1949;
- suggesting that the information gathered for the Water Framework Directive compliance assessment should be collected at the same time as the information for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and should consider all affected waterbodies;
- suggesting that consideration is given to the need for abstraction licences and permits for standby diesel generators;

- suggesting that the impacts on species designated in the biodiversity action plan should be assessed;
- suggesting that climate change should be factored into the proposals, particularly with regard to water supply and treatment, water quality, flood risk, coastal erosion, waste disposal facilities and marine biodiversity;
- requesting that water efficiency is prioritised due to existing water pressures in the East Suffolk region; and
- suggesting that the waste management and drainage strategies should be developed.

1.24 Essex and Suffolk Water

- 1.24.1. Essex and Suffolk Water raised concern that the Goose Hill option for the visitor centre did not have an existing water supply but suggested using the new link planned for Sizewell C.
- 1.24.2. They commented that the accommodation campus would need a water main, which should be the minimum sized main to supply a fire demand. They believed the main development site location would require an off-site main, but they urged caution for the Leiston East Campus because the 12" trunk main supply to Sizewell B crossed this site.
- 1.24.3. They raised no issues with the northern park and ride options. Option 1 for the southern location was in their Anglian Water bulk metered supply area but Options 2 and 3 were not in their area of supply. The lorry park options were not in their area of supply, but Essex and Suffolk Water noted that construction might impact the AC trunk main and 3" and 4" AC mains. Regarding the options for rail transport, Essex and Suffolk Water commented that the blue route crossed an 8" AC main, the green route crossed 8", 6" and 3" mains and the red route crossed 8" and 3" mains.

1.25 Essex County Council

- 1.25.1. Essex County Council were concerned by the proposal for transporting excavated material to the nature reserve at Wallasea Island. They stated that if further drier habitat areas are created a landscape assessment may also be required.
- 1.25.2. They further noted minimal impact on Essex's highway network but asked to be kept informed of any change in transport strategy.

1.26 Eyke Parish Council

- 1.26.1. The council highlighted the benefits of locating a power station at Sizewell but questioned what would happen to land used for temporary developments post-construction. The council also expressed concern about rat-running through Eyke and traffic increases and resultant safety impacts in general. They expressed support for the main development site campus location, the temporary rail extension option, the Farnham bypass, a lorry park at Orwell (east) or (west), a southern park and ride at Wickham Market, use of railway and sea transport and for the use of local supply chains for construction. They questioned the accuracy of SZC Co.'s traffic rise predictions and thought the pressure on local roads would become intolerable.

1.27 Forestry Commission

- 1.27.1. The Forestry Commission highlighted the proposals would inevitably lead to the loss of some woodland and commented that this should be mitigated by the planting of new woodland at a ratio of 6:1. They noted that the felling of the trees would need to be covered by a felling licence and asked for confirmation that the relevant planning authority would consider the complete Sizewell C Project, including proposed deforestation, under the Town and Country Planning EIA Regulations.

1.28 Friston Parish Council

- 1.28.1. Friston Parish Council raised concerns about an increase of traffic negatively impacting residents. They were also concerned about damaging the AONB and SSSI. They questioned how use of the park and ride schemes would be monitored and suggested the use of rail to transport workers. They criticised a lack of career opportunities for local people and school leavers. They cited the contribution retired residents made through volunteering and were concerned that a decline in property values would force them to move away.

1.29 Galloper Wind Farm Ltd

- 1.29.1. Galloper Wind Farm Ltd commented that future documents should be clearer about the marine impact and include greater details regarding sea protection, the jetty and work on the foreshore. They stated that agreement was needed about Galloper Wind Farm Ltd's export cables and SZC Co.'s water intakes, connecting tunnels and cooling water infrastructure. They required the finalisation of a full proximity agreement deriving from agreed heads of terms with SZC Co.
- 1.29.2. They suggested that they would assist in future consultations if spatially focused development could be shown in the introductory section and that an alternative version of **Figure 3.2** should be produced to show their proposed onshore substation.

- 1.29.3. Galloper Wind Farm Ltd were concerned that the location and access for Option 2 for the visitor centre at the end of the Sizewell Gap Road may conflict with the Order Limits of the Galloper Wind Farm development consent order (DCO) (the Galloper Wind Farm Order 2013/1203 was subsequently made on 24 May 2013 pursuant to the Planning Act 2008) . Furthermore, they flagged the direct spatial conflict between the footprint for Option 2 of the campus accommodation and the Order Limits of the Galloper Wind Farm Ltd DCO application. Additionally, they stated that the temporary rail extension would potentially affect the designated HGV route for the Galloper Wind Farm Ltd onshore development.
- 1.29.4. Galloper Wind Farm Ltd required that the spatial separation in the Pill Box Field be maintained and the proposed tree planting, which was part of the Galloper Wind Farm Ltd DCO application, be fully considered in any adjacent proposals for this field. They noted potential effects on coastal geomorphology and hydrogeology and asked for consideration of the potential effect on Galloper Wind Farm Ltd infrastructure. They would like to see consideration of the wider impact on Galloper Wind Farm Ltd.

1.30 Great Glemham Parish Council

- 1.30.1. Great Glemham Parish Council suggested that the proposals should include the following:
- A four-village bypass on the A12 to reduce the impacts of traffic congestion.
 - Other mitigation measures for the A12 especially for pedestrians and cyclists should a four-village bypass not be taken forward.
 - For various footpaths along the A12 to be upgraded to cycle paths.
 - A proposal for managing the impacts of diversions from the A12.
 - The re-establishment of a passenger station at Leiston.
 - Robust coastal protection measures balanced with ecology mitigation.
 - Measures to maximise the use of the park and ride schemes.

1.31 Abellio Greater Anglia Limited

- 1.31.1. Abellio Greater Anglia Limited highlighted that their fleet is at maximum capacity, and further expansion would require additional resources. They noted that diesel multiple unit resources were limited and that an early dialogue should be established.
- 1.31.2. They commented that the proposals should be considered in conjunction with legacy improvements. They welcomed the proposal to use freight if the infrastructure was upgraded. They stated that running five return freight trains per day between Ipswich and Leiston, via Westerfield and Saxmundham, was

achievable with improvements to the Saxmundham junction. They were concerned, however, that the proposed passing loop at Wickham Market was of insufficient length. They stated that a dynamic passing loop or reinstatement of double track between Wickham Market and Woodbridge could be a solution. They also requested improvements to line speeds on the East Suffolk line.

1.31.3. Abellio Greater Anglia Limited stated that the consultation should have considered the potential for workers to travel by rail on the East Suffolk line and transfer to park and ride services at Wickham Market, Saxmundham or Darsham railway stations. They commented that the Darsham scheme was best for connections with East Suffolk line services.

1.31.4. They stated that the possible reinstatement of passenger services on the Leiston branch line would require significant upgrades and the impact on freight needed to be understood. A shuttle service from Saxmundham would require construction of a bay platform and going through to Ipswich would incur significant costs.

1.32 Halesworth Town Council

1.32.1. Halesworth Town Council stated that they would be submitting comments after their March meeting from the relevant councillors. However, SZC Co. did not receive further comments from the town council.

1.33 Hasketon Parish Council

1.33.1. Hasketon Parish Council highlighted that they would be particularly affected by the Woodbridge park and ride at Hasketon. They opposed this option, stating that it would destroy agricultural land, wildlife habitats and public footpaths. They raised further concerns about light, noise and fuel pollution. They questioned the use of the Woodbridge park and ride after the construction had finished and whether the land would be restored and decontaminated. They stated that Potash Corner would also be inappropriate and that the Wickham Market site should be used.

1.34 Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard

1.34.1. The Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard stated that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should provide enough information for the HPA to assess the impact on public health and should contain risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures and residual impacts.

1.34.2. The Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard provided further detail of what they considered should be included in the EIA. They stated that it should identify and assess potential

public health impacts and emissions from the installation during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases. They recommended using the Government's Good Practice Guide for EIA.

- 1.34.3. The Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard stated that the assessment should identify human and environmental receptors, impacts arising from construction and decommissioning and control of emissions to air and water. They expected to see details of hazardous contamination that would be present on-site and stated that emissions to and from the ground should be considered in terms of the site's previous history. The Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard stated that the EIA should demonstrate compliance with the waste hierarchy and describe how SZC Co. would respond to accidents with potential off-site emissions. The Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard commented that SZC Co. should consider Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001 and the Major Accident Off-Site Emergency Plan (Management of Waste from Extractive Industries) (England and Wales) Regulations 2009.
- 1.34.4. They highlighted a potential health impact associated with the electric and magnetic fields around substations and the connecting cables or lines. They were concerned about possible effects of long-term exposure to electromagnetic fields, including possible carcinogenic effects at levels much lower than those given in the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. They stated that radiological impact assessments to demonstrate compliance with UK legislation and the principles of radiation protection would be required. The Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard stated that the radiological impact of any solid waste storage and disposal would also need to comply with UK practice and legislation.
- 1.34.5. The Health Protection Agency, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazard recommended liaison with the local authority, Food Standards Agency, Environment Agency and the Primary Care Trust(s) and Strategic Health Authority.
- 1.35 **Highways Agency**
- 1.35.1. The Highways Agency expressed support in principle for locating the lorry park within the southern park and ride, but should a separate site be pursued, they expressed preference for the A12/A14 Seven Hills Junction option. They explained that the Orwell Lorry Park east and west sites would go against the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 01/2008. They also specified several

issues that should be considered in future modelling, such as planned construction and developments and bridge closures.

1.36 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council

1.36.1. Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council were concerned about the impact on local services from the influx of workers and asked for more details about the appropriate impact assessments. They highlighted the potential for negative impact on the AONB, SSSI and tourism and suggested that the construction be camouflaged so it would not be visually obtrusive. They requested that SZC Co. set up a fund to assist the local community.

1.36.2. They stated that the size of the Sizewell C Project should be reduced and lighting should be restricted to reduce its impact on wildlife and they raised concern about environmental damage. They commented that the visitors centre should be located at Goose Hill because it had the best view and had a car park, but that the existing centre at Sizewell B should be used until it is ready.

1.36.3. Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council raised concern about the local housing market and impact on homelessness. They suggested some workers be housed on ships and that housing legacy be considered. They requested greater emphasis on cycle paths and the potential introduction of 'Boris Bikes'. They commented that a four-village bypass should be constructed due to concern for the villages and stated that increasing traffic would be dangerous and traffic calming measures were needed.

