



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Annex Ö Stage G 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



Annex D – Stage 2 Section 42 Consultee Response Summaries

Contents

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 Ltd.....	2
1.4	Bawdsey Parish Council.....	3
1.5	Blaxhall Parish Council.....	3
1.6	Blythburgh, Blucamp and Hinton Parish Council.....	4
1.7	Bredfield Parish Council.....	4
1.8	Butley, Wantisden and Capel St. Andrew Parish Council.....	5
1.9	Campsea Ashe Parish Council.....	5
1.10	Darsham Parish Council.....	5
1.11	EDF Energy Nuclear Generation Limited.....	6
1.12	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust.....	6
1.13	Environment Agency.....	7
1.14	Essex County Council.....	7
1.15	Farnham with Stratford St. Andrew Parish Council.....	8
1.16	Felixstowe Town Council.....	8
1.17	Friston Parish Council.....	8
1.18	Galloper Offshore Wind Farm Ltd.....	9
1.19	Hacheston Parish Council.....	9
1.20	Historic England.....	11
1.21	Ipswich Borough Council.....	11
1.22	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council.....	12
1.23	Leiston-cum-SizeWell Town Council.....	13
1.24	Little Glemham Parish Council.....	14
1.25	Marlesford Parish Council.....	15

1.26	Martlesham Parish Council.....	16
1.27	Melton Parish Council.....	17
1.28	Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council.....	18
1.29	Marine Management Organisation.....	18
1.30	National Grid.....	19
1.31	Natural England.....	19
1.32	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, Direct Rail Services Limited & Magnox Limited 20	
1.33	Network Rail.....	21
1.34	Norfolk County Council.....	22
1.35	Peasenhall Parish Council.....	22
1.36	Public Health England.....	23
1.37	Rendham Parish Council.....	23
1.38	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.....	23
1.39	Saxmundham Town Council.....	24
1.40	Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council.....	25
1.41	Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service.....	26
1.42	Snape Parish Council.....	27
1.43	Southwold Town Council.....	27
1.44	Sudbourne Parish Council.....	28
1.45	Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership.....	28
1.46	Suffolk Constabulary.....	29
1.47	Swefling Parish Council.....	30
1.48	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council.....	30
1.49	The Coal Authority.....	32
1.50	Trinity House.....	32
1.51	Waldringfield Parish Council.....	32
1.52	Waveney District Council.....	33
1.53	Wenhaston with Mellis Hamlet Parish Council.....	34
1.54	Westhall Parish Council.....	34
1.55	Westleton Parish Council.....	35
1.56	Wickham Market Parish Council.....	35

1.57	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.....	46
2.3	Rail Improvement Options	51
2.4	Sea Transport Options.....	54
2.5	Park and Ride Options.....	55
2.6	Road Improvements – A12	58
2.7	Road Improvements – Yoxford/B1122.....	61

Tables

None provided.

Plates

None provided.

Figures

None provided.

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

1.1 Aldeburgh Town Council

1.1.1 Aldeburgh Town Council commented that they were unable to give a full response due to insufficient knowledge provided by SZC Co., which they believed fell short of ‘adequate consultation’. They requested the provision of additional information about certain details and for another consultation prior to Stage 3.

1.1.2 They commented that the main impacts on Aldeburgh would be physical difficulties including traffic, infrastructure overload, imbalance of accommodation needs, damage to the beach and coastline, and negative impacts on the town which could reduce visitor numbers.

1.1.3 They commented on the environmental effects of the main development site, including impacts on the River Aide, the sea and shingle beach, coastal erosion including sand banks change and expressed concern about the lack of research into the impact of the jetty on the shoreline, long-term storage of nuclear waste, adverse effect on Minsmere Nature Reserve from the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) crossing, as well as air pollution, noise and vibration, light pollution, dust and run-off and project timescales, including 24 hour working timetable. They suggested that additional protection be proposed for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) including complementary building design to follow requirements set out in NPS EN-6, and for sustainable legacy infrastructure for local communities, such as a cycle path from Aldeburgh to Thorpeness and refurbishment of Jubilee Hall.

1.1.4 Aldeburgh Town Council suggested alternative accommodation proposals, such as smaller buildings or to enhance existing infrastructure in Ipswich or Lowestoft, for example. They expressed concern that tourist rental accommodation would be taken up by workers, about uncertain legacy benefits and the size and visual intrusiveness of the buildings.

1.2 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council

1.2.1 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council commented that the lack of information and detail provided prevents an informed response and commented that long-term benefits for communities had not been considered when determining preferred options. They required more information to consider the adequacy of mitigation and compensation measures and expressed disappointment with the timing of this stage of consultation.

- 1.2.2 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council expressed concern about the main development site's location within the AONB, near Sizewell Marshes SSSI and on the Suffolk Heritage Coast. They expected visual, noise, light and air pollution impact, loss of habitat, impact on designated areas, and impact on access to recreational activities to be minimised. They also expressed concern about the lack of detail on coastal processes and coastal management planning, for which they stated their concerns, as well as concerns about impacts of permanent development, beach access, restoration, new access road proposals (supporting Option 3) and the height of borrow pits.
- 1.2.3 They expressed the belief that the development would exacerbate current challenges faced by the community, including impact on local infrastructure and services. They supported Option 2(ii) of the accommodation proposals but commented on the lack of legacy benefits and suggested dispersing the campus or for a design with maximum respect to the environment and surrounding communities.
- 1.2.4 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council supported the overall transport strategy, particularly the use of rail and sea, Option 1 for the temporary rail extension, Option 3 for the beach landing facility and Option 4 for the two-village bypass (but would have preferred a four-village bypass). They requested legacy benefits for the Leiston branch line such as additional track paths or an interchange at Saxmundham and detailed analysis of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) impacts.
- 1.3 **Anglian Water Services Ltd**
- 1.3.1 Anglian Water Services Ltd expressed their intent to engage as an interested party in the Sizewell C Development Consent Order (DCO) application to protect their assets. They commented on the potential impact of the accommodation campus on the Leiston Water Recycling Centre, as it would be unable to accommodate the additional capacity the campus would create. Therefore, they expressed support for the construction of a sewage treatment works within the contractors' compound to serve the campus.
- 1.3.2 They commented that it would be vital that sewage pipelines are protected during and after construction. They wished to discuss several issues including:
- Wording of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) including protective provisions.
 - Requirement for wastewater services.

- Impact of the development on Anglian Water’s assets and the need for mitigation.
- Pre-construction surveys and ground investigations.

1.3.3 They commented that there was a lack of clarity for the requirement of wastewater services during the construction phases and requested that Anglian Water’s Resource Management Plan be considered.

1.4 Bawdsey Parish Council

1.4.1 Bawdsey Parish Council commented on the importance of the A12, stating that traffic mitigation here was a considerable concern. They expressed support for the two-village bypass and for the road improvements as suggested by Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC). They requested further consideration for park and ride access to maintain traffic flows on main roads.

1.4.2 They expressed concern about the impact on the AONB and widespread effects on East Suffolk, believing environmental concerns should be given greater attention given that Sizewell is the only UK power station within an AONB. They requested more information about radiological clearance of Sizewell B and Sizewell C.

1.4.3 They had several questions about coastal impacts of the development, given the major pier, jetty and conduits for water intake and discharge, including:

- Consideration to re-use heat which is being discharged to sea.
- The effects on sediment movement.
- The difference in effect of the short and long jetty proposals.
- Detail about the effect of the offshore works.
- How public access along the foreshore would be retained with the jetty.

1.5 Blaxhall Parish Council

1.5.1 The parish council’s main concerns included the following:

- Additional local traffic, forecast to increase between 10-24%.
- The impact on the Wickham Market park and ride facility on the local ecology, particularly noise and light pollution, whether use of the facility

would be enforced and about the slip road heading north. They requested assurance that the land would be restored post-construction.

- The construction of the jetty to require closure of the Suffolk Coastal Path and requested timescales for this and whether alternative routes would be signposted.
- They requested provision to minimise the impact of workers on local services.
- For protection of wildlife habitats close to the development, such as Kenton Hills.

1.5.2 They expressed a preference for Option 4 for the Farnham Bypass.

1.6 Blythburgh, Blucamp and Hinton Parish Council

1.6.1 Blythburgh, Blucamp and Hinton Parish Council expressed concern about the traffic impacts on Blythburgh including congestion and speed, dangerous bottlenecks and junctions, lack of safe crossing points for pedestrians, discontinuous footpaths and rat-running especially on the A12 and B1125, and the resulting impacts on businesses, tourism and the community. They suggested specific mitigation measures including speed cameras, junction improvements, a pedestrian crossing, barriers and controls for large good vehicles (LGVs) and private cars. They also commented that negative impacts on heritage and character, the AONB, the importance of tourism in Blythburgh, and impact on skills migration, health services and local facilities had not yet been considered by SZC Co.

1.6.2 They expressed support for the maximum use of sea and rail transport but were not convinced that this could be achieved. They expressed concern about the use of the B1122 for access to the main development site and highlighted support for a link road (such as the 'D2' route) and a two-village bypass. They highlighted the insufficiencies of the campus accommodation proposals in recognising the impact on local communities or providing legacy benefits. They commented that site access should bridge, rather than separate, the SSSI to avoid habitat fragmentation and that rail legacy development should be included, such as double tracking from Woodbridge to Saxmundham. Finally, they commented on the consultation itself, saying the time period was insufficient, the process not transparent, and the information provided inadequate.

1.7 Bredfield Parish Council

1.7.1 The parish council expressed concern about traffic issues on the A12 associated with the southern park and ride. They believed park and ride

Option 2, at Woodbridge, would have intercepted car trips earlier on the A12 and that the expected level of HGV traffic increase would make access from adjoining roads onto the A12 problematic, potentially causing rat-running through Bredfield. They were also concerned that traffic assessments failed to consider construction works that were underway or planned for the Woods Lane area.