1.36.4. They raised a further concern that training local people would not be set up in time, called for economic assessments and asked how SZC Co. would mitigate negative impacts. They stated that there was insufficient time and data to properly consider impacts.

1.37 Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council

1.37.1. Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council commented that they could not support the proposals until the impacts on amenities and traffic for Leiston and Sizewell were resolved. They urged that impacts on the beach, public rights of way, and areas of importance regarding heritage and the environment must be fully considered.

1.37.2. Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council commented that although there would be some economic benefits, there would also be detrimental effects to residents, amenities and some local businesses. They requested consideration of emergency services, an overall strategy for dealing with the socio-economic effects of the Sizewell C Project, equal opportunities for recruitment and

community benefits such as footpath and cycleway improvements and upgrades to local facilities and amenities.

- 1.37.3. The council expressed a preference towards sea, rail then road transport but required more detail to assess the transport strategy, such as the size and design of the jetty and the frequency of night rail movements. They suggested that rail should link directly into the main development site, for all level crossings to be automated and for double-track between Saxmundham and Wickham Market. They supported the blue rail route. They expressed concern about the road traffic impact on Leiston from worker vehicles, park and ride buses and HGVs and resultant noise and vibration impacts. They requested that designated routes be discussed and agreed and for further environmental assessment of transport options to be carried out.
- 1.37.4. They expressed their preference for reusing the existing visitor centre at Sizewell B. They felt the accommodation strategy was flawed, with all three campus options unsuitable due to socio-economic and infrastructural impacts on Leiston and visual impacts on the surrounding area. They requested smaller, permanent campus sites in some locations further away from the main development site and commented that anti-social behaviour issues, as associated with previous developments, must be correctly addressed.
- 1.37.5. The council considered the proposed locations of all park and ride proposals on greenfield sites to be unsuitable and expressed support for a lorry park at Orwell Lorry Park (east or west). They commented that upgrades would be required for the B1122 and requested consideration of the D2 route and four-village bypass on the A12. They outlined additional information to be included in future assessments and highlighted concerns regarding potable water.

1.38 Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council

- 1.38.1. Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council outlined the benefits of locating a lorry park at one of the proposed standalone locations, such as legacy for Operation Stack and potential business synergy with the existing lorry park (for Options 1 and 2).
- 1.38.2. They highlighted the pros of a site at Orwell Lorry Park, such as access, existing facilities and legacy benefits, and the cons as the need for screening, impacts on long-term employment opportunities and the prevention of proposals to extend the existing lorry park. They expressed strong objection to the Seven Hills Junction site due to access issues, congestion, safety issues, damage to road infrastructure, unsuitability as for Operation Stack and loss of agricultural land.

1.39 Little Glemham Parish Council

- 1.39.1. Little Glemham Parish Council expressed concern that additional traffic on the A12 would impact its operation as a major transport route in the region with subsequent economic impacts. They commented that these impacts must be properly modelled before mitigation measures can be assessed and believed sufficient evidence and information had not been provided in Stage 1, including assessment of noise and air quality impacts and assessment of alternative options. They requested information about how SZC Co. would attempt to monitor and control the transport of its workforce.
- 1.39.2. Little Glemham Parish Council expressed concern about the impact of buses from the southern park and ride and HGVs and LGVs from the south on Little Glemham and resultant noise, vibration and safety impacts. They commented on the benefits of a four-village bypass suggesting that it should be considered as an option and commented that further remodelling of the A12 for the southern park and ride was required. They listed the additional transport related information that they considered was needed and they believed traffic may increase the physical barrier between the village across the A12.

1.40 Marine Management Organisation

- 1.40.1. The Marine Management Organisation considered that cooling water infrastructure, coastal flood defences, a jetty and works area on the foreshore for sea infrastructure would have the potential to impact the marine area and highlighted the requirement for consideration of the Marine Policy Statement and Marine Plan in the proposals.
- 1.40.2. They commented on the lack of detail about a potential jetty preventing significant analysis, and requested details about the construction, operation and decommissioning phases and resultant impacts of the jetty. They expressed concern about the impact of the Sizewell Beach visitor centre option on the marine area.
- 1.40.3. They made comments about the Environmental Report, specifically that further assessment may be necessary to identify the main resources and receptors that have potential to be affected by the Sizewell C Project, that some environmental effects such as impacts on spawning and nursery grounds had not been identified, and that further work on the design choices was needed so that they could positively respond to environmental sensitivities. The Marine Management Organisation also made comments and suggestions about specific sections of the Environmental Report. They comment on terrestrial ecology and ornithology, suggesting that assessments should consider impact pathways from the main development site to the marine environment and highlight the cumulative impact of habitat change as the area around the Sizewell outfall provides foraging habitat for seabirds.

- 1.40.4. The Marine Management Organisation also commented on recreation, asking for an assessment of the frequency of yachting in the area and the impact of additional marine obstructions on yachting activity as well as assessment of the resources of the beach adjacent to Sizewell C likely to be affected.
- 1.40.5. They commented on noise and vibration, drawing attention to the lack of assessment of the impact of vibration on marine mammals and requesting further consideration of noise impacts.
- 1.40.6. They suggested that the Marine Management Organisation should be consulted on the design of flood defence works and for these works to have a full impact assessment, including their impact on designated sites and their indirect impacts.
- 1.40.7. The Marine Management Organisation expressed satisfaction with the proposal for assessing coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics and the identification of environmental issues present during the construction of Sizewell B. They requested an explanation for the proposed location of the jetty and cooling water infrastructure and suggested consideration of erosion, climate change, engineering interventions and the cumulative impact from other projects should occur during development of plans for coastal and flood protection.
- 1.40.8. They commented on marine water quality and suggested assessments to check for the presence of shellfish waters, to consider potential contamination of marine waters from construction and that the thermal plume modelling should inform design decisions.
- 1.40.9. They made comments about commercial fisheries, suggesting that the baseline description used to inform the Environmental Report is not up to date and contains errors. They asked for an evaluation of any impacts to vulnerable species and spawning and nursery grounds and assessment of the subsequent impact of these factors on commercial fishing.
- 1.40.10. The Marine Management Organisation commented on navigation, suggesting the information on navigation should be up to date and include fishing vessels from outside the United Kingdom. They asked that SZC Co. consider the navigational impacts for marine users at different stages of the development, the impacts caused by the retention of part of the jetty and the impact of any displacement caused by the development and that mitigation should be proposed for any long-term navigational impact.
- 1.40.11. They commented on radiological effects and requested that further assessment is undertaken to establish the potential impact on marine radionuclide concentrations during the lifetime of Sizewell C and the effect of radiological impacts on non-human species.

1.40.12. They commented that the location of temporary developments should be based on minimising environmental impacts and impacts to the recreational use of the beach and sea.

1.41 Marlesford Parish Council

1.41.1. Marlesford Parish Council raised objections to several figures quoted in the consultation document and associated materials, particularly with regard to traffic levels, as they believed SZC Co.'s model to be deeply flawed. Marlesford Parish Council felt that this 'lack of hard data' prevented them from making fully informed comments, and therefore limited the consultation's usefulness.

1.41.2. Marlesford Parish Council also expressed concerns regarding the suitability of the proposals for a new park and ride site, given the current location would impact important local roads. They also drew attention to other areas they considered inadequate in the proposals: specifically, the lack of appropriate infrastructure for increased HGV traffic and Government's rejection of the proposed four villages bypass.

1.42 Martlesham Parish Council

1.42.1. The parish council expressed concern about the impact on Martlesham roads during construction from vehicle volume, noise and air pollution, combined with existing pressures on Orwell Bridge, the A12 and Seven Hills Junction. They asked that consideration be given to planned housing developments in the transport proposals.

1.42.2. They made suggestions to mitigate the impacts such as keeping road transport to a minimum, using noise-reducing road surfaces and conducting new air quality impact studies. They supported sea transport given that effects on marine ecology and coastal erosion would be minimal, and supported a passing loop, suggesting a halt at Martlesham as well. They suggested that legacy benefit housing be considered for the accommodation strategy.

1.42.3. The parish council made comments about the impact of Sizewell C during operation, particularly safety issues. They also expressed concern about the destruction of wildlife and the expense of storing nuclear waste.

1.43 Melton Parish Council

1.43.1. The parish council stated that subsidiary developments should be temporary in nature, with land restored post-construction. They expressed concern about the estimates used for the accommodation strategy but believed the use of a campus would reduce the impact to the rental market and considered that there should be appropriate safeguards for tourism accommodation.

- 1.43.2. They supported the maximum use of sea and rail to minimise road travel but had concerns about the southern park and ride proposals, suggesting that certain sections of the A12 be dualled to prevent dangerous driving. They could support Wickham Market or Woodbridge if this occurred but were strongly opposed to Potash Corner. They alternatively suggested locating it within the existing site at Martlesham.
- 1.43.3. They supported the location of a lorry park at an existing freight facility, not a combined site, and supported a passing loop and the red rail route for the opportunity to reinstate passenger services. They expressed concern about the impact of rail proposals on the East Suffolk line.
- 1.43.4. They highlighted the importance of developing strong links between SZC Co. and local schools and colleges. They made positive comments about the consultation process so far and made some suggestions. Finally, they drew attention to the potential for cumulative impacts together with other developments and believed impacts should be managed as a whole.

1.44 Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council

- 1.44.1. Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council's main concerns included the amount of land-take and its long-term use for temporary construction, methods of transporting materials, impacts on social, emergency and medical services, potential rising of council tax, the design of the buildings, their impact on the AONB and SSSIs and subsequent damage to tourism.
- 1.44.2. They expressed support for the maximum use of rail and sea transport but expressed concern about the impact of the jetty on the coast. They suggested that lighting should be designed to mitigate light pollution, that the campus should consist of smaller units with legacy potential (but had some support for Option 3) and that construction traffic should not use the B1122, suggesting a new access route from the A12 direct to the top of the site and traffic calming measures on the B1122 and B1125.
- 1.44.3. They supported a visitor centre at Goose Hill (Option 3), a standalone lorry park at Orwell east or west and felt that park and ride sites at Woodbridge and the A12/A14 junction were most appropriate (but suggested a northern location further north of Lowestoft), providing reasons to discount the other options. They felt that a four-village bypass was needed, but otherwise would support a Farnham Bypass, a rail extension into the main development site and the green rail route. They felt that legacy benefits should be provided wherever possible.
- 1.44.4. Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council expressed opposition to the timing of the consultation period, the inadequate distribution of questionnaires, the lack of

meaningful data and the misrepresentation of the buildings and infrastructure in the documentation.