1.8 Butley, Wantisden and Capel St. Andrew Parish Council

1.8.1 The council expressed the belief that inadequate information was provided for Stage 2 and that the Sizewell C Project would have a greater impact than expected by SZC Co., especially in respect to additional traffic volumes. They requested clarification on traffic management provisions and expressed support for the two-village bypass but felt that a four-village bypass would be required. Finally, they raised concerns about the impact on local services and requested clarification about provisions to minimise impact on local services.

1.9 Campsea Ashe Parish Council

1.9.1 Campsea Ashe Parish Council agreed with the need for a nuclear power station. They expressed concern about rail and road transport through Campsea Ashe, particularly regarding the passing loop on the single-track railway, commenting that proposals for this had not yet been clearly indicated. They commented that the possibility of a two-platform station at Campsea Ashe may be of little benefit to the village.

1.9.2 Campsea Ashe Parish Council expressed concern about the impact of the southern park and ride on Hacheston, due to increases in HGV usage on rural roads including the B1078. In terms of the road improvements for Farnham, they commented that Options 3a and 3b appeared the most appropriate and Option 4 involved the loss of more land of considerable local interest.

1.9.3 They commented that the consultation should have been longer but made positive comments about the consultation events.

1.10 Darsham Parish Council

1.10.1 Darsham Parish Council commented that concerns raised at Stage 1 appeared to have been ignored and that the consultation documentation contained a lack of detail. Their main concerns were regarding the proposed location of the northern park and ride at Darsham, including the location of the entrance and exit (which they believed should be on Willow Marsh Lane), the impact of lighting on the dark sky area, rat-running on minor roads, for

which more preventative measures are needed. They also requested a small legacy car park at the facility.

1.10.2 They expressed concern about traffic on the A12, for which they supported a four-village bypass and on the B1122, for which they stated proposed improvements would be inadequate. They suggested that the 'D2' route would alleviate congestion and suggested split accommodation closer to urban areas or to the main site, with permanent legacy benefit.

1.10.3 Darsham Parish Council raised concerns that the impacts on local services, schools and health facilities, impact of workforce behaviour and overall community impact had not been addressed. They also commented on the visual impact of spoil heaps on the AONB and the effect on the visitor economy. They outlined several environmental issues which they believed the consultation documentation lacked detail on, including impacts of the jetty and pollution from water run-off.

1.11 EDF Energy Nuclear Generation Limited

1.11.1 EDF Energy Nuclear Generation Limited assessed the proposal from an operational basis on impacts on existing operations, safety regulation/nuclear licensing, environmental risk, emergency planning and security and had no representations at Stage 2.

1.12 East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust

1.12.1 The Trust considered that the level of in-depth detail to permit full evaluation of mitigation against the impacts was not available. Their key concerns included the following:

- A large increase in workforce and associated medical emergencies would lead to raised call volume and demand.
- The accommodation campus as there will be increased need to attend the campus for routine incidents and so there will be an impact upon public health in the region.
- Traffic volume increases would lead to longer and delayed response times.
- Detriment to local health economy.

1.12.2 The Trust expressed support for the use of railways and sea transport, Option 1 for the temporary rail extension, the park and ride proposals, Option 4 for A12 road improvements around Farnham and Yoxford B1122 roundabout.

1.13 Environment Agency

1.13.1 The Environment Agency sought further information and discussion about details of the proposed marine transport infrastructure, cooling water tunnels and associated foreshore works, impacts on sediment regime and coastal processes and the need for a coastal management strategy as well as any environmental impact of the marine infrastructure including thermal and chemical plume modelling and impingement on marine ecology.

1.13.2 They also requested a flood impact assessment with flood risk modelling and impact assessments to demonstrate changes in groundwater and surface water levels and impacts to species and habitats.

1.13.3 They asked for further compensation for the loss of SSSI land.

1.13.4 They also requested details of the source of freshwater supply for the development, the plans for the re-use and disposal of excavated material as part of the waste management strategy and details of a sustainable and suitable foul drainage strategy.

1.13.5 They highlighted their concerns about potential environmental impacts, including impacts of the main site, transport infrastructure and associated developments and suggested solutions to each of these.

1.14 Essex County Council

1.14.1 Essex County Council required clarification and additional information about the individual and cumulative effects and mitigation for:

- The principle of development and interrelationship with Essex and Bradwell B, including cumulative effects and opportunities.
- Socio-economic and wider regional impacts and how benefits would be achieved.
- Skills, employment and accommodation, including suggestions that SZC Co. should aim for greater levels of ambition to upskill the local population and accommodating the workforce within existing communities.
- Highways and transportation, including requests for further impact assessment on specific roads and consideration of planned highway improvements and freight movement impact on the Great Eastern services.

- Minerals and waste planning, including the potential use of RSPB Wallasea for the disposal of spoil waste.
- Safety and security.
- How water quality, marine environment, Essex inshore sea fisheries and Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB had been considered.

1.15 Farnham with Stratford St. Andrew Parish Council

1.15.1 Farnham with Stratford St. Andrew Parish Council expressed concern that the increases in road traffic would exacerbate high levels of nitrous dioxide in Stratford St. Andrew and commented that impacts of traffic through the villages should be reduced. They expressed support for the two-village bypass because of reduction in traffic flow, subsequent improvements in air quality, safety, noise and property damage and improved access. However, they acknowledged the disadvantages to some residents including ecological impact on Foxborrow Wood, severance of rights of way, noise, vibration and air quality, reduction in passing trade for businesses, and impact on Farnham Hall and Mollett's Farm. They requested inclusion in discussions about route alignment and suggested that it should run to the east of Foxborrow Wood and noise and visual mitigation should be provided. They made detailed comments about the reasons for their opposition to the other proposed options and requested consideration in any discussion about a potential four-village bypass.

1.15.2 They commented on the lack of information in the consultation documentation regarding sea and rail transport potential and requested more detailed modelling of these options.

1.16 Felixstowe Town Council

1.16.1 Felixstowe Town Council stated that full information should be provided regarding agreement with Network Rail for rail requirements, with sufficient evidence of works and timings to prevent impact to Felixstowe Port's targets. They supported the position of SCC and SCDC with regards to traffic and required further information about construction traffic movements to understand the potential impact on road networks. They also felt significant upgrades to the Seven Hills Roundabout would be necessary before commencement of work.

1.17 Friston Parish Council

1.17.1 Friston Parish Council expressed concern about construction delays at other sites, that the proposed reactor was unproven with resulting safety issues to

communities living nearby, and impact on ambulance response times to accidents.

1.17.2 They expressed concern about air quality due to transport and engine emissions as well as noise impacts from construction machinery and the 24/7 working hours. They were also concerned about transport impacts, particularly congestion on the A12, commenting that a four-village bypass and extensive road improvements from the south of Martlesham to north of Woodbridge would be required. They requested maximum use of rail and sea transport, and legacy improvements for the East Suffolk line including dual track between Woodbridge and Saxmundham and potentially a rail service for Leiston.

1.17.3 Friston Parish Council expressed concern about the impacts on the tourist industry and associated businesses from the use of holiday homes by workers, construction pollution and traffic. Furthermore, they commented that the source of potable water supply was not mentioned in the consultation documentation and had concerns about water requirements for the development.

1.18 Galloper Offshore Wind Farm Ltd

1.18.1 Galloper Offshore Wind Farm Ltd submitted two responses to this stage of consultation. The first response noted that proposed vegetation/woodland planting in the area around the Galloper Wind Farm onshore substation is on land which already has a consented and detailed landscaping and planning scheme. The second dealt with the landscaping plan.

1.18.2 In their second response, Galloper Offshore Wind Farm Ltd commented that potential impacts of Sizewell C on two export cables from the wind farm to the onshore transmission network should be considered. They requested information in future consultation documentation about assessment of potential scour and changes to coastal processes. They requested acknowledgement of the potential for simultaneous construction and maintenance to take place by Galloper Wind Farm Ltd and Sizewell C, for which communication and advance notice would be needed. They also requested that protective provisions for Galloper Wind Farm Ltd be provided in the draft DCO application, that their own intent to plant trees in Pillbox Field be taken into account and to be informed of any proposed use of Sizewell Gap Road.

1.19 Hacheston Parish Council

1.19.1 The council were accepting of the location of Sizewell and highlighted the importance of the Sizewell C Project in creating a long-term legacy for Suffolk

and Hacheston. They outlined the local community's priorities which included:

- Traffic calming measures on the B1116 and B1078, improvements to the A12 bridge and slip roads and the Fiveways roundabout, an A12 roundabout to access the southern park and ride and enlarging lanes on small roads.
- Suggestions for visual and lighting mitigation for the southern park and ride.
- Double tracking the railways from Woodbridge to Saxmundham.
- Cycle routes from the southern park and ride to the main development site.
- Improved mobile phone networks to aid traffic management.
- Utilising local businesses for the southern park and ride.
- They suggested additional local bus services for workers to the park and ride.

1.19.2 They commented on the sensitivity and importance of the AONB, Sizewell Marshes SSSI, Minsmere Nature Reserve, Minsmere to Walberswick Special Protection Area (SPA), Outer Thames Estuary SPA and a county wildlife site and expressed belief that the development would sever wildlife habitats, affecting several species. They commented that proposed mitigation would not be adequate and suggested further measures such as having a concrete section for the deep storage facility. The council supported a single span permanent bridge and on-site stockpiles to reduce HGV movements, but expressed concern about the height, visual, environmental and health impacts of proposed stockpiles.

1.19.3 The council expressed concern about antisocial behaviour, the design of housing and impact on rental markets due to the accommodation proposals and made suggestions about how to mitigate these, as well as alternative strategies, including several smaller sites or onsite accommodation. They suggested locating proposed sports facilities closer to Leiston.

1.19.4 They requested maximum use of sea and rail and suggested a passing loop at Campsea Ashe station, upgrades to the Saxmundham Leiston line and East Suffolk line and direct delivery of materials to the main development site. They supported the wide jetty option and the possible use of a beach landing facility as well but noted potential impacts on sensitive coastline.

1.19.5 They supported the two-village bypass but would have preferred a four-village bypass and expressed the belief that proposed mitigation for Yoxford/B1122 was inadequate. They expressed concern about the location of the southern park and ride site due to HGV movements along the A12 south of Wickham Market, traffic and pollution impacts, specific traffic issues at Hacheston, impact on the SLA and Marlesford Conservation Area (referring to the visibility assessment) and impact during summer traffic peaks. They challenged the ‘cost efficiencies’ that identified Hacheston as a priority site. They suggested alternative sites at locations along the A12 (such as Woodbridge or Martlesham), working patterns that minimise peak time travel, protection of the footpath, other ways to mitigate concerns over access and suggestions in case of archaeological discovery.

1.19.6 The council requested more information about school and apprenticeship opportunities and highlighted concerns about the consultation process including the time period, the structure of the documents, the overall cost to the parish council and the lack of detail in the proposals.

1.20 Historic England

1.20.1 Historic England expressed concern about the impact of the development on Leiston Abbey, primarily from visual impact caused by the main site, the green rail route and the accommodation campus. They recommended the site of the campus be reconsidered, supported the red rail route, a new rail terminal option and the maximisation of marine transport.

1.20.2 They considered there to be insufficient evidence for how the historic environment was considered during options appraisals and requested further analysis of options focusing on noise and light, as well as visual, impacts. They further commented that the cumulative impact of elements of the scheme would cause a high degree of harm, which they commented the Environmental Statement should address.

1.20.3 They also expressed concern about potential archaeological impacts of the southern park and ride proposals at Wickham Market and suggested that the revised area be investigated and assessed to mitigate impacts. They also highlighted their concerns about heritage impacts for each of the A12 road improvement options for Farnham. They stated that proposed mitigation was appropriate for the most part, but that they would require further details for strategies once the preferred options had been selected.

1.21 Ipswich Borough Council

1.21.1 Ipswich Borough Council believed a lack of consideration had been given to the use of clean energy and reducing CO₂ emissions of construction. They

requested that as little as possible of the construction materials should leave the main development site.

- 1.21.2 The council expressed disappointment that Ipswich was not included in the worker residential sector tables and commented that worker travel through Ipswich should have been addressed to avoid underestimated congestion issues. They suggested that Ipswich could offer a headquarters location, that impact on rental sector would have to be managed, for Ipswich businesses to benefit from training, maximum supply chain opportunities for Ipswich, use of the marketplace website, opportunities for local businesses to bid for contracts and support for the University of Suffolk.
- 1.21.3 They expressed concern about the size of the campus, considered there to be a lack of information about the caravan site and limited accommodation facilities. They suggested more, smaller sites would limit the impact and that as many workers as possible should be home based.
- 1.21.4 The council expressed support for the use of sea and rail for goods movement to reduce the number of HGVs, specifically around the congested section of the A14 near Orwell Bridge. They also requested investment into the East Suffolk railway line, including additional rail services between Ipswich and Saxmundham and double tracking between Woodbridge and Saxmundham, as there were insufficient legacy benefits in the proposals. They supported Option 1 of the wide jetty for the sea transport proposals.
- 1.21.5 Finally, they stated that the level of detail provided made it difficult to comment on the proposals other than at a high strategic level, that the CGI at event exhibitions was misleading but that staff were helpful and open.

1.22 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council

- 1.22.1 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council expressed disappointment about the short consultation period and the lack of information, which they believed prevented adequate response.
- 1.22.2 They commented that the level of amenity from the East Coast road network and Ipswich Lowestoft railway line should not be diminished. Their concerns included the safety, accessibility and effects on enjoyment of the A12 and B1122 by congestion, their inability to sustain the volume and weight of forecast traffic, that no other emergency routes had been identified, visibility around the A12, air pollution from traffic increases and the lack of mitigation of transport effects on local communities. They suggested the park and rides should be functional before any development work began, for electric bike pools and regular bus services to be invested in for worker transport and for strict rules to ensure park and ride use. They requested inclusion in early

discussions about rail and marine transport decisions and sought clarifications about the proposed helipad. They also suggested additional mitigation measures for the B1122/Yoxford junction including speed limits, pedestrian enhancement and visibility improvements.

1.22.3 The council highlighted the importance of preventing further diminution of affordable housing and wished to maximise opportunities for local rental accommodation. They believed the accommodation strategy could damage the character and viability of the village in the long-term and made suggestions for how the impacts of access and parking could be reduced, including the removal of most ‘emergency use’ parking spaces. They expressed concern about public services such as hospitals and utilities such as water and electricity, for which they believed that further mitigation would be needed, and requested that employment for residents will be maximised by publicising commercial and small-medium-enterprise opportunities.

1.22.4 They requested that actions be implemented to safeguard residents, the environment and infrastructure against construction impacts and unforeseen events, commenting on the lack of emergency information such as traffic accidents, vehicle breakdowns, carbon monoxide dangers and emergency vehicle response issues. They requested close interworking with public sector agencies to ensure emergency planning would be maintained.

1.23 Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council

1.23.1 Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council’s primary concerns were the impacts from additional traffic, especially during the first two years of construction. The council expressed concern about the loss of beach access restricting amenity, visual impact from infrastructure such as the jetty, the impact on the Ramsar site, the SSSI and on natural and heritage sites, including Leiston Abbey. They commented on the potential impact on coastal processes and long-term impacts of the beach landing facility and expressed concern about flood risk, groundwater extraction and potable water and made suggestions for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

1.23.2 Socio-economic impacts identified included pressure on emergency services, impacts on the local economy following the peak of construction and distortions to the local housing market, but also several positive impacts, which they requested should be secured and maximised. They suggested community mitigation measures such as access across the SSSI crossing and regeneration of the town centre.

1.23.3 They favoured sea, rail, then road transport, depending on train movement hours, mitigation for the early years of construction and stated that Buckleswood Road must not be blocked. They expressed concern about

traffic flow on Waterloo Avenue, King George Avenue, Valley Road, Lovers' Lane and Abbey Lane, making suggestions for other improvements and a cycleway and rail passing loop. They also expressed concern about use of the park and ride scheme, HGVs and congestion on local roads, impacts on residents, businesses and visitors and suggested spreading workforce shift patterns to avoid congestion peaks. They considered the traffic assessment to be inadequate, especially for Leiston, requested mitigation for congestion at Darsham, for air quality and noise monitoring along the B1122 and opposed the removal of the lorry park proposal.

1.23.4 They requested that highway improvements considered emergency service provision and commented on the inadequacy of proposed B1122 improvements, suggesting a 'D2' link road and for the B1122 site entrance to be redesigned as a T-junction, with landscaping to protect Leiston Abbey from the accommodation and laydown.

1.23.5 The council preferred Option 2(ii) for the accommodation campus and suggested consideration of permanent legacy benefits, as well as Options 3 and 4 for construction materials as long as the flow of Leiston River and Minsmere Sluice would not be affected. They requested full assessment of the impacts on Leiston's amenities and infrastructure in absorbing the off-duty workforce. They believed temporary uses of land had been under-exaggerated and requested a clear decommissioning timetable.

1.24 Little Glemham Parish Council

1.24.1 Little Glemham Parish Council's chief concern was the impact of increased A12 traffic on the village of Little Glemham, which straddles the road. They commented that the proposals to mitigate this effect were inadequate, commenting on the unacceptability of Options 1, 2, 3A and 3B for the A12 road improvements. They stated that Option 4 was the only acceptable option but that would have several negative impacts such as reduction in property values and trade and increased traffic and pollution, which would require mitigation including signage, remodelling of junctions, compensation and emergency service route plans. They would have preferred a four-village bypass as an option.

1.24.2 They supported the delivery and removal of materials by rail and sea but commented that heavy freight train movement during the night would cause unacceptable noise and vibration. They suggested that extra trains could be run, for worker transport. They supported the postal consolidation facility and park and ride proposals but commented that they should be compulsorily policed and would have visual and congestion impacts on the A12/B1078/B1116. They suggested mitigation, including lengthening slip roads and removing vegetation to improve visibility.

1.24.3 The council expressed a belief that the influx of workers may cause social problems and cause anxiety among residents and suggested that social and entertainment facilities should be provided in the campus. They also expressed concern about pressure on medical facilities, the rental market, tourist accommodation and house prices and proposed mitigation to provide onsite medical facilities, extra funding for local services, incentives for workers to commute from home, the use of tourist accommodation only out of season, the use of spare rooms in private houses and a worker code of conduct.

1.24.4 They welcomed the skills, education and employment strategy and encouraged commencement as soon as possible, but commented on the negative effect on tourism due to proximity to Minsmere Nature Reserve and the AONB, which the proposed visitor centre would not negate. They suggested provision of funding for the promotion of tourism.

1.24.5 Finally, they expressed disappointment about the short timescale for Stage 2, and the lack of information and detail for proposals despite the number of years since Stage 1.

1.25 Marlesford Parish Council

1.25.1 The council was broadly supportive of Sizewell C due to the need for long term, low carbon power generation. The primary concerns of Marlesford Parish Council included the following:

- Concern that the constant stream of traffic on the busy A12 may get worse, preventing access or crossing the road and creating litter, noise, light and air pollution.
- The impact of the southern park and ride on noise and light pollution, impact on wildlife (especially bat populations), hard surfaces creating inferior wildlife habitat and an increased flood risk of the River Ore.
- Concern that the southern park and ride would become a holding area for HGVs in the event of a major incident/accident and that the site would not be returned to agricultural land after its use.
- Increases in rat-running.
- The lack of detailed map and traffic data for the southern park and ride.