1.45 Nacton Parish Council

- 1.45.1. Nacton Parish Council expressed support for the maximum use of rail and sea transport to reduce the number of HGVs on the roads and for the temporary rail extension option and a combined lorry park and park and ride, for the environmental benefits. They would have preferred for a standalone lorry park to be located at Orwell east or west for better access, use after construction, for considerations of other development proposals and for having less of an environmental impact. They also made positive comments about the consultation process.

1.46 National Grid

- 1.46.1. National Grid outlined their infrastructure within the vicinity of the proposed area of works including two 400kV overhead lines and four 132kV underground cables, as well as their Sizewell substations and the Leiston substation. They also outlined the proximity of their infrastructure, including overhead line and gas pipelines, to accommodation campus Options 2 and 3, southern park and ride Options 1 and 3 and rail improvements Option 1 (new rail terminal) and Option 2 (red rail route).
- 1.46.2. They also commented that guidance and agreements protecting their infrastructure should be followed and that access and statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained always. They made the suggestion that to protect their gas pipelines National Grid will need to agree the material, dimensions and method of installation for any proposed protective measure and that no permanent structures should be built over or under any pipelines. They commented that the relevant guidance for working safely near existing underground pipelines is found in the Health and Safety Executive's Guidance HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger From Underground Services" and asked that SZC Co. staff are aware of this guidance.
- 1.46.3. National Trust also raised concerns regarding the Sustainability Appraisal and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) included in the Stage 1 consultation documents, i.e. that these reports were inadequate and, particularly in the case of the Sustainability Appraisal, that they constituted something of an afterthought. National Trust were concerned that the release of these documents was a deliberate tactic to avoid publishing more detailed studies at a later date, and to shut down respondents' environmental concerns.
- 1.46.4. National Trust were keen to coordinate with SZC Co. and local communities to deliver a development that could be deemed an 'environmental exemplar', and that environmental concerns were given the same weight as the needs case set

out by EDF. They also made several suggestions regarding the legacy of the Sizewell C Project, most notably the creation of new cycleways, bridleways and footpaths.

1.47 NATS (En Route) Limited

1.47.1. NATS (En Route) reviewed the Stage 1 proposals and found no conflicts with their safeguarding criteria, and therefore found no reason to object to the proposals at this stage. However, they emphasised that, as a statutory consultee, NATS En Route must be consulted again should any substantive changes be made to the proposals.

1.48 Natural England

1.48.1. Natural England stated that impacts must be considered at the whole Sizewell C Project level rather than each element being assessed separately and that the Sizewell C Project must demonstrate avoidance and consideration of alternatives particularly regarding designated sites and protected landscape.

1.48.2. Natural England's main concerns included:

- that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) is not complete;
- the loss of land from the Sizewell Marshes SSSI (for which they requested more information and justification);
- impacts on Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SSSI;
- adverse impact on landscape character and visual amenity of the AONB from the main and associated development sites such as the accommodation campus and lorry park; and
- impacts on protected species, especially rare bats.

1.48.3. Natural England identified shortcomings to the Environmental Report where potential environmental impacts had not been satisfactorily assessed, including:

- impacts of changes to shipping and navigation on red-throated diver;
- impacts on coastal processes of construction area for jetty and sea defence;
- functioning of the SSSI triangle as an ecological corridor;
- impacts of removal or retention of temporary structures;
- impacts on the SSSI from dewatering and re-routing of the internal drainage board (IDB) watercourse; and

- impact on the AONB and its setting from the main and associated development sites.

1.48.4. They made suggestions about the design choices, such as that the coastal and marine structure design should consider changes to coastal configuration, that it must minimise direct loss of SSSI habitats and that it should ensure ecological corridors and sufficient connectivity for certain species as well as taking account of underlying soil types to ensure that the vision for the landscape can be delivered.

1.49 Network Rail

1.49.1. Network Rail commented that they would seek protection from the exercise of compulsory purchase powers over operational land for temporary or permanent purposes and would wish to agree protection for the railway.

1.49.2. They commented on the standard protective provisions to be included in the DCO and that consideration must be given to proposed alterations to the rail network including the passing loop at Wickham Market, the temporary or new rail terminal at Sizewell and the affected level crossings.

1.49.3. They listed the legal and commercial agreements that would need to be agreed and suggested that they be consulted about design of any infrastructure adjacent to operational lines regarding drainage and earthworks. They expected consideration to ensure that construction and maintenance could be carried out without affecting the safety of or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land.

1.50 NHS Suffolk

1.50.1. NHS Suffolk requested that more information should be forthcoming regarding the impact of the proposals on emergency services, primary care services, and public health and wellbeing, and suggested that a SZC Co.-funded budget be provided to assist them in ascertaining potential impacts and coordinating appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures.

1.51 Norfolk County Council

1.51.1. Norfolk County Council suggested that further environmental assessment should address issues with connections to the National Grid, particularly the need for reinforcement of existing power lines and whether further power lines or reinforcement of the wider grid network would be required, due to the cross-boundary effect this could have.

1.52 Office for Nuclear Regulation

1.52.1. The Office for Nuclear Regulation considered there to be no inaccuracies in the documentation regarding nuclear safety and security regimes enforced by the

Office for Nuclear Regulation and for statements regarding these issues for the proposed nuclear site. They commented that the siting of the accommodation campus should fully explore the viability of the Sizewell Emergency Response plan throughout its lifetime.

1.53 Orford and Gedgrave Parish Council

- 1.53.1. Orford and Gedgrave Parish Council commented that a lack of information prevented constructive contribution but expressed concern about the impact of the jetty and cooling water inlets on the marine environment, effect on coastal processes and the impact of light pollution on the AONB and the dark skies. They also commented on the impact of the proposals on availability, cost and quality of local housing for the tourist industry and about the effect of the workforce on local infrastructure including parking and footpaths. They requested information regarding the need for skills during construction and operation, for training and recruitment programmes and for information about the storage of radioactive materials. They also suggested a legacy audit and a carbon audit of the construction process.

1.54 Otley Parish Council

- 1.54.1. Otley Parish Council raised concern about the increase in traffic along the B1078 and impact on local roads around Wickham Market due to the southern park and ride location. They expressed a preference for the A12/A14 junction for the lorry park because of good access and long-term use for Operation Stack.
- 1.54.2. Otley Parish Council requested that approved HGV routes for traffic coming from the south on the A12 and A14 must be clearly signposted, as the use of minor roads through Otley would have major negative impacts on the local community. They also requested that rail improvements be maximised.

1.55 Passenger Focus

- 1.55.1. Passenger Focus noted the proposals for use of the freight-only branch line from Saxmundham to Sizewell, the potential new passing loop and the additional demand on the East Suffolk line, commenting that these proposals should not affect the hourly passenger service so it would be essential for sufficient capacity to be provided.

1.56 Peasenhall Parish Council

- 1.56.1. The council was most concerned about noise impacts from traffic increases. They suggested automatic number plate recognition cameras for freight transport and speed cameras to prevent noisy traffic at night. They also requested redesigning of the reactor buildings.

- 1.56.2. Peasenhall Parish Council expressed support for a four-village bypass, consideration of the 'D2' route and realignment of the A12 from Ipswich to Yarmouth.
- 1.56.3. They expressed concern about worker traffic on the A1120 and disturbance from early/late shift patterns. They commented that travel times from Norfolk beyond Lowestoft would be too great for home-based workers to commute and believed this would put pressure on local accommodation. They also requested a reworking of the Gravity Study.
- 1.56.4. They suggested an early start to education and training in the area to support the local economy and requested support for their village school.

1.57 Rendlesham Parish Council

- 1.57.1. Rendlesham Parish Council expressed concern about the proposed size of the main development site, the land-take from the AONB and SSSI areas and the lack of required infrastructure in place. They commented that it was difficult to distinguish the meaning of 'temporary' with regard to developments, and that there was no assurance of how protected areas would be preserved or reference to noise, light and vibration impacts on these areas.
- 1.57.2. They expressed a preference for a visitor centre at Sizewell Beach (but stated that they would support a more urban location) and for the main development site location for the campus accommodation (if it would allow workers to walk to the site).
- 1.57.3. Rendlesham Parish Council requested more information about sea and rail transport proposals, commenting on the inadequacy of the road network and existing congestion at Woodbridge and stated that none of the options for Farnham were adequate, suggesting consideration of a four-village bypass. They requested doubling of the rail track on the East Suffolk line and expressed concern about the environmental and archaeological impacts of a temporary rail extension.
- 1.57.4. They made suggestions about land restoration, questioning why so much greenfield land was to be used for developments, and requested further studies about the impact of increased traffic on rural roads. They expressed a preference for a Darsham park and ride (if it could be linked to the rail route), highlighted concerns about all southern park and ride options and opposed a combined lorry park site, with a preference for Orwell Park West.
- 1.57.5. Finally, they requested investment into training and apprenticeships to increase the local skill base and local employment in favour of outsourcing. They made several suggestions for the consultation documentation and listed specific points for which they believed more information was required in future stages.

1.58 Royal Mail

- 1.58.1. Royal Mail listed their operational properties within the area of the proposed development and expressed concern that their ability to provide services may be adversely affected by the transport impact of the development during its construction. They expressed the wish to register a holding objection to Sizewell C until they were satisfied that the risk of impact to their operations was acceptable or that they could be mitigated. They requested sight of the **Environmental Statement (ES)** (Doc Ref. Book 6) Scoping Report and any preliminary environmental information at the earliest possible opportunity and commented that they could provide information about their vehicle flows for traffic modelling.

1.59 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

- 1.59.1. The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) expressed disappointment at the scarcity of information provided and required more information on the scope, extent and design of the proposed works. They stated that they did not consider nuclear power an essential part of the UK's emission reduction strategy due to uncertainties surrounding nuclear waste disposal.
- 1.59.2. The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds highlighted the ecological importance of the Minsmere Nature Reserve and the need to conserve the natural beauty of the AONB. They expressed concern about the effects on protected areas including special protection Areas, special areas of conservation and SSSI sites, such as disturbance to breeding of wintering birds and other protected species, fragmentation and harm to habitat, noise, light and air pollution to habitats and species, loss or alteration to coastal, freshwater terrestrial habitats and alteration of roosting and foraging areas and marine ecosystems.
- 1.59.3. Their concerns based on the consultation document related to the location of the helipad near designated sites, lack of assessment for impacts on Sizewell Marshes SSSI, beach/offshore processes and species movement during and post-construction, limited information about Minsmere Sluice, noise, vibration and lighting on designated areas, lack of evidence to demonstrate habitat compensation for SSSIs, the construction and location of the visitor centre on potential heathland creation land, and no evidence about the impacts of the new railway and campus locations on species and habitats.
- 1.59.4. They commented that all issues that affect Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites should be assessed in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (HRA) and agreed with the direction that the HRA was taking based on their knowledge so far.

1.60 Saxmundham Town Council

- 1.60.1. Saxmundham Town Council was particularly concerned with traffic impacts and the impacts on residents from Sizewell C. They considered that there was a limited period and insufficient evidence and information presented at this stage of consultation, especially regarding transport and socio-economic effects, and believed alternative options should have been included to allow informed decisions.
- 1.60.2. They requested that Sizewell traffic be kept to main roads only, with designated routes signposted (discussing several specific signage ideas), and that the frequency of night movements for trains should be documented. They expressed concern about the detrimental effects of the development on residents, amenities, emergency services, employers and the housing balance of the town.
- 1.60.3. They thought the southern park and ride options were poorly related to the local road networks and suggested the possibility of a single site on the A12 next to a possible 'D2' link road, and that any site should be constructed before work on the main development site begins. They commented that none of the visitor centre sites or proposed campus options were suitable as they were proposed for greenfield land and suggested using several smaller sites instead. They asked that more transport options and options for parking in Saxmundham were explored.

1.61 Shottisham Parish Council

- 1.61.4. Shottisham Parish Council considered that legacy benefits should be provided to compensate for the short and long-term disturbance to residents.
- 1.61.5. They expressed concern about the impact on the AONB, traffic on the A12 and subsequent impacts on tourism. They believed it would be crucial for SZC Co. to provide infrastructure improvements, such as a rail link between Suffolk and London, a double track line from Ipswich to Lowestoft and for improvements to the A12 including a four-village bypass. They requested further traffic analysis and for sea transport to be developed without damage to coastal environments. They urged SZC Co. to source labour and supply needs locally to prevent impacts on social, healthcare and education systems and for the provision of long-term employment and apprenticeships.

1.62 Southwold Town Council

- 1.62.6. Southwold Town Council supported the development, subject to environmental considerations and legacy benefit, but felt that the site and associated developments would be invasive and obtrusive. They expressed preference for

Goose Hill for the visitor centre and thought the accommodation strategy was acceptable.

1.62.7. They suggested that double-tracking the rail line would enable more freight and for improvements to the A1120 and B1120 junctions in Yoxford. They expressed concern about the size of a jetty and vessels and unreliable weather patterns for sea deliveries. They supported a lorry park but believed it should be separate to the park and ride site and were opposed to a possible four-village bypass. They also supported the red rail route for reduced landscape impact and made suggestions about education and training, including supply chain and employment opportunities and consideration of effects on tourism. They were supportive of the consultation process.

1.63 Sudbourne Parish Council

1.63.8. The parish council commented that the documentation was inconclusive and vague and expressed concern about the impacts on local services due to the influx of workers, the effect of the accommodation campus and the impact of a jetty on shingle and coastal erosion. They suggested that any leisure facilities built should be permanent, for consideration of a four-village bypass and for support for local businesses and training provisions. They also commented that Suffolk should benefit in the long term through planning and community benefit gain.

1.64 Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership

1.64.9. Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership were supportive of the potential economic benefits of the development but stressed the importance of adequately accommodating the Sizewell C Project within a sensitive landscape. They believed that the proposals would cut the AONB in half and damage its amenity, tranquillity, access and biodiversity and suggested mitigating against any fluvial or tidal impacts.

1.64.10. Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership questioned the justification for increased land use and what proposals had been made to offset the losses during the construction period. They were supportive of a visitor centre of an 'exemplar' design at Goose Hill as the most appropriate option, as well as an accommodation campus at Leiston East depending on opportunities for legacy benefits and avoiding damage to the AONB. They also commented on the impact of the lorry park options on the AONB, considering them inappropriate.

1.64.11. They expressed concern about the impacts of the transport strategy and the effect of traffic on tourism and businesses. They were supportive of rail transport, with preference for the new rail terminal option.

1.65 Suffolk Coastal District Council & Suffolk County Council

- 1.65.12. Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council submitted a joint response. The councils commented that the benefits of the development should be balanced against the impacts on the environment, communities and the transport network. They made suggestions that opportunities for local businesses and skills development should be enhanced by SZC Co. through liaison with local authorities and other bodies in the East of England and requested community benefits to compensate the community for the perceived dis-benefits of hosting a nuclear power plant. They commented on the importance of high-quality design, enhancements to the AONB and biodiversity and the design of structures to minimise impact on coastal processes. They strongly stated that a four-village bypass would be necessary and requested sufficient mitigation for the B1122, upgrades to the Seven Hills roundabout, protection for minor roads near the A12 and more realistic transport assessment including understanding of in-combination impacts of other developments.
- 1.65.13. They believed car traffic estimates to the site had been underestimated, that park and rides should not be located near the main development site and that rail improvements should be made to accommodate worker transport to the site.
- 1.65.14. They supported Option 2 for a temporary rail extension to the main development site, the siting a lorry park east or west of Orwell Lorry Park and Option 2 for the northern park and ride site. They strongly opposed Option 2 for the accommodation campus and thought a split campus should be taken into consideration. They strongly opposed Option 3 for the southern park and ride and suggested that the Wickham Market and Woodbridge options should be retained for more detailed study.
- 1.65.15. They requested clarifications about spent fuel storage, justification for lay-down and construction areas and suggested ways to minimise impact.

1.66 Suffolk Constabulary

- 1.66.16. The constabulary commented that further detailed work would be required to understand the policing and community issues linked to the proposed development and expected SZC Co. to minimise and mitigate these issues to prevent adverse impact.
- 1.66.17. They commented on a possible significant increase in demand on Suffolk Constabulary from crime, requests for police attendance, road traffic issues, changes to the night-time economy and increasing offences in the vicinity and wider area during construction due to the influx of workers. They sought support in achieving cohesion between communities and minimising local tensions. They also expressed concern about building site offences and prolonged or large-scale protest activity.

- 1.66.18. The constabulary expressed a preference for campus Option 1 for reducing vehicle traffic through Leiston. They outlined the potential demands that could arise from the accommodation such as from workers leaving the site for recreational activity. They commented on the attraction of theft and urged that crime prevention measures be followed. They suggested use of the premises on the campus site for police use.
- 1.66.19. They suggested that park and ride site locations should consider where most workers are coming from to reduce A12 traffic and requested assurance that crime prevention measures would be adopted at the sites. They suggested that both Options 2 and 3 would be viable for the north and Option 1 for the south.
- 1.66.20. The constabulary welcomed the use of rail and sea to reduce road congestion and subsequent safety risks and suggested having freight delivered directly to the construction site. They preferred Option 2 for the lorry park location, but suggested upgrades they believed would be needed. They had no objections to any proposed rail routes, supported an A12 bypass, specifically a four-village bypass and suggested further assessment and mitigation for the B1122.

1.67 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

- 1.67.21. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service had concerns about the community safety consequences of the Sizewell C Project and advised that financial and resource burdens which are directly attributable to supporting the Sizewell C Project would need to be underwritten by SZC Co. They commented that impacts on Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service emergency response capability should be considered for the temporary developments.
- 1.67.22. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service expressed support for the following option proposals above others:
- Sizewell Beach for the visitor centre to keep traffic away from key intersections.
 - The development site campus accommodation to minimise site related traffic.
 - The A12/A14 junction for the northern park and ride and Wickham Market for the southern park and ride on the basis of road safety and local traffic impact mitigation.
 - A standalone lorry park, with both Orwell Lorry Park options being deemed appropriate.
 - The bypass at Farnham to reduce congestion.
 - The temporary rail extension to minimise site related traffic.
 - The red rail route due to minimal disruption along the B1122.

1.67.23. However, they expressed concern about site related traffic impacts to the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service emergency response capability as they stated that the additional volumes and type of traffic would be likely to cause significant congestion and road accidents. They suggested cooperation with local employers for the Sizewell C Project recruitment strategy and had concerns that Sizewell C employment may negatively impact recruitment and retention of fire and rescue personnel. They commented on a need for greater clarity in future consultations.

1.67.24. They outlined issues that impact the Integrated Risk Management Plans for Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service in detail, including community safety, home safety/sleeping risk safety, road safety and youth education and support amongst others.

1.68 Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT)

1.68.25. SWT commented on the importance of the landscape and ecology at the proposed site and believed that biodiversity loss caused by the main development site and associated developments must be addressed. They expressed concern about the impact on Sizewell Marshes SSSI, its network of watercourses and wildlife within the area and questioned how this would be compensated for. They expressed concern about bats, reptiles and recreational disturbance, about the impact on groundwater levels and suggested a more robust hydrological survey be undertaken, the impact of borrow pits and requested detail about restoration post-development.

1.68.26. SWT requested clarification about the timing of the visitor centre construction and about ecological surveys for the proposed options, with significant concerns about the Goose Hill option.

1.68.27. They expressed concerns about the environmental impacts of the accommodation campus options outlining their concerns for each and suggesting an alternative location or several smaller sites instead. They expressed opposition to a southern park and ride at Potash Corner due to dangerous traffic issues and had ecological concerns about the Farnham bypass option. They suggested further ecological surveying for the rail proposals, specifically bat-commuting corridors. The SWT expressed concern about impacts to the marine and coastal environment caused by marine infrastructure on designated areas.

1.69 Sweffling Parish Council

1.69.28. The parish council's main concerns included:

- The potential impact of storm surges and coastal erosion on the development.

- Exacerbating cumulative impacts on tourism, nature reserves and SSSIs that already exist from Sizewell A decommissioning and windfarm substation growth.
- The impact of traffic on the A12 on the tourist industry.
- The impact of an influx of people on health services and schools.