1.25.2 The council made the following suggestions, some of which were to help mitigate impacts:

- screening and bunds for the southern park and ride;
- enhancement of the northern park and ride by linking it to the railway station, which could eliminate the requirement for the southern site;
- maximising the use of rail transport for long-term rail legacy benefit;
- options for offshore accommodation; and
- further assessment including the EIA, Habitat Regulations Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment and Water Framework Directive.

1.25.3 They supported a four-village bypass and sought assurance that if this is approved, proposals for the southern park and ride would be revisited and new locations considered.

1.26 Martlesham Parish Council

1.26.1 The council expressed concern about the increase in road traffic and resultant impact on noise and air pollution, commenting on areas that were already under strain from traffic pressure which could be exacerbated by other development plans. For this reason, they stated that sea and rail transport should be maximised and made suggestions including extending the electronic freight management scheme to sub-contractors and visitors, quietening the road surface through Martlesham, improvements in public transport and new air quality impact studies.

1.26.2 They expressed concern about the environmental impacts of the green rail route and disappointment about the lack of plans for workers and the public to use the rail. They commented on the coastal erosion and loss of shingle from the jetty proposals.

1.26.3 They expressed concern about the impact of the proposals including the accommodation campus, main development site and access road on nearby designated areas including the SPA, AONB and SSSI, as well as the dust and visual impact of stockpiles and borrow pits on Minsmere Nature Reserve and Leiston Abbey. They also suggested that accommodation should be made into permanent, affordable housing for future community benefits.

1.26.4 The council commented that the proposals would reduce the attractiveness of the area to tourists and impact smaller construction firms and requested more information about emergency procedures and radioactive waste storage.

1.27 Melton Parish Council

- 1.27.1 The council expressed concern about the impact on air pollution due to traffic increases and the effect on coastal deposits and impacts on the Deben Estuary from the jetty proposals. They requested that proposals for construction materials protect Suffolk’s heritage sites, tourism, agriculture, ecology, environment and landscape, and that land would be restored post-construction.
- 1.27.2 The council expressed concern that workers may put increased pressure on the local rental market and requested small, non-campus developments with legacy benefit for the accommodation campus.
- 1.27.3 The council expressed preference for sea, then rail, then road transport because of the inadequacy of the infrastructure to handle additional traffic. They expressed support for the principle of park and ride facilities to minimise road movements. They believed Melton would be directly affected by any increase in rail due to the close proximity of a rail station and the A1152 level crossing to the village and the resulting additional noise generated. They suggested mitigation measures including safety reviews, minimal use of night trains and noise mitigation and requested that the beach remained open for as long as possible, for provision of details about policing the jetty and for consideration of impacts on the River Deben.
- 1.27.4 The council supported the siting of the southern park and ride at Wickham Market but strongly opposed the use of Woodbridge/Melton as a reserve site. They requested consideration of a local shuttle bus to take workers to the facility. They supported any of the bypass options for Farnham but would have preferred a four-village bypass. They requested new traffic modelling data for the Woods Lane roundabout, for parts of the road to be made into dual carriageway, appropriate signage to reduce the impact of rat-running, for the potential ‘D2’ relief road and for consideration of a planned northern bypass around Ipswich in the proposals. They highlighted the lack of information about traffic through Melton.
- 1.27.5 The council expressed concern that the proposals would impact the tourist economy and harm small businesses by making the area unattractive to visit. They requested that the visual impact of Sizewell C be reduced to prevent this, for protection to businesses (such as compensation), employment opportunities for young people, educational school visits and more information about mitigation for local services.

1.28 Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council

1.28.1 The council expressed severe concern at the lack of information and solutions to issues previously raised and about the timing of the Stage 2 consultation. They commented that the lack of information about environmental impacts meant they could not judge the effectiveness of proposed mitigation. They commented that all options for construction materials were inappropriate, that the three-span bridge be chosen for the access route, and supported Option 4 for the two-village bypass and Option 1 for the rail terminal. They expressed concern about the following:

- The destructive effects of the campus on Eastbridge and the effect of the strategy on tourist rental housing. They suggested other locations that could provide further use of facilities after construction.
- That more data would be needed about materials and quantity to evaluate the transport strategy, including the coastal impact of jetties. They supported maximum sea and rail use but questioned the extent of this.
- Yoxford would potential be severely impacted by congestion, and the proposed roundabout option would require slip roads.
- The B1122 would be regularly disrupted and may not be structurally capable of withholding additional traffic. There were no proposed alternative routes, but the 'D2' route would obviate issues and provide an emergency escape route.
- Proposals for people and the economy were inconsistent, with the potential effect of the influx of workers overloading services and local facilities, with anti-social behaviour and a loss of local tradesman.

1.29 Marine Management Organisation

1.29.1 The Marine Management Organisation expressed concern that it was unclear where the infrastructure below Marine High Water Springs was detailed within the consultation document. The Marine Management Organisation requested that future consultation documents ensure that the red line boundary for the whole project including activities below Marine High Water Springs be provided. They mentioned several other areas where they considered that there was a lack of information or assessment, including detail about cooling water infrastructure and the fish return system, the status of commercial fisheries in the Sizewell area, vessel traffic noise and cumulative assessment for combined impact of increased temperatures on

marine life, effects of discharged chemicals from the power station and entrainment/impingement of marine organisms.

- 1.29.2 They commented on the requirements for dredging/disposal agreements and suggested consideration of whether water control structure designs fell within the marine licensing area and requested further details about both aspects. They expressed preference for jetty and sea defence construction proposals to form part of the DCO but commented that if considered in a separate application for a marine licence, the Environmental Statement should include assessment of all associated works. They also raised concerns about sections of the consultation documentation that they considered were misleading, unclear or inaccurate and should have been changed, and that it did not recognise the Marine Management Organisation’s Eastern Area Marine Plans or the Marine Policy Statement.

1.30 National Grid

- 1.30.1 National Grid provided details of their infrastructure within the vicinity of the proposed area of works, including two overhead lines and four underground cables within the development site boundary and several substations within proximity to the proposed area of works. They highlighted several points to be taken into consideration regarding electricity infrastructure including statutory electrical safety clearances, guidance and protective agreements.

- 1.30.2 They also provided advice about diversions, acquiring land and interference with National Grid’s apparatus. They requested consultation at the earliest stages to ensure protective provisions in the DCO application, as well as the Draft DCO including the Book of Reference and relevant Land Plans and shape files or CAD files for the order limits.

1.31 Natural England

- 1.31.1 Natural England expressed concern about the proposed location in an environment of high value and sensitivity and impact on protected landscapes including the special qualities of Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and the landscape and seascape of the Heritage Coast, mostly due to the design of the reactor buildings and turbine and the accommodation layout. They commented on the water quality, noise, light, loss of connectivity and habitat fragmentation impacts on other designated sites including Sizewell Marshes and Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SSSI and protected species within. They requested a map which would clearly overlay the development against boundaries and habitats.

- 1.31.2 They commented that potential for impact should be considered cumulatively rather than individually. They stated that sufficient information about

environmental impacts, mitigation and compensation should have been included in Stage 2, with demonstration of avoidance and consideration of alternatives, especially for loss of designated sites. They suggested that SSSI/SPA/special area of conservation/Ramsar sites should be fully assessed and were unclear whether adaptation had been accounted for in the Flood Risk Assessment.

1.31.3 In terms of options, they expressed the following opinions:

- The SSSI crossing option should cause the least damage and disturbance, with further assessment needed before an option could be chosen e.g. species impacts and extent of permanent land take.
- Option 1 for the construction materials appeared to have the least impact on the AONB and biodiversity but needed further mitigation.
- Several impacts should be assessed for the marine options, including ship movement numbers, noise impacts with regards to marine ecology, construction works timing, disturbance to marine and coastal habitats and impact on sediment movement.
- A preference for Options 1 or 2 for the A12 road improvements due to lesser environmental impact, and suggested that works should be fully assessed for effects on the setting of the landscape.
- Natural England also expressed concern about the impact on recreation and access to public footpaths including Sandlings Walk and Suffolk Coast Path and bridleways, impacts on groundwater and of the cooling water infrastructure and suggested that surveying for protected species should be completed on the B1122. They also commented that the consultation document lacked sufficient information and challenged the wording of certain sections, as they did not consider them to match what SZC Co. had previously agreed with Natural England.

1.32 Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, Direct Rail Services Limited & Magnox Limited

1.32.1 The parties requested continuous engagement from SZC Co. as the development designs matured, particularly about power supply, water supply, site access, matters that could impact the environment, security, supply chain and local economy and community decisions.

1.32.2 Direct Rail Services Limited requested the opportunity to discuss the impact of the proposals on the Leiston Railhead, of which they have a 125-year

lease. They requested assurance that the caravan accommodation proposals would not impact their requirements at Leiston Railhead.

1.32.3 They commented on the Site Collaboration Agreement in place with other nuclear sites and suggested a similar agreement with Sizewell. They proposed a jointly established ‘Integrated Programme Team’ to cover site strategic plans over the life cycle of Sizewell C and to seek out mutually beneficial opportunities for the supply chain, shared services and logistics. They commented on the potential opportunities to ensure coherent environmental monitoring regimes.

1.32.4 They expressed concern about SZC Co.’s electrical power requirements, requesting formal confirmation of sourcing power from the Grid, and that no additional overhead line circuits would be required near the main development site. They also requested clarification of proposals for the beach landing facility, sea defences and coastal management proposals and security and emergency management.

1.32.5 The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority supported the proposed access road if it would not impact their access to Sizewell A. They supported the green rail route and Option 2 for the new railhead at Leiston but requested more clarity about the use of existing rail infrastructure, such as Sizewell Halt, during construction.

1.32.6 Finally, they commented on land acquisition and property considerations, protective provisions to ensure the scheme does not impact on critical operations, stakeholder engagement and for a clear view of decommissioning and disposal plans.

1.33 Network Rail

1.33.1 Network Rail commented that the information presented at this stage was not sufficiently detailed for a full assessment of potential impacts on the railway, but they noted impacts on railway infrastructure from potential upgrades to the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line, and a rail extension and level crossing closures on the East Suffolk line.