1.69.29. The parish council supported an accommodation campus at Leiston East due to benefits to trade in Leiston, a temporary rail extension into the main development site, a bypass at Farnham, a separate lorry park at Orwell East or West, a southern park and ride at Wickham Market, a northern park and ride at Darsham for legacy benefits or A12/A14 junction for safety and for maximum use of sea and rail transport. They commented that all proposed rail routes were not ideal, but that the green route appeared to impact the fewest residents. They expressed concern about the risk of accidents from HGVs, the use of the A1120 and B1119 as rat-runs and the impacts on safety at Benhall Low Street/Sweffling.

1.69.30. They requested more information about local employment and urged that social and economic mistakes made during Sizewell B construction are not made again.

1.70 Swilland and Witnesham grouped Parish Council

1.70.31. Swilland and Witnesham grouped Parish Council commented on the inevitability of a nuclear build at Sizewell C and had no particular concerns to address.

1.71 The Coal Authority

1.71.32. The Coal Authority confirmed that the area of the proposed development was not within the defined coalfield and therefore had no observations or specific comments to make.

1.72 Tunstall Parish Council

1.72.33. The parish council requested information about how to report HGVs that may stray from the designated construction route and expressed support for a northern park and ride at Darsham due to the proximity to rail links.

1.72.34. They questioned the amount of investment planned for local communities to compensate for the risk of hosting a dangerous nuclear facility for a long amount of time. They also commented on the lack of information about the risk of terrorism and about spent fuel disposal, for which they expressed substantial alarm.

1.72.35. They expressed concern about increased traffic and impacts to road infrastructure of the A12, commenting that not enough had been done to mitigate any damage. They requested that for associated development such as

the accommodation campus, conditions should be imposed to restore these to their original condition, but that some facilities such as sports facilities should be left as an asset to the local community.

1.73 Ufford Parish Council

1.73.36. The parish council commented that the nuclear power station should be sited where the power would be used, nearer London. They expressed support for Option 1 for the accommodation campus, the red route rail line, a rail extension into the site to be used permanently, not just for construction, a four-village bypass, Option 2 for Orwell Lorry Park (east) to be left as a legacy benefit for permanent use and a southern park and ride at Wickham Market. They supported the use of sea and rail but expressed concern about the disruption to local services and people, and suggested improvements at Melton crossing, engagement with local colleges to ensure training and apprenticeships are provided for local people and further details about the potential for new pylons or underground cables.

1.74 Waldringfield Parish Council

1.74.37. The council suggested that accommodation should provide permanent, affordable housing for the community. They suggested that the transport strategy should take further consideration of planned housing developments, particularly around Orwell Bridge, and traffic should not exceed the quoted maximum. They expressed preference for a northern park and ride at Yoxford Road and Darsham and a four-village bypass.

1.75 Waveney District Council

1.75.38. Waveney District Council fully embraced the positive impacts to residents and businesses of the district. They suggested that the development should be seen alongside other energy sector developments. They shared the views of Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council in relation to transport infrastructure and workforce training and development and commented that to achieve potential opportunities, the appropriate infrastructure should be in place for the development, for good access to towns such as Lowestoft and for the use of their skilled and available workforce and training and development to ensure economic and social benefits to the district.

1.76 Wickham Market Parish Council

1.76.39. Wickham Market Parish Council commented that the timescale for the consultation was too short and set during an inconvenient time. They expressed concern about the impact of the development on traffic, especially during construction, and felt the documentation was lacking in estimations and statistics.

1.76.40. They requested a strict traffic proposal for the Wickham Market southern park and ride site and legacy benefits such as for the site to retain the landscaping around it as community woodland and for community use of associated park and ride buildings.

1.76.41. They supported a possible four-village bypass to reduce traffic impact and requested that SZC Co. consider proposals to rebuild their village hall in the community benefit planning.

1.77 Woodbridge Town Council

1.77.42. The council commented that there had been insufficient data and time given in the consultation to enable full comment on the proposed options. They felt that all southern park and ride options would be inadequate in reducing the impact of worker traffic and suggested a site further south. They supported a northern park and ride at Darsham, a separate lorry park at Orwell east or west to minimise impact and maximise legacy potential and for sea transport to be used. They supported the use of rail in principle but believed the options needed more visual and environmental consideration and further infrastructure improvements before they would be acceptable.

1.77.43. The council disagreed with SZC Co.'s traffic estimates and commented that future housing developments should be taken into consideration. They expressed concern about the increased traffic and vibration damage at Yoxford and on the B1122, and supported a bypass at Farnham as a minimum, but preferably a four-village bypass. They requested a proposal for community benefits and legacy.

1.78 Yoxford Parish Council

1.78.44. Yoxford Parish Council expressed support for a northern park and ride at Darsham. They commented that the proposed mitigation for the B1122 would be inadequate and that impacts could additionally spread to the A1120 junction. They expressed concern about the use of the B1122 and requested some form of compensation for residents of the B1122 and A1120.

1.78.45. Yoxford Parish Council made suggestions about better use of port facilities and for upgrades to village infrastructure such as broadband and mobile coverage, for SZC Co. to pay for road infrastructure damage and for traffic calming measures on approaches to Yoxford.

1.78.46. They expressed concern about safety issues associated with SZC Co.'s operations. They felt a lack of information was provided about emergency planning, nuclear waste disposal and competition law, stating that these should be addressed. They also asked that SZC Co. be obliged to pay for decommissioning, waste disposal and clean-up of Sizewell C.

2 Summary of Responses from Section 42(1)(d) Consultees by Theme

2.1 Overall Proposals

General

- 2.1.1. Some section 42(1)(d) consultees (referred to throughout as persons with an interest in land, or PILs) supported the Sizewell C Project as they believed that the predicted increase in demand for energy was stretching existing generation capacity and that it was important to diversify the nation's energy supply. Some PILs were supportive without providing reasons for their support or were supportive but with caveats such as the need for traffic mitigation.
- 2.1.2. Other PILs supported nuclear power as they felt it was efficient compared to other forms of renewable energy and that it was perceived as a necessary response to climate change.
- 2.1.3. Some PILs opposed the Sizewell C Project for a number of reasons including:
- A perception that there is insufficient space for two reactors.
 - Safety concerns.
 - The view that the location on the Suffolk Coast is unsuitable as it has poor access for transport and is on an eroding coastline with too many existing energy projects.
 - The potential impact on nearby designated areas and the wildlife that live there.
 - The potential impact on local residents.
- 2.1.4. Some PILs expressed opposition to nuclear energy for a number of reasons, including suggestions that it does not reduce carbon emissions significantly enough, is too expensive, presents too great a safety risk and that it provides a legacy of spent nuclear waste.
- 2.1.5. Some PILs expressed concern about the long timeline for construction. They also commented on other EDF Energy nuclear projects that are delayed, suggesting that Sizewell C might follow this pattern.
- 2.1.6. A number of PILs commented in favour of alternative renewable energy sources such as wind power as they believed these would be more resilient or that government assessment of the need for nuclear energy was inaccurate.
- 2.1.7. Some PILs provided suggestions of alternative locations for the reactors such as on industrial land in Tilbury, or other nuclear sites including Wylfa in Anglesey or Moorside in Cumbria.

Safety

- 2.1.8. Some PILs commented on the potential for emergency incidents at Sizewell C. As tidal surges were reported to have occurred in the area a few suggested there was a risk of an event like the Fukushima disaster. Other PILs requested that an emergency plan should be put in place, although some believed that an evacuation would be difficult as transport access through East Suffolk is perceived as inadequate, particularly with increased HGV movements expected on the B1122.
- 2.1.9. Some PILs suggested that the proposal to build two reactors on the main development site was potentially dangerous as they felt the site was not big enough.
- 2.1.10. Some PILs suggested that the reactor design chosen for Sizewell C has caused complications in other SZC Co. projects and felt that it was outdated. Others believed that the reactor design would require the ground to be built up to 6.5 metres above mean sea level, representing a very carbon intensive construction system due to the extensive use of concrete.
- 2.1.11. The processing of nuclear waste was commented on by some PILs who suggested this currently uncertain due to the lack of an operational EPR reactor to provide practical guidance. Some also commented on the absence of an agreed location for a long-term storage facility for nuclear waste. Others commented on the high costs associated with disposing of nuclear waste.

Socio-economics

- 2.1.12. Some PILs supported apprenticeships and other education and training schemes put forward by SZC Co. as they felt this would help address historic unemployment in Leiston. Others suggested that efforts should be made to engage schoolchildren with the proposals through school tours.
- 2.1.13. Some PILs felt that proposed compensation for local communities was not sufficient and that any benefits experienced would be short-term. Others made specific suggestions such as for government compensation packages like those offered to home owners living near the planned HS2 rail scheme. Suggestions for compensation measures from SZC Co. included:
- the construction of new facilities such as a local NHS x-ray centre;
 - the building of affordable housing in the Leiston area;
 - the refurbishment of existing facilities such as the children's centre; and
 - the subsidisation of bills such as council tax.

- 2.1.14. Some PILs believed that the existing community infrastructure would be unable to cope with the increased number of workers, suggesting that pressure would be placed on freshwater supplies, the police service, doctors, schools and sewage works. They felt these issues had not been given enough attention by SZC Co. at that date. Some PILs believed that additional funding was needed to mitigate the effects on local infrastructure, especially in relation to health services.
- 2.1.15. Some PILs requested further details on employment figures, including the ratio of locally employed people to non-locals. Others asked for further assessment of the impact of workers on the local community.
- 2.1.16. Some PILs felt that the impacts of the construction would reduce local residents' quality of life and have an adverse impact on physical and mental health. This was particularly in reference to construction being planned for 24 hours a day. Participants suggested that the construction would last for over a decade and involve increased congestion, noise and vibration and light pollution, all of which would affect quality of life. Some PILs felt that little concern was being shown for the local community and requested that these effects be mitigated as much as possible.
- 2.1.17. Some PILs commented on their experiences during the construction of Sizewell B, suggesting there was an increase in crime and antisocial behaviour. They felt there had been a failure by SZC Co. to address the concerns of the local community and the demands on resources such as freshwater. Some PILs believed these issues would reoccur during construction of Sizewell C. They highlighted the importance of trying to mitigate these impacts through increased policing and the provision of entertainment facilities for workers.
- 2.1.18. Some PILs mentioned specific concerns about the impacts of the overall Sizewell C Project such as noise and dust pollution, increased traffic and the potential loss of access to properties and amenities. They also expressed concern that any land taken temporarily would not be restored to its original state.
- 2.1.19. Some PILs who reported that they own local businesses commented on the potential for loss of local jobs and revenue, especially in the tourism and farming industries or among those whose land is directly required for the Sizewell C Project. Other PILs felt proposed road improvements would have a negative impact on the ease of access to their businesses.
- 2.1.20. Tourism was also raised as an issue and some PILs felt they would be affected by construction. They suggested construction impacts of the Sizewell C Project as a whole would discourage tourists from visiting the area and

therefore damage a key part of the economy. In contrast, some believed that if workers used accommodation usually occupied by tourists then this would be positive for those businesses which otherwise might struggle to generate revenue.

- 2.1.21. Some PILs felt that the proposals would be detrimental to people's enjoyment of local amenities, such as dog walking routes to the west of the main development site, due to the closure or alteration of sites. They requested further assessment of the loss of amenity and the impacts this would have in the Habitat Regulations Assessment.
- 2.1.22. Some PILs believed that the proposals could have a harmful impact on vulnerable groups such as the elderly and school children due to the proximity of elements of the development to nursing homes, schools and amenities. This included sites said to be particularly used by children such as the campsite at Eastbridge.
- 2.1.23. Other PILs believed that the development would be generally beneficial for the local economy.
- 2.1.24. Some PILs asked for priority to be given to local businesses and labour in forming the workforce and supply chain for the construction process. Other PILs asked that the priority be the quality of the work and felt that this should not be jeopardised by trying to ensure local businesses benefit from the development.

Transport

- 2.1.25. Some PILs opposed the proposed transport strategy as they felt it was inadequate and motivated primarily by saving money. Others supported the transport strategy or supported it if other conditions were met, such as that a link road is built between the A12 and the main development site or that use of park and ride sites is enforced.
- 2.1.26. Some PILs asked for several traffic assessments to be undertaken. This included the effects of increased traffic movement on specific roads such as the B1122, as well as assessment of the impact of mitigation proposals such as the Farnham bend. Other PILs wished to see how the figures for the increase in traffic provided by SZC Co. had been calculated as they felt these might be inaccurate.
- 2.1.27. Some PILs commented on the funding for road improvements, with some suggesting that government should fund all the road improvements aside from a potential Farnham bypass. Others suggested that SZC Co. should help fund the improvements alongside central government and Suffolk County Council.

- 2.1.28. Some PILs suggested that the use of road freight should be minimised as much as possible. Where unavoidable, they requested measures to reduce the impacts of HGVs such as HGV traffic controls, although other PILs felt traffic controls were ineffective. Alternatively, they suggested transferring some of the road freight to rail to limit the number of HGV movements.
- 2.1.29. Some PILs believed that certain roads, particularly the B1122, would be unsuitable for HGV movements on a large scale as this road is often congested and is single lane only.
- 2.1.30. Some PILs felt that congestion would increase in the local area as a result of the rise in traffic movements during construction of Sizewell C. A few PILs suggested that use of the A12 and B1122 as part of the transport strategy should be avoided owing to existing congestion. Other roads mentioned by PILs to avoid were:
- Lovers Lane as it is a site of cut-through driving.
 - Abbey Lane which is single lane and contains existing public amenities.
 - Sizewell Gap Road as this is prone to traffic collisions.
- 2.1.31. Other PILs requested the minimising of congestion on all local roads and felt that any increase in congestion would be unacceptable.
- 2.1.32. Some PILs believed that the forecast increase in traffic was an underestimate and the capacity of the existing road network had been overestimated. Other PILs requested that the traffic assessments take into account peaks in traffic experienced during the rush hour, summer and bank holidays.
- 2.1.33. Some PILs suggested the state of the current road network was poor and felt many roads such as the B1122 and the A12 would require upgrades before they could cope with additional HGV movements. Other PILs requested speed restriction measures on roads such as Abbey Lane to deter traffic.
- 2.1.34. Some PILs requested provision of access to the main development site through a new bypass from the A12 to avoid the congestion on the B1122 and provide an alternative emergency access route. Other PILs requested improvements to the safety of the A12 or the creation of a passenger rail link to the main development site.
- 2.1.35. Some PILs commented on the potential impacts of congestion on accessibility for emergency services in the local area, particularly in the event of an incident at Sizewell C.
- 2.1.36. Some PILs suggested that congestion from the use of the A12 and B1122 as part of the transport strategy could disrupt the lives of residents, particularly in

the villages of Yoxford, Middleton and Theberton. They believed the close proximity of houses to these roads would subject the properties to greater noise and vibration. Other concerns related to the A12 and the B1122 were:

- Access to and from properties on these roads could be more difficult for residents.
 - Traffic collisions could affect local residents, especially schoolchildren who have pick-up points on the B1122.
 - Access to and from the A12 and B1122 could be more unsafe because of the increased congestion.
- 2.1.37. Some PILs suggested that smaller roads such as Abbey Lane could become more dangerous due to increased congestion as PILs believed these roads already suffered from poor visibility. Other PILs believed that increased HGV movements would place pedestrians and cyclists at risk as some sections of the B1122 do not have pavements or adequate space for two HGVs to pass each other.
- 2.1.38. A number of PILs requested that the D2 link road proposed when Sizewell B was constructed be built as they feared that without it the B1122 could become heavily congested.
- 2.1.39. Some PILs suggested that SZC Co. needs to enforce aspects of the transport strategy, particularly the use of the park and ride facilities and the prevention of the use of smaller local roads by Sizewell C workers. Other aspects PILs suggested SZC Co. needed to enforce included speed management controls on the B1122, Sizewell C approach road and the Sizewell Gap Road.
- 2.1.40. Some PILs encouraged the use of rail and sea in the transport strategy to move freight as this could decrease traffic on the road network and make it easier to convey large loads.
- 2.1.41. Some PILs commented that access routes to the jetty pass through the Outer Thames Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and suggested the inclusion of the impacts this would cause in the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Construction Materials

- 2.1.42. Some PILs expressed concerns about the proposal to transport spoil by rail to Wallasea Island as they felt that constructing a rail terminal would be detrimental to the site. Other PILs commented that they had no issues with spoil disposal on the condition that spoil was not deposited in mass piles that could lead to flooding.

- 2.1.43. Some PILs requested further details about how construction materials would be obtained from borrow pits located within the construction area, as well as information about the mitigation that would be proposed for the impact of these borrow pits.

Consultation Process

- 2.1.44. Some PILs felt that they were well-informed after the consultation process and that people's views were sought out to a greater extent for Sizewell C than for Sizewell B.
- 2.1.45. Some PILs praised the consultation events for being very informative and useful and the staff at the events for being professional and approachable.
- 2.1.46. In contrast other PILs suggested staff at the consultation events showed little appreciation for the effects of historic development on the local community and were unable to answer the concerns of local people as they lacked local knowledge. Other PILs commented that the events were not well publicised and difficult to attend for those working full-time or stay at home parents.
- 2.1.47. Some PILs felt that some of the information provided as part of the consultation was misleading, particularly the maps and diagrams. They suggested this misleading information was designed to downplay the impact that the proposals could have on the local community, wildlife and ecology. In contrast, other PILs believed the information provided had been very good and informative.
- 2.1.48. Some PILs criticised the description of the benefits provided by Option 1 for the new rail terminal as they felt it was misleading to suggest this would allow unloading operations to take place further from the residential areas of Leiston. The PILs suggested Leiston would still be affected by noise, dust and light pollution.
- 2.1.49. Some PILs suggested that the opinion of local councils should be prioritised during consultation. Others expressly suggested local opinion should be valued as local people would be most impacted by the proposals.
- 2.1.50. Some PILs commented on the level of detail in the consultation as they felt SZC Co. had failed to submit enough data for people to reach informed conclusions, especially with regard to the transport proposals and the environmental impact of the proposals. As a result of the lack of information, some PILs felt that further consultation was necessary. Other PILs requested further assessments and specific details on several topics including:

- Transport proposals.

- Environmental mitigation measures.
- The visitor centre.

- 2.1.51. Some PILs suggested the scope of the consultation should be expanded to encompass discussion of wider issues related to nuclear power such as its viability. Others asked that as persons with an interest in land they, and other organisations such as the RSPB, should be kept fully updated on developments within the Sizewell C Project.
- 2.1.52. Some PILs believed that communication from SZC Co. had been insufficient as they felt they did not know about proposals that would affect their land until it was too late to provide a detailed response. Some PILs suggested the consultation document should have been sent to all homes in the local area.
- 2.1.53. Some PILs felt the consultation timescale was too short, particularly since it included the Christmas holiday period which reduced capacity for people to respond to the consultation. Other PILs felt that the timescale for consultation was too long and wanted the Sizewell C Project to begin as soon as possible.
- 2.1.54. Some PILs criticised the website as they felt it was unclear and hard to use. They suggested that the consultation process was not accessible for older people.
- 2.1.55. Some PILs believed that the consultation process was predetermined, and their views were not being considered by SZC Co. Some felt that proposals to use particular areas of land were included in the consultation before PILs had reached agreement with SZC Co.

2.2 Main Development Site

General

- 2.2.1. Some PILs commented on aspects of the main development site including the permanent access road, which they feared would increase flood risk. Other PILs felt the design of the main development site buildings would be unsuitable for the low-lying landscape of the AONB and asked that they be modelled on the existing Sizewell B buildings instead. Other PILs requested a clear span design for the SSSI crossing for the benefit of wildlife.
- 2.2.2. Some PILs perceived there to be a lack of information about the cooling water infrastructure and commented that there was a need for assessment of the impact on wildlife and ecology. Other PILs requested details of the proposals for the de-watering of the main development site.

- 2.2.3. Some PILs commented on the extent of the land take required as they believed this was too large, especially given the ecologically sensitive nature of the location and the existing land in the area already owned by SZC Co. Other PILs questioned why land they owned or occupied was required and asked that alternative options be presented.
- 2.2.4. Some PILs felt that the timescale for use of the temporary land was too long and expressed doubts about whether this land would be returned to its original use.
- 2.2.5. Some PILs requested that details of the scope and scale of pre-construction works should be provided and asked for these works to be postponed until further ecological assessment had been carried out.
- 2.2.6. Some PILs questioned the location of the induction centre, close to the main development site, given that many of the workers were expected to live far away from the site. Other PILs raised concerns about the location of the proposed main development site given the number of other energy projects in the Suffolk coastal area.