1.33.2 They commented on the exercise of compulsory purchase powers over operational land and requested agreement for protection for the railway during construction works, as well as the requirement of asset protection measures, standard protective provisions needed for the DCO and legal and commercial agreements. They requested that when construction and maintenance of infrastructure and buildings is undertaken, it is done so in a manner that would not affect the safety and security of Network Rail sites and boundaries.

1.34 Norfolk County Council

1.34.1 Norfolk County Council commented that the proposals would be unlikely to have any significant impact on landscape, ecology, archaeology or traffic matters in Norfolk. They expressed concern about the impact on the 400kv network which runs between Norfolk and Suffolk. They commented on the need for further studies for the proposed connection from Sizewell and clarification about potential requirements for reinforcement of the existing 400kv network or new overhead lines. They also requested that the EIA address the in-combination impact on the 400kv network in the wider strategic area, given the amount of energy coming from offshore wind energy projects of the Norfolk and Suffolk coast. The council commented on potential impacts on the local labour market, such as the shortage of construction workers in East Anglia and requested more information about investment into training in the local area and how economic issues would be mitigated.

1.35 Peasenhall Parish Council

1.35.1 The council's main concerns included:

- The volume and speed of traffic using the A1120 through Peasenhall village and resultant disturbance to residents, damage to buildings through vibration, and increase in fumes and dust.
- Access from the A1120 to the A12 at Yoxford from the Carlton Green crossroads to Saxmundham.
- The use of minor roads as rat-runs by construction workers.
- The maintenance of the highway network due to increased traffic levels.
- The short and long-term effect on the housing market.

1.35.2 They clarified their priorities on mitigation measures as being:

- Speed reduction measures on the A1120 through Peasenhall, including cameras and review of speed limits.
- Control of HGVs using the A1120 in both directions and encouraging LGVs to use main routes other than the A1120 or minor roads.
- Improvements of access to the A12 at Yoxford and to Saxmundham from Peasenhall.
- Encouraging car sharing for workers.

- Grants towards environmental schemes for the village.

1.36 Public Health England

1.36.1 Public Health England provided details of their recommendations regarding the scoping document regarding receptors, emissions to air and water, impacts arising from construction and decommissioning, land quality, waste and response to accidents in the EIA. They also commented on the health impact associated with electromagnetic fields, gave details on policy measures for the electricity industry, exposure guidelines and long-term effects and provided information about the Stakeholder Advisory Group on extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields (EMFs).

1.36.2 They stated the need for a permit from the Environment Agency to operate and considerations and measures to be taken involving potential exposure to ionising radiation. Finally, they outlined points to be considered when undertaking a human health risk assessment.

1.37 Rendham Parish Council

1.37.1 Rendham Parish Council supported the proposals but raised concerns about value for taxpayers. They called for improvements to local infrastructure such as the A12 around Stratford St Andrew.

1.37.2 They stated that mitigation proposals for environmental damage were adequate. They supported every option for the new access road and managing construction materials. They suggested that 90% of the construction workers be accommodated within a 7-mile radius, citing concerns over traffic and inconvenience for residents. The park and rides should also be in this radius.

1.37.3 Rendham Parish Council supported all the options for campus layout but raised a concern about the Ipswich to Lowestoft line. They stated that permanent improvements were needed, and lorries should not be allowed on back roads. They stressed the importance of sea transport of bulk materials and claimed that locals were 'owed' a bypass because they were 'hosting' Sizewell. They objected to the suggested road improvements at Yoxford/B1122 because they slow down traffic on the A12.

1.38 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

1.38.1 The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds expressed concern that a lack of information was provided. They requested more information and assessment to ascertain the full extent of the impacts and identify mitigation

measures, including a full Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), impacts of coastal infrastructure on the Minsmere frontage and high-value grassland, information about the loss of SSSI land, impacts of noise, lighting, the cut-off wall and surface water discharge, hydrological impacts from borrow pits, effects of noise and vibration from road and rail transport, habitat loss from the proposed bypass and the effects on tourism due to environmental impacts and loss of tourist accommodation.

1.38.2 The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds expressed opposition to nuclear power generation, outlining their reasoning with regards to the policy context. They expressed particular concern about the potential for coastal defences and other infrastructure to affect coastal processes on the RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve frontage, and potential effects on the reserve's habitats if increased erosion were to occur. They suggested greater compensation for the loss of SSSI would be needed as stated in NPS EN-1 as they felt proposed compensation at Aldhurst Farm would be inadequate, outlining the principles they believed should be adhered to.

1.38.3 They required more information to be able to comment on the acceptability of the proposed SSSI crossing options and sought assurance that the crossing would not cause hydrological impacts on the Minsmere Levels. They expressed concern about the impact on bat habitats in Kenton Hills, of the loss of heading and trees near Eastbridge and the impacts of a visitor centre at Goose Hill.

1.39 Saxmundham Town Council

1.39.1 The council expressed concern that local communities had been largely ignored and that the consultation document lacked detail and clarity. Their concerns about the impact on Saxmundham included:

- Cut-through driving worsening congestion through the town centre, for which adequate preventative measures would be needed.
- Impact on community life, particularly due to workforce behaviour and disruption during construction, which had not been adequately addressed.
- Saxmundham's holiday let, service and supply industries may be damaged in the long-term by impacts of the development.
- The large influx of labour would overstretch health facilities, school, other public services and local shops, and they made suggestions for how to improve the town centre.

- 1.39.2 The council also expressed concern about the visual impact of spoil heaps and deterrence to visitors to RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve, Dunwich Heath and the surrounding AONB, impacts on coastal processes, groundwater, local agriculture, wildlife, SSSIs, the coast and beaches, marsh landscapes, heritage sites and land take for borrow pits. They requested a full EIA to provide greater details. They supported the single-span bridge access route for having the least environmental impact.
- 1.39.3 The council commented that the options for A12 improvements were restricted and that the proposals should bring long-term improvements such as a four-village bypass and 'D2' route. They questioned the use of the B1122 as the main route to the main development site and requested an extension to the Saxmundham to Sizewell rail link and double tracking between Lowestoft and Darsham.
- 1.39.4 They opposed the accommodation options, suggesting permanent builds on the outskirts of Leiston and closer to Sizewell, or dispersing it over a wider area. They commented that there was no certainty that local people would receive job opportunities and suggested more advantages and compensation for local people. Finally, they commented that closed questions in the questionnaire did not allow respondents to express their views adequately, and the consultation did the bare minimum to enable SZC Co. to fulfil its statutory requirement.
- 1.40 **Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council**
- 1.40.1 Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council submitted a joint response. The councils expressed concern about the visual impact of the development on Suffolk Heritage Coast and Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, such as the design of the main reactor, stockpiles and accommodation compounds. They also raised concerns about the spoil management strategy including the impacts of borrow pits, changes to groundwater, noise, vibration and disturbance to wildlife. They stated their preference for Option 3 for the SSSI crossing for having the least ecological impact but commented that Aldhurst Farm compensation would be welcome but not sufficient. They stated that Stage 2 failed to recognise the extent of the environmental challenges and that some ecological surveys had been overlooked. They expressed concern about the impact of the sea defences on coastal processes and marine ecology, suggesting further flood risk assessment including future changes to water levels.
- 1.40.2 They commented that there was limited evidence to support the transport proposals and that impacts on the highway network had been underestimated, requesting clarification for traffic and gravity modelling. They supported the maximum use of marine and rail transport with a freight

management facility on the A14 and a two-village bypass as a minimum and requested a southern park and ride site south of Woodbridge. They expressed concern about the effectiveness of the proposed B1122 junction improvements, commenting on the wider impact of development on the A12, A14 and cross-country routes, identifying sections where congestion would be worst and where improvements would be needed on minor roads.

1.40.3 The councils welcomed SZC Co.'s socio-economic aims but said there was not enough detail to determine whether they would be achievable. They commented that positive, sustainable local community legacy benefits were essential with maximum opportunities for local businesses to win contracts, increasing local skills development and raising the proportion of home-based workers. They requested more information about skills displacements, mitigation to reduce labour market displacement effects and impacts on tourism, public services and the housing market.

1.41 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

1.41.1 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service commented that the uncertainty of options and lack of detail around transport was a significant barrier to effective consultation, commenting on the need for greater clarity about future consultation governance processes. They commented on the lack of detail regarding blue light/emergency services and public safety and suggested a Community Safety Management Plan, and for the Emergency Services Working Group to be established as soon as possible.

1.41.2 Their key concerns included:

- Emergency service response times to the locality, which could be increased due to increased traffic volumes and congestion.
- Safety aspects for the public, SZC Co. staff and emergency service responders from the high-risk activities at the proposed main development site, for emergency services and resultant resourcing implications.
- Road safety impacts, residential fire safety and night-time economy related potential issues.
- Impacts on workforce retention in emergency services, with staff potentially being displaced to work as part of the Sizewell C development.

1.41.3 They suggested avoidance of negative impacts to sensitive areas, such as the SSSI crossing, for example fire, water run-off and leakage of hazardous

substances. They made suggestions about the access provision including details of their vehicle fleet, and for site access road and traffic management systems to facilitate the crossing on emergency vehicles without obstruction or delay. They suggested that emergency planning, evacuation and ‘high-rise’ requirements should be considered in the accommodation strategy and that the B1122 road improvement option should be chosen to consider emergency response vehicles, noting the significant congestion that would be caused on the B1122, A12 and A1120. Finally, they supported Option 1 for the temporary rail extension and Option 1 for the jetty to reduce road traffic.

1.42 Snape Parish Council

1.42.1 The council encouraged a responsible approach to flood risk and care and welfare of the environment, especially the AONB because it is a feature of enjoyment and attraction to the visitor region.