Environment – General

- 2.2.7. Some PILs commented on the perceived impact of the proposals on the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, suggesting there would be habitat loss as well as a detrimental effect on hydrology and wildlife. Other PILs mentioned the visual impact of the main development site on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. Some PILs also commented on the potential ecological impact of the proposals on RSPB Minsmere Reserve.
- 2.2.8. Some PILs felt that environmental mitigation would be inadequate as they believed too few mitigation measures were proposed and that there was not enough detail for the proposed measures. Other PILs believed that it would be impossible to restore the habitat required temporarily to its original state once construction was over.
- 2.2.9. Some PILs requested assessment of the impact of power station cooling systems on marine ecology as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Other environmental aspects that PILs felt required further assessment included:
- The impact of the Sizewell C Project on coastal processes.
 - The effects of the proposed helipad on nearby designated areas.
 - The impact of noise on local residents.

- 2.2.10. Some PILs suggested that the need for ongoing management of wildlife habitats should be taken into account during the construction period.
- 2.2.11. Some PILs commented on the impact of the closure of public rights of way on walkers, horse riders and tourists.

Noise and vibration

- 2.2.12. Some PILs suggested potential increases in noise and vibration could have a detrimental effect on properties, businesses and the wildlife and ecology in the local area.

Air quality

- 2.2.13. Some PILs commented that the movement of HGVs to and from the main development site during the construction phase could have an adverse effect on air quality through the generation of emissions and dust.

Landscape and visual

- 2.2.14. Some PILs commented on the landscape and visual impacts of the main development site, as well as the accommodation campus and the park and ride sites. They felt each of the developments would be a ‘blot’ on the countryside and change the rural character of the area. Other PILs requested the introduction of a landscape strategy to provide mitigation during construction and restore the areas to their original state post-construction.
- 2.2.15. PILs also commented that aspects of the proposals, especially the main development site, accommodation campus and park and ride sites might generate light pollution which could have a harmful impact on local residents, wildlife and dark skies at night.

Ecology

- 2.2.16. Some PILs felt that the overall proposals would place wildlife and their habitats at risk and raised concerns in particular about the effect on flora and fauna designated in the Biodiversity Action Plan. Other PILs specified aspects of the proposals such as the main development site accommodation campus and the option of a visitor centre at Goose Hill as especially damaging for wildlife.

Groundwater and Surface Water

- 2.2.17. Some PILs raised concerns about the availability of potable water as they noted that the Suffolk water network is already under pressure and felt it could be difficult to provide sufficient water for the construction workforce and the operation of the main development site.

- 2.2.18. Some PILs believed that the proposals could lead to an increased risk of flooding, particularly in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI and around Minsmere Sluice where the hydrology is fragile. Other PILs commented on the history of flooding in Leiston and suggested this would be exacerbated by the development of the Sizewell C site within the nearby flood plain.

Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water

- 2.2.19. Some PILs praised the idea of using a jetty as they felt it could reduce congestion on the roads with the caveat that the jetty should be removed once construction was complete.
- 2.2.20. Some PILs believed the effect of the jetty on coastal processes could lead to the need for further sea defences along the Suffolk coast. Other PILs requested additional details about the jetty such as its intended location.
- 2.2.21. Some PILs felt coastal erosion represented a major risk to the Sizewell C site. They suggested sea level changes in the near future could enhance coastal erosion and risk flooding the site. Other PILs mentioned the history of tidal surges in the area and the risk that these would pose to the nuclear reactor, as well as the potential for the cooling water infrastructure to have an impact on coastal processes.
- 2.2.22. Some PILs commented on the identification of potential impacts on the marine environment in the Initial Proposals and Options Environment Report and requested the mitigation of these impacts.

Climate Change

- 2.2.23. Some PILs raised concerns that Sizewell C would not be an effective low carbon energy plant as they believed it would contribute to climate change through the release of greenhouse gases during the construction and decommissioning phases of the power station.

Soils and Agriculture

- 2.2.24. Some PILs commented on the proposed use of greenfield, agricultural land for the accommodation campus and visitor centre as they felt that this would mean the loss of valuable farmland and endanger farming businesses. They suggested the use of brownfield sites should be prioritised instead.

Cultural Heritage

- 2.2.25. Some PILs commented on the perceived impacts the proposals could have on cultural heritage and archaeological sites. This included the impact the main development site could have on the setting of a Grade I listed building.

2.3 Temporary Developments

General

- 2.3.1. Some PILs suggested the proposed temporary developments would be necessary for such a large scale project, although others included the caveat that the land should be restored to its original state. Conversely, some PILs suggested the infrastructure should be retained and provide legacy value.
- 2.3.2. Other PILs opposed the temporary developments as they felt they had been planned without thought for the impact they could have on local communities.

Site Suitability

- 2.3.3. Some PILs requested that temporary structures should be contained within the main development site and have minimal impact on local communities. Some asked for more information about the impact of temporary structures, in particular the impact of the proposed jetty.

2.4 Visitor Centre

Site Suitability

- 2.4.1. Some PILs supported the idea of a visitor centre in general terms. In contrast, other PILs suggested that the visitor centre was unnecessary.
- 2.4.2. Some PILs questioned why the visitor centre would not be placed on the site of the existing visitor centre.
- 2.4.3. Some PILs praised the Lovers Lane option as it could be linked to the Sizewell Gap Campus, be easily accessed from Leiston and have less impact on the community and the environment than other options for the visitor centre.
- 2.4.4. Other PILs expressed concerns about the option for a visitor centre at Lovers Lane because of its placement on greenfield land within an AONB. They also commented on the close proximity of the visitor centre's access to a dangerous junction and the increase in traffic that it could bring to an already congested area.
- 2.4.5. Some PILs supported the Sizewell Beach option as, unlike the other two options, it is already popular with tourists and locals and therefore would attract more visitors. Others noted that there are already existing facilities at Sizewell Beach so it would not impact an undeveloped area of countryside and could bring additional custom to local businesses.

- 2.4.6. Other PILs believed that the option of a visitor centre at Sizewell Beach could increase local traffic and make the number of visitors to the area excessive. Some felt the increased visitor numbers could cause damage to the AONB.
- 2.4.7. Some PILs favoured the option of a visitor centre at Goose Hill for a number of reasons including its close proximity to Sizewell C, the accessibility of the beach from this site and the lack of impact on traffic on Sizewell Gap Road.
- 2.4.8. In contrast, others PILs believed a visitor centre at Goose Hill could adversely affect the biodiversity of the area. Other PILs commented that the site was within an AONB and felt it should not be chosen as a result.

2.5 Accommodation Proposals

General

- 2.5.1. Some PILs requested further details about the accommodation strategy including proposals for the management of waste and accommodation for workers not living in the campus. Other PILs asked for an assessment of the impact of the campus and cars owned by those living there on local communities and for an ecological field assessment of all off-site development areas.
- 2.5.2. Some PILs felt that the selection criteria for the accommodation campus should be that it would have minimal impact on the local community and designated areas and it should be close to the site and existing population centres such as Leiston.
- 2.5.3. Some PILs supported the proposed accommodation campus without going into detail as to why.

Site Suitability

- 2.5.4. Some PILs commented that the option of a main development site campus close to the site entrance could reduce congestion on local roads. Other reasons given for support of this option were:
- Furthest away from Leiston and would impact fewer people than alternative options.
 - Outside the AONB.
 - The accommodation campus and associated contractor compounds would be in the same area.
- 2.5.5. Other PILs suggested the main development site campus was unsuitable as it could destroy valuable farmland and compromise access to the land management base at Upper Abbey Farm. Other concerns included:

- The potentially detrimental impact on the small rural communities of Theberton and Eastbridge including the increase in noise and disturbance and the loss of homes.
- The suggestion workers would walk to work from Option 1 was perceived to be unrealistic and so it was felt the campus would increase traffic in the area, especially on the B1122.
- It could impact tourism, local businesses and schools in the area.
- The potential destruction of wildlife habitat, particularly hedges on the eastern boundary and an area originally proposed by SZC Co. as a reptile translocation area.

- 2.5.6. Some PILs supported the Sizewell Gap Campus because the site is already owned by SZC Co. and contains existing commercial buildings so could affect other landowners less. Others commented that the site could offer suitable transport options and would be close to Leiston, offering potential long-term and short-term benefits to the town.
- 2.5.7. Other PILs expressed concerns about the Sizewell Gap Campus as they felt it would be too close to the Sizewell Marshes SSSI and could be detrimental to the creation of heathland habitat.
- 2.5.8. Some PILs commented on the close proximity of the Sizewell Gap Campus and the Leiston East Campus to the Sandlings SPA and the potential impact on nesting birds as a result. Others mentioned further concerns for both these options:
- The close proximity to existing properties and the town of Leiston could result in light, noise and air pollution for nearby residents.
 - Potential increase in traffic on local roads particularly Sizewell Gap Road and Lovers Lane.
 - The possibility of landscape and visual impacts.
 - Potential impacts on public rights of way.
- 2.5.9. Conversely, other PILs supported the Leiston East Campus as workers could boost the local economy in Leiston. Some suggested the campus could provide a legacy benefit for the town in the form of affordable housing.
- 2.5.10. Some PILs suggested that the car park for the Leiston East Campus should be at the front of the site on Sizewell Gap Road as this would reduce the use of greenfield land.
- 2.5.11. Other PILs rejected all proposed locations for the accommodation campus and provided suggestions for alternative locations for the campus including:

- The main development site or other SZC Co. owned land.
 - A brownfield site.
 - A site close to the park and ride sites.
 - A site closer to Ipswich.
 - A site in Leiston.
- 2.5.12. Some PILs requested security for the accommodation campus to police the behaviour of the resident workers and prevent the increase in crime that is said to have occurred in Leiston during the building of Sizewell B.
- 2.5.13. Other PILs suggested that smaller sites should be used to provide accommodation instead of one large accommodation campus. They commented that these smaller sites could be turned into affordable housing once the construction of Sizewell C was complete. Another suggestion was that use of local rental accommodation should be prioritised, although other PILs warned against the use of accommodation normally used by tourists.