1.42.2 They expressed concern about traffic and speeding on the A1094 and requested the use of the B1122 for construction traffic, for efforts to redirect traffic from the A1094 including signage at Friday Street junction and for prevention of A1152-B1069 route as a rat-run. They also commented that parking at the main development site should be kept to a minimum and that detail should be provided on the traffic proposals including greater evidence to underpin the assumptions that the village of Snape would not be adversely impacted. They requested the use of rail and sea to reduce HGV movement and for information about the operation of the number plate recognition system. They suggested a dual carriageway on the A12 would encourage road users not to look for alternative routes.

1.42.3 They commented on the need to ensure enough accommodation remains available for tourism. They acknowledged that good quality accommodation with recreational equipment would be important for worker welfare, as without it there could be an increase in crime and disturbance. They requested additional policing resources for the campus and locality.

1.42.4 Finally, they commented on the disruptive timing of the consultation and the inaccessibility of the response form and thought greater effort could have been made to communicate with the community.

1.43 Southwold Town Council

1.43.1 The council expressed concern about the lack of detail or sufficient information to reduce the concerns of residents. Their main concerns included the large impact on the AONB from the design of the main development and spoil heaps, safety concerns about the EPR™ reactor, lack

of clarity for the transport strategy, impact on the economy and tourism particularly due to traffic increases and the impact of a jetty on coastal processes.

1.43.2 They suggested SZC Co. undertake a Health Impact Assessment and Public Services Strategy to identify the effects on public services. They also requested more detail regarding training, job and education opportunities for the community.

1.44 Sudbourne Parish Council

1.44.1 The council expressed concern at the location of the proposals in an area of extremely high ecological and environmental value which already has significant traffic and transport problems. Their environmental concerns included: damage to the AONB, SSSI and ecology; loss of footpaths and bridleways; light, noise and air pollution; impact on coastal processes; and a lack of mitigation proposals for these impacts.

1.44.2 They expressed concern about increase in traffic on the A12 and rail traffic through Melton, and that proposals for sea freight movement had not progressed much since Stage 1. They requested train movement indicators along the Lowestoft line, and stated that they needed more information about the impact on the Melton level crossing. They suggested that the four-village bypass be implemented, although a two-village bypass should be the minimum proposed.

1.44.3 Finally, they commented on the impact on tourism and local services in Sudbourne and urged investment into skills training, supporting businesses and prioritising local skilled employment.

1.45 Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership

1.45.1 The partnership commented on the lack of information and significant faults and omissions from the consultation documentation, for not adequately identifying the boundary of the AONB (or the Heritage Coast) or its sensitivity as a national designated landscape. They expressed concern that the proposals had not been adequately measured against the Natural Beauty and Special Qualities of the AONB and would impact it through:

- Off-the-shelf power station design (lifted and shifted from Hinkley Point C).
- Unacceptable stockpile height which would have an unacceptable impact on sensitive views across the AONB.

- Severance of the AONB.
- Impacts on the wildlife of the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and the Sizewell Belts SSSI, of which mitigation proposals were not adequate.
- Loss of tranquillity for a 'long-term' construction period, including effects on areas known for dark skies, quiet walks and wildlife.

1.45.2 They requested clarification, further explanation in subsequent consultations or a requirement for further detail about each of the points they made.

1.46 Suffolk Constabulary

1.46.1 Suffolk Constabulary raised concerns that an increase in the workforce population might have an adverse impact upon safety and crime. They commented that increased traffic might cause higher accidents and delay police responses. Policing protests against the construction would also be costly for the Suffolk Constabulary. They called for liaison with the Suffolk Constabulary Community Safety Unit and Architectural Liaison Officers about the Sizewell C Project. They were additionally concerned that building sites would attract criminals but recognised SZC Co. had put in measures to minimise this, in addition to the workforce impact. They offered to engage with SZC Co. They also stated that they would seek additional funding from SZC Co. to ensure that the level of service afforded to Suffolk's communities is not impacted by the Sizewell C development.

1.46.2 They supported the workers campus but asked for more details about the caravan site. They offered to work with SZC Co. on CCTV and appropriate target hardening techniques and sought onsite accommodation within the campus for Suffolk Constabulary officers.

1.46.3 The Suffolk Constabulary favoured Option 1 of the rail improvements but called for more detail on the increased crossings of public roads, and of the arrangements if the jetty were to be closed. They supported the park and ride schemes but were concerned about visibility and turning at Darsham and that the Wickham Market option would increase traffic.

1.46.4 They called for SZC Co. to liaise with Suffolk Constabulary when looking to utilise ANPR for lorry management. They requested more information about road improvements and stressed the need for long-term benefits of these. Suffolk Constabulary considered the options 3A, 3B and 4 for improving the A12 to be viable but preferred Option 4 to remove traffic from the villages and reduce pollution, emission and safety issues. They suggested improvements to the A12/B1122 junction, the B1122 and to cycle routes.

1.47 Swefling Parish Council

1.47.1 The council expressed concern about the size and design of the development for the proposed location within an AONB on the Heritage Coast, with SSSI land take and close to Minsmere Nature Reserve and Dunwich Heath. They commented on the visual, noise, dust and light pollution from the borrow pits and spoil heaps, the use of the B1122 and the accommodation campus impacting residents (particularly Eastbridge and Theberton), wildlife and Minsmere Levels. They commented on a perceived lack of assessment of pollution and commitments to mitigation and supported Option 3 for the access road proposals, to prevent disturbance to water flow.

1.47.2 The council felt the local road, rail and sea infrastructure would not be suitable for movements required and that modelling had not considered seasonal changes on the A12 and emergency service access. They commented that construction traffic and workers using the B1122 would increase accidents and congestion which would affect visitor numbers in the long term and be difficult to mitigate, so expressed support for a 'D2' route relief road. They supported the two-village bypass but believed it would be inadequate and commented that the B1122 improvements lacked consideration of the A12/A1120 junction, creating more traffic at Yoxford. They suggested that the southern park and ride should be larger than the northern park and ride, and that rail use should be expanded to transport workers to the main development site and left as a legacy benefit.

1.47.3 The council's community concerns included the availability of healthcare, policing, education and leisure facilities for workers, in respect of which they requested more information, the impacts of anti-social behaviour, for which they commented that more than a Code of Conduct would be needed, and that there would be insufficient local housing to accommodate workers. They were concerned that the supply of tradespeople to the local market could be disrupted and requested commitment to train and employ local people. Finally, they expressed disappointment at the timing of the consultation and criticised the consultation documentation for lacking an index and oversimplifying issues.

1.48 Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council

1.48.1 The council believed that Sizewell C would have a devastating impact on Eastbridge and Theberton and residents' quality of life and that an unreasonable burden had been placed on them to minimise the Sizewell C road traffic. Their concerns included:

- Use of the B1122 creating noise, vibration damage, pollution and danger.
- Visual impact of spoil heaps and borrow pits and effect on RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve.
- That the accommodation strategy would restrict tourist rentals and cause visual, light and noise impact, rat-run traffic, anti-social behaviour and affect residents' health, but if 'forced', would favour Option 2(ii).
- Tourism would be impacted by all stated impacts.
- There were no proposals for mitigation or compensation to residents.

1.48.2 The council raised many environmental concerns, including:

- Impacts of the main site on bats in Ash Wood, surface water flows, inland drains, groundwater systems, Minsmere Sluice and species rich grassland.
- Aldhurst habitat creation was welcome but not considered adequate in mitigating the loss of SSSI land. More, including water treatment and a baseline water level map, would be needed.
- Accelerated impacts on Minsmere coastal frontage from the main development site protection features once the sacrificial dunes are naturally eroded.
- That all construction materials options would cause unacceptable environmental impacts, so should be brought in by rail or sea.

1.48.3 The council made the following comments in relation to the transport strategy:

- Support for rail and sea transport with park and ride facilities and suggested a relief road south of Saxmundham additionally, however they were not in favour of any bypass around Theberton.
- There was a lack of transport data including site entrance traffic data, busiest day/hour data and account of local events such as Latitude Festival.
- A lack of evidence of diversionary routes, and that traffic should not be directed through country lanes or impact on emergency routes.
- inadequacy of the B1122, suggesting surveys, repair and reconstruction.

- 1.48.4 They favoured Option 1 for the temporary rail extension but suggested the rail line should be extended into the Sizewell C site, Option 1 for the wide jetty but requested more information about dredging, navigation and sailing impacts and removal of the jetty and Option 3 for the new access road, but expressed concern about the blockage of hydrological flow between Sizewell Marshes and Minsmere. They commented that neither options for Yoxford road improvements would be satisfactory.
- 1.48.5 They requested more information about how SZC Co. would provide additional health, education and police services for the influx of workers, about the supply and usage of potable water for the development and accommodation and requested that links with local schools should be established and to create training facilities for young people. They also commented on the timing of consultation over the holidays, on the lack of an index in the consultation documentation, unclear and incomplete maps and diagrams and unrealistic CGI.
- 1.49 **The Coal Authority**
- 1.49.1 The Coal Authority had no comments or observations to make on this proposal because it was outside of the defined coalfield.
- 1.50 **Trinity House**
- 1.50.1 Trinity House commented that the proposed power station and associated works would be within their General Lighthouse Authority area of jurisdiction. They made several suggestions for the Navigation Risk Assessment as they were particularly interested in the navigational marking of works to be carried out below the high water mark including the cooling water infrastructure, the jetty and the spoil handling including the possibility of spoil being deposited at the Wallasea Island Nature Reserve or at sea. They commented that they would register as an interested party when the DCO application is made.
- 1.51 **Waldringfield Parish Council**
- 1.51.1 The council expressed concern about sea level rise over the lifetime of the development and commented that full regard should be taken of the AONB qualities and the proximity of two SSSIs and Minsmere Nature Reserve. They expressed belief that late detailed assessment of environmental impacts makes it increasingly difficult for consultees to influence the outcome and asked that an EIA be published urgently. They expressed concern about the impact of noise and lighting on wildlife, especially birds, of coastal erosion and marine ecology, and suggested that further evidence for the lack of anticipated impacts should be provided.