Environmental - General

- 2.5.14. Some PILs felt the accommodation campus would be too large and out of keeping with the rural character of the area. Others believed it could be environmentally harmful because of the increased lighting and the disposal of foul water drainage.

Some PILs raised doubts about whether the site of the accommodation campus would be restored after use.

2.6 Park and Ride – Principle

- 2.6.1. Some PILs suggested Leiston Airfield as an alternative location for a park and ride site.
- 2.6.2. Other PILs felt various criteria could be used to select an appropriate site including avoiding very rural greenfield sites and congested junctions, assessing the legacy value a site could provide and the proximity of a site to a main road.
- 2.6.3. Some PILs felt that the park and ride sites could bring too much noise, disruption and increased traffic to local villages. Others expressed concerns that the car parks at the park and ride sites could be environmentally detrimental to the countryside and suggested it might be impossible to return the land used for the sites to agricultural use after the construction is complete.

2.6.4. Some PILs commented that the proposed park and ride sites all use the B1122 and that this road could become regularly congested. Others believed that workers would not use the park and ride as they would prefer to drive directly to the main development site.

2.7 Northern Park and Ride

Site Suitability

2.7.1. Some PILs suggested that the Yoxford Road option could have a lower impact on local residents than the other northern park and ride options, and could benefit local businesses.

2.7.2. Some PILs believed that the Yoxford Road option was unsuitable as the B1122 would be unable to cope with the increased traffic, particularly in the event of an incident at Sizewell C, as it is already very congested. Others felt that this option could bring noise and light pollution to a rural area and would be too close to a small village.

2.7.3. Some PILs supported the Darsham option because it was closest to the A12, near to Darsham Railway Station and would not impact too many local residents. Other reasons for support included:

- It could provide legacy value in the form of parking for the railway station.
- It has existing services such as a petrol station.
- It could have less impact on busy junctions on the B1122 than the other options.

2.7.4. In contrast some PILs felt that the Darsham site would be inappropriate as the A12 might not be able to accommodate the extra traffic.

2.7.5. Other PILs felt that the Darsham site would be unsuitable as it is too close to a junction perceived to be unsafe and could increase delays for vehicles trying to access the A12. Some PILs believed that the Darsham site could damage tourism as it is close to a caravan site and a golf course.

2.7.6. Some PILs supported the A12/A144 Junction site as it would avoid use of the congested B1122. Others praised this option for the limited impact it would have on local communities.

2.7.7. Other PILs requested ecological surveys of the northern park and ride options as they overlap with areas that have the potential to support threatened bird species.

2.8 Southern Park and Ride

Site Suitability

2.8.1. Some PILs supported the Wickham Market option as they felt it was closest to the main development site and could offer better access to the A12. Other reasons for support included:

- It could have the least impact on local residents.
- It could be less visually intrusive as it is adjacent to an existing exit from the A12 with sensitive screening.
- It would avoid use of the B1122 other than in Leiston.

2.8.2. Some PILs supported the Woodbridge option as they believed it could provide the best access onto the A12 for cars and road freight and would avoid the bottleneck after the Wickham Market bypass.

2.8.3. Conversely, other PILs raised concerns about the Woodbridge option as they suggested it would be too close to residential properties, a nursing home and a school. They suggested this close proximity could lead to decreased road safety and increased disturbances. Other concerns raised were:

- The site could be visually intrusive.
- It could decrease property values in the area.
- Woodbridge is already congested.

2.8.4. Some PILs felt that the option at Potash Corner would be unsuitable as it would be close to a junction perceived to be unsafe and could have a detrimental visual impact and decrease local property values.

2.8.5. Some PILs felt that drainage of Option 2 for the southern park and ride site, Woodbridge, risked causing water pollution to a local stream.

2.9 Lorry Park Site Options

Site Suitability

2.9.1. Some PILs supported Options 1 and 2, the Orwell Lorry Park sites, for the proposed lorry park because of the existing facilities that could be used to cater for HGV drivers. Other PILs suggested these options would be in a better position to control HGVs on the entirety of the A12.

2.9.2. Other PILs believed that Options 1 and 2 should not be used as they suggested the Orwell Lorry Park is the only site in the area for employment generation.

- 2.9.3. Some PILs supported Option 3, the A12/A14 Seven Hills Junction, as they believed it was the most appropriate option. Other PILs rejected Option 3 as they felt it could increase the existing congestion and number of accidents that occur at the roundabout.
- 2.9.4. Some PILs suggested Leiston Airfield could be an alternative site for the lorry park.
- 2.9.5. Some PILs put forward selection criteria for the location of the lorry parks including ease of access to the main development site and avoiding use of greenfield land and the A12.
- 2.9.6. Some PILs opposed the idea of combined lorry parks and park and ride sites as they believed they should be kept separate to avoid confusion.
- 2.9.7. Conversely, other PILs suggested that the sites should be combined to reduce the visual intrusion of building multiple temporary sites and ensure that security arrangements could be combined.

Environment – General

- 2.9.8. Some PILs requested the completion of ecological surveys for the proposed lorry park sites to understand the ecological impacts of each site and suggest measures to benefit wildlife.

2.10 Junction and Road Improvement Options

Site Suitability

- 2.10.1. Some PILs supported the four village bypass as they felt it would be necessary due to existing local congestion and the lack of alternative options for HGV movements in the event of an accident. Other reasons PILs put forward for their support included:
- It could remove the requirement for park and ride sites, lorry parks and rail and sea transport for unspecified reasons.
 - It could make that stretch of the A12 safer.
 - The figure of a 5-15% traffic increase on the A12 as a result of the construction of Sizewell C was perceived to be an underestimate and the increase in traffic could be enough to justify the bypass.
- 2.10.2. Other PILs believed that a four village bypass was unnecessary. They felt it could require too much destruction of the countryside and important wildlife habitats, sever existing public rights of way, be too expensive and create increased noise and adverse visual impacts for properties along the route of

the bypass. For these reasons, some preferred the suggestion of a Farnham relief road.

- 2.10.3. In contrast, other PILs suggested the Farnham bypass would not reduce congestion for those living on roads after the proposed bypass or in the other local villages. They also commented that bypassing Farnham could prove detrimental to businesses in Farnham. Others suggested that there could be a harmful impact on the environment, especially since the route would cross a number of watercourses, and that the impact on wildlife would need to be mitigated.
- 2.10.4. Some PILs supported the Farnham bypass as they felt it was the only effective option presented for mitigating the impact of traffic on Farnham. Other PILs suggested the bypass would help the development of the area in the long-term. Other reasons for supporting this option included:
- It could remove the safety risk presented by the Farnham bend.
 - The number of landowners affected would be low and the land not valuable.
 - It could be less damaging to the countryside than the four village bypass.
 - It could lead to less disruption for residents.
- 2.10.5. Some PILs suggested measures that should accompany the Farnham bypass such as reduced speed limits after leaving the bypass and refuges adjacent to turnings to help residents in the villages surrounding Farnham. Others provided alternative suggestions such as:
- A Leiston/Eastbridge/Theberton bypass.
 - An alternative Farnham bypass to the east of Farnham to avoid building on a flood plain and impacting the village hall, playground and amenity land.
 - A bypass of Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew.
 - A roundabout at Friday Street and mitigation measures for Little Glemham.
- 2.10.6. Some PILs felt the road widening at Farnham bend would be inappropriate as they believed it could encourage cars to drive faster around the bend and traffic could still be too close to properties in Farnham, both of which could lead to accidents. Others noted the following concerns:
- It might not reduce the increased traffic volumes in Farnham or the other villages.
 - It might not be cost effective.
 - Properties including a Grade II listed building would have to be demolished.
 - A suggestion that it would create an even sharper corner than exists presently.

2.10.7. Some PILs commented on the option of introducing HGV traffic controls at the Farnham bend and felt that this would prove ineffective as similar controls were in place temporarily and had little impact. Others suggested that although the traffic controls might improve safety, they would do little to mitigate increased congestion and could increase journey times.

2.11 Rail Improvements

Site Suitability

2.11.1. Some PILs suggested that the legacy value of the rail link was the priority while others felt the priority should be to minimise the impact of the rail route on local residents and wildlife.

2.11.2. Some PILs supported Option 1, a new rail terminal and freight laydown area north of King George's Avenue, as they felt this would be preferable to building a new railway through the countryside potentially leading to noise and light pollution.

2.11.3. Other PILs commented that a new rail terminal could increase the risk of flooding to local properties due to the run off of surface water from the storage area. Other concerns about Option 1 included:

- The temporary construction zone could be unsightly in an AONB.
- The time taken for HGV traffic to reach the site could increase, worsening congestion in an area that already suffers from cut-through driving.
- Tourism could be negatively impacted.

2.11.4. Some PILs felt the option of a temporary rail extension could allow rail freight to be delivered directly to the main development site and could reduce traffic on the road.

2.11.5. Some PILs supported the red and green routes as they felt that they could be more cost-effective than the blue route due to their reduced length. Conversely, others favoured the blue route as it would deliver rail freight right to the point of use, avoid impacts on the residents of Leiston and would be close to the accommodation campus.

2.11.6. Some PILs supported the green route because it avoided the developed areas of Leiston. Others supported the red route because it would have minimal impact on the countryside and utilise the existing railway line.

2.11.7. Some PILs suggested the road crossings necessary for the blue and green routes would worsen the congestion on the B1122. Other issues raised about the blue and green routes included:

- The potential creation of noise and disturbance in the countryside, which could impact local businesses.
- The use of farmland which could be unlikely to return to good condition.
- Structural damage might occur to homes and could lead to the devaluation of properties.

2.11.8. Some PILs believed that the blue route could interfere with the plans for the main development site campus and criticised this option as it would cross land that they owned. Others felt this option could disrupt wildlife habitats and access to land.

2.11.9. Some PILs suggested the red route could cause major intrusion to at least a hundred properties in Leiston. Others suggested the blue route could impact on a historic monument and raised concern about the impact several of the proposals could have on historic villages.

2.11.10. Other PILs offered suggestions about the rail strategy including the construction of tunnels when road crossings are necessary. Other suggestions were:

- Sidings should be used on the green route to minimise the need for HGV movements.
- The rail link should be used to transport the workforce into the main development site.
- A passenger terminal should be built enabling passenger access to the line.