1.51.2 The council commented that the accommodation campus would have a large impact on Eastbridge and Theberton without contributing to the need for affordable housing in the area, and for this reason all options were deemed unsuitable. They suggested siting the accommodation in urban settings, such as Leiston.

1.51.3 They requested maximum rail and sea transport to reduce road congestion and supported the temporary rail extension and wide jetty options. They suggested the use of a park and ride facility at Martlesham and an A12 four-village bypass, although the two-village bypass was the best of the options presented. They expressed opposition to the use of the B1122 and suggested a new relief road to reduce impacts, provide emergency route access and legacy benefits.

1.51.4 They requested mitigation for the impacts on tourism and for the extra demand on health services, schools and leisure provision in the area. They also expressed concern about the lack of planning in case of an accident or terrorism emergency, and about the security of radioactive materials.

1.52 Waveney District Council

1.52.1 The council welcomed SZC Co.'s aims and objectives around socio-economics but commented that there was insufficient detail of how these could be achieved.

1.52.2 They commented that transport modes would be important for determining impacts of the development and requested evidence of estimations, including what proportion of materials may be delivered via sea.

1.52.3 The council felt there were not enough specific economic strategy proposals and suggested considerations to be made, including clarification of the definition of 'local', economic impact metrics and the potential to improve digital connectivity.

1.52.4 They made comments about maximising the opportunities for local businesses to win contracts for Sizewell C, such as a local procurement presence and exploring opportunities to link with other developers in the energy sector. They expressed concern about the evidence and assumptions made regarding skills and employment opportunities, including the use of datasets, and believed targets for home-based workers lacked ambition. They made further comments and suggestions about work inspiration, apprenticeships, education and training and commented on the potential adverse economic impact from skills displacement, impacts on tourism (which they believed had not been adequately addressed), agriculture, impact on the housing market and impacts on emergency services,

healthcare and schools. The council suggested the potential use of Lowestoft Port for the development.

1.53 Wenhaston with Mells Hamlet Parish Council

1.53.1 The council commented that any damage to the qualities of the protected landscape of high wildlife, biodiversity and tourism value should be avoided or mitigated against. They expressed concern about the lack of information to make informed judgements and that local people's views had been overlooked or ignored. Their main concerns were:

- Opposition to the accommodation campus at Eastbridge because of its location on arable land, landscape impacts and burden on local infrastructure, healthcare, services and facilities and impacts on Minsmere. They suggested dispersing accommodation around larger villages, leaving a legacy of affordable housing.
- The use of the B1122 would be unsuitable due to the contoured, narrow nature of the road, impacts on tourism and damage to amenity value of the area. They suggested the construction of a relief road to avoid these impacts.
- The proposals would impact wildlife habitats along the Heritage Coastline, in the AONB, Minsmere Nature Reserve and Dunwich Forest and Heath due to noise, light pollution, dust disturbance, coastal erosion and lack of compensation.

1.53.2 They suggested that proposals for skills training and apprenticeships should be included, with a greater emphasis on sustainable legacy.

1.54 Westhall Parish Council

1.54.1 The council commented that any increase in road or rail transport would negatively impact current users due to poor infrastructure and underfunding. They requested that A12 improvements should provide better permanent benefits to residents.

1.54.2 The council supported the use of sea and rail over road but questioned the use of the inadequate rail line between Ipswich and Lowestoft and suggested traffic management to reduce congestion and for permanent facilities at Darsham. They supported the two-village bypass option and Option 1 for the roundabout at Yoxford.

1.55 Westleton Parish Council

- 1.55.1 The council expressed concern about the impact on the AONB, the tourism industry and the quality of life of residents. They commented that the proposals were lacking in detail and clarity, with disappointment in the timing of the consultation period.
- 1.55.2 They expressed concern about the visual and environmental impact of the spoil heaps and borrow pits, of coastal erosion, flooding and the dark sky designation. They commented on the speeding problem on the B1125, and fear that it would be used as a rat-run, for example to the Darsham park and ride, and about the use of the B1122 as the main route. They suggested the 'D2' relief route to reduce noise, pollution and traffic impacts on residents.
- 1.55.3 They expressed opposition to the accommodation proposals due to visual, environmental and social impact on Eastbridge and the lack of legacy benefits, suggesting splitting the campus and providing permanent homes. They requested further details about the impact and mitigation on services, schools and healthcare and suggested the provision of training and apprenticeship opportunities.

1.56 Wickham Market Parish Council

- 1.56.1 The council suggested the provision of a community impact mitigation fund. They described their major concern as relating to increased traffic, associated safety issues and that the road would be unable to cope, which had not been addressed in the documentation and no mitigation had been proposed.
- 1.56.2 They expressed concern about coastal erosion, the impact of the access road and car park on recreational green space, ecology, landscape and potential for future ancillary developments. They commented on landscape and ecology impacts of the accommodation campus, inadequate size of the caravan site and suggested coastal accommodation at various ports. They supported maximum use of sea and rail transport including the wide jetty option and suggested an increase to the five rail journeys proposed per day, additional enhancements to rail infrastructure (such as a passing place at Campsea Ashe Station) as well as robust traffic management methods.
- 1.56.3 They expressed concern about the location of the southern park and ride between two SLAs and near the Marlesford Conservation Area, causing a loss of woodland, and about the increase in traffic on the B1078, suggesting traffic calming measures. They requested details about facilities to be provided at the park and ride, the use and size of the lorry park and suggested that employment opportunities be provided there. They supported

the use of a Delivery Management System (DMS), including ANPR, and the two-village bypass. They also requested additional funding for emergency services and policing.

1.56.4 Finally, they made several comments about the consultation documents, including the lack of information, lack of clarity of key information and the limited scope of the questionnaire.

1.57 Yoxford Parish Council

1.57.1 The council expressed concern that the construction would be too large for the proposed main development site, especially within an AONB, and that SZC Co. should consider alternatives. They felt the impacts on wildlife, coastal erosion and water flows had not been fully understood and that the accommodation campus, stockpiles and borrow pits would create significant visual impact, harming the AONB and tourism (regarding which there was a lack of quantification). They requested that the campus be spread over several sites to reduce impact on Eastbridge and for long-term affordable housing opportunities.

1.57.2 The council commented that the B1122 would be unsuitable for the amount and size of construction traffic and that there had been no assessment of pollution along the A12, B1122 and A1120, no provision for crossing of A12 at Yoxford or for upgrades to junctions along the A12 and consideration of the A1120/A12 junction in Yoxford. They suggested the 'D2' relief road and for traffic controls at the A1120/A12 junction. They believed traffic forecasts were not convincing and made suggestions for this, requesting that the Gravity Model be shared, and that transport modelling should predict the worst-case scenario.

1.57.3 They expressed concern about the extent of benefits of jobs and contracts for local firms, requesting estimates, and commented that there had been no firm commitment to providing jobs for unemployed and low-skilled workers. They requested quantification of the increased need for health, social care, policing, education and leisure facilities and mitigation for anti-social behaviour and how workers would be held to account.

1.57.4 They felt such a degree of information was missing in the consultation that an additional stage should be carried out after Stage 3.

2. Summary of Responses from Section 42(1)(D) Consultees By Theme

2.1 Overall Proposals

a) General

- 2.1.1 Some section 42(1)(d) consultees (referred to throughout this report as persons with an interest in land or Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)) expressed opposition to a new nuclear power station at Sizewell. Some objected because of their opposition to nuclear power in general, whereas others based their objections on the perceived social, economic and environmental impacts of siting the development in this location. General comments on nuclear energy were focused on the safety aspects, cost and the handling of nuclear waste.
- 2.1.2 Some PILs expressed a preference for investment and development of alternative forms of energy production, particularly from renewable sources such as wind and solar power. They stated that these technologies had lower risk and environmental impact whilst producing sustainable electricity. Others claimed that the disadvantages of building Sizewell C would far outweigh any advantages and therefore felt the proposals were not justified.
- 2.1.3 Some PILs were supportive of the proposals overall, commenting that the development would be necessary to produce sufficient electricity and to avoid reliance on external sources of energy in the future. Some were supportive of nuclear energy as a low-carbon source of electricity production. Others expressed support for the proposed location given the existence of Sizewell A and B. They also commented on the benefits they believed it would bring to the local economy (see ‘Socio-economics’).
- 2.1.4 Other PILs expressed support for the proposals but only under certain conditions, for example that new roads should be sufficient to handle the increase in traffic and that the impact on local villages and the environment be adequately addressed.
- 2.1.5 Some PILs highlighted their concerns about the development proposals in general. Some raised issues about the use of an EPR reactor, suggesting that the technology was ‘unproven’ given that there were no working reactors of this type in any other location. Others mentioned reports of delays and malfunctions on other SZC Co. nuclear projects.
- 2.1.6 Some commented that the size of Sizewell C and its associated developments would be too large and intrusive for this area of East Suffolk,

and that land take would be much larger than envisaged at the first stage of consultation. They felt that it would be greater than the size of Sizewell A and B combined, resulting in more disruptive impacts of construction. Others claimed that the area of the proposed site would be too small for what is required for this development.

- 2.1.7 Some PILs felt that this area would not be appropriate for a nuclear power station because of its rural sensitivity, which they say should be protected. They believed there were more appropriate locations for the development to be built, such as industrialised areas, brownfield sites, outside of designated areas and closer to London. Others suggested a smaller footprint reactor technology in several different locations instead of constructing one large nuclear development.
- 2.1.8 Some PILs commented on the cost of the proposed development and highlighted potential financial issues. They suggested that more innovative and financially viable alternatives exist and that the proposed development would produce energy at a substantially high cost to the taxpayer. They therefore believed that the Sizewell C Project would not be value for money. Some PILs also expressed doubt that the development would be built on time and to budget, when taking into account other nuclear projects. Some suggested that government should look objectively at the issues rather than choosing the option perceived to have the greatest financial and community cost.
- 2.1.9 Some PILs felt that they would have no say in the selection process for any part of the proposals and believed they would be powerless to prevent the proposed development from happening.
- 2.1.10 Galloper Wind Farm requested several matters relating to the coastal and offshore environment in relation to the Galloper Wind Farm's export cables should be included in future documentation. Galloper Wind Farm also requested that the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) mirror the protective provisions for Galloper Wind Farm as provided to SZC Co. in the Galloper Wind Farm Order 2013/1203.
- 2.1.11 Some PILs suggested there were potential safety concerns, commenting that the stockpiles could cause fatal accidents, similar to historic events in Wales.
- 2.1.12 Other issues with the overall development proposals suggested by PILs were:
- That the development would be owned by a French company and funded from China, as decisions would be made 'high up' with SZC Co. and their Chinese partners.

- The belief that no possible mitigation could be sufficiently effective in reducing the impacts for the local population and the environment.
- That the proposals did not make many considerations for some towns and villages that would be directly impacted by associated developments.
- That the proposals to move the visitor centre to Coronation Wood resulting in the felling of trees would be unacceptable, and that any site should be closer to Leiston, not within the AONB.

a) Safety

2.1.13 Some PILs suggested that the design of the development had not been proven as safe. They felt there was a possibility of a major nuclear disaster due to eroding coastlines and also commented on the long-term storage of nuclear waste leading to radioactive contamination for future generations. They were concerned that the proposals failed to address problems during the operational phases, as well as long-term storage and decommissioning phases.

2.1.14 Others were concerned about the security of their properties and their own personal security with construction workers moving to their location. They also commented on potential vandalism of farming equipment from Sizewell workers, in particular in relation to farming equipment and vehicles on the B1122. Others commented on the continuous threat of vandalism or theft and asked what precautions were being taken regarding nuclear terrorism.

b) Socio-economics

2.1.15 Some PILs commented that the positive impact on the local economy would be considerable, with some stating that schemes are already in place for the younger generation. However, others felt that the documentation showed 'superficial' consideration to communities and commented that local people should be considered more fully.

2.1.16 Other PILs felt that the positives of the proposals would not outweigh the negative impacts on the community and environment and believed nothing had been offered to minimise the considerable adverse impact on the community. They expressed the view that the proposals had been guided by cost.

2.1.17 Some PILs commented on the potential damage to the community and their way of life, with perceived impacts on mental and physical health. This included the suggestion that the closure of footpaths would affect recreational

amenity and congestion would affect their day to day lives. Some PILs commented that in the early stages of construction at Hinkley Point C, road building and traffic caused severe disruptions and they expected the same would happen for Sizewell C. Some commented that the area contains a large number of older residents who would not benefit but would bear the brunt of the disruption, in many cases, for the rest of their lives.

- 2.1.18** Some PILs were concerned that social services such as doctors, dentists, emergency services and schools may not be able to support the increased numbers of residents in the area, suggesting that they are already overrun. They requested measures to be put in place to mitigate this. Others raised concerns about the potential for changes in social dynamics as a result of workers moving to the area.
- 2.1.19** Some PILs commented on the perceived impact of anti-social behaviour and crime, such as drug and alcohol abuse, prostitution, violence and sexually transmitted diseases. They suggested this would provide an unacceptable burden on the local community. They felt that Eastbridge has a lack of entertainment amenities and believed the proposed sports facility would not be adequate to deal with workers' boredom, leading to increases in crime. They referred to similar experiences of adverse social impact during the construction of Sizewell B. Others were worried about the security of their residences and farms and expressed concern about the ability of the local police force to handle the potential increase in crime.
- 2.1.20** Some PILs felt that “monitoring the situation” of anti-social behaviour would not be adequate mitigation and suggested that SZC Co. should vet all workers before they are employed.
- 2.1.21** Some PILs challenged the assumed benefits of the proposals, such as the creation of jobs for the local area, opportunities for local suppliers and training and education. They felt the assertion that there will be ‘local’ opportunities was inaccurate as the documentation defines this as within a 90 minute drive. Others commented that benefits and job opportunities would only be short-term and low-skilled, with skilled jobs going to an already established UK base and workers from abroad. Some PILs believed negative impacts to the local economy would be long-term, mostly due to the adverse impact on the tourism industry.
- 2.1.22** Some PILs questioned the amount of income construction workers would be spending in local businesses. They commented that Sizewell B outage workers very rarely visit local businesses such as farm shops, and suggested that Sizewell C workers should be encouraged to do so.

- 2.1.23 They stated that tourism, which depends on the peace and tranquillity of the area, would suffer due to the increase in traffic, noise, pollution and damage to the landscape and character of the area. They believed visitor numbers would reduce which would directly affect local businesses, causing the loss of jobs and potentially destroying the industry in the long-term. Others suggested that further assessment was needed of the impacts on tourism.
- 2.1.24 Some PILs also commented on the loss of farmland and the resultant effect on farmers' livelihoods. Some felt that land may never be restored to its previous quality. They questioned how loss of rights of way, farm access, drainage ditches and sources of irrigation will be replaced, restored or compensated for.
- 2.1.25 Some PILs suggested that mitigation measures should be introduced to minimise the impact of the proposals on the local community and ensure benefits for their long-term economic future. For example, by renting holiday lets at market rate to Sizewell C employees, other measures to help the tourist industry, creating opportunities for local businesses and training local workers. They also suggested SZC Co. should invest in local schools and colleges to develop skills for the area. Some requested that the Education, Skills and Employment Strategy and Community Impact Assessment should be made available before the DCO application submission.
- 2.1.26 Some PILs suggested that compensation be provided for devaluation of property and disruption to lives, commenting that house prices had already dropped by 10%. Others suggested consideration of compensation for the effects on health, for example from the impacts of nitrous oxide as a result of increased traffic. Some were concerned about the use of legal powers for compulsory purchase of land. Some PILs felt that construction working hours should take into account disruption to residents, and asked that SZC Co. be truthful and realistic in communication to communities about this issue.

c) Accommodation Strategy

- 2.1.27 Some PILs expressed opposition to the accommodation strategy proposals. Some commented that the proposals would be environmentally unacceptable and unsuitable for the community, without further explanation. Others expressed support for the strategy, stating that it made sense to locate workers close to the main development site. Some PILs were also supportive of the proposals for an accommodation office to manage the process.
- 2.1.28 Some PILs accused SZC Co. of deciding upon their preferred strategy before consultation and merely asking residents' opinions about 'minor

adjustments’. They also felt that the accommodation proposals indicated that local people would not be used for the construction workforce.

2.1.29 Some PILs commented on the perceived impact of construction workers renting holiday lets and the reduction in availability of accommodation for tourists. Others raised concerns about the impact on the rental housing market. Some also felt that the accommodation proposals offered no mitigation to communities who would be adversely affected, such as Eastbridge.

2.1.30 Some PILs requested more information about the accommodation strategy proposals, including:

- details about forms of screening to be used as visual mitigation.
- confirmation of whether workers will walk to the main site.
- the exact length of time that the temporary accommodation will in use.
- whether the proposed sports facility will be left for use by local people.
- further details about the social and environmental impact.
- the extent of plans to utilise local accommodation.

2.1.31 Some PILs suggested that the accommodation strategy should allow greater cohesion and integration into the community. Rather than segregating workers into the campus and caravan sites, some PILs believed dispersion into communities may allow workers to better engage with local people and become part of the community. Some PILs also made the following suggestions about the overall accommodation:

- employ healthcare and social workers to protect employee welfare.
- the sports facility should be located elsewhere to provide better community benefits, or closer to the main development site to reduce impacts on the surroundings.
- the suggested ‘D2’ route would allow Saxmundham to be used for accommodation.
- to use renewable sources of energy such as wind and solar for powering the campus.

2.1.32 Some PILs were opposed to an accommodation campus entirely due to the social and environmental impacts, particularly for Eastbridge. They felt that the campus proposals were unacceptable as workers would be treated ‘like

prisoners'. Others were supportive of the location for being far from their place of residence and for easing pressure on the local rental housing sector.

- 2.1.33 Some PILs commented that the campus would place an overwhelming burden on the small villages of Eastbridge and Theberton. They also believed the proposed accommodation campus may be too large and imposing for the surroundings, feeling that five storeys would have a detrimental visible impact. Others commented on the potential impact on a scheduled monument at Leiston Abbey and the Pro Corda music school.
- 2.1.34 Some PILs commented on the impact of the accommodation campus on the tranquil nature of the area. They also raised concerns that the campus would impact the fragile hydrology of the Minsmere Sluice and Sizewell Levels as well as groundwater levels, water supplies, and waste water. They felt it would waste good quality farmland and be too close to RSPB Minsmere, further affecting tourism.
- 2.1.35 Other PILs offered support for the accommodation campus, as long as certain conditions were met, for example that the option chosen should be that with the smallest amount of land take or that which minimises impact on the local area.
- 2.1.36 Discussing the three proposed options for an accommodation campus, PILs expressed a range of views. Some PILs commented that they would prefer Option 1 of the accommodation campus proposals because the building would be lower in height. Some expressed opposition to Option 2(ii) because the sports facilities would be located remotely. Conversely others expressed a preference for Option 2(ii) for the same reason.
- 2.1.37 PILs made the following alternative suggestions for the accommodation campus:
- To reduce the proposed height of the building.
 - For two or more campus buildings, or a 'split campus' similar that at Hinkley Point C.
 - Long-term rather than temporary buildings to leave a worthwhile legacy benefit of sustainable, affordable housing for local people.
 - To be based in towns and urban areas such as Leiston, Lowestoft, Ipswich and Saxmundham where impacts would be felt less.
 - To be closer to the construction site, for example on the site of Sizewell A.

- To be located on brownfield sites.
- That sports facilities should be located within the campus site.

2.1.38 Some PILs commented on the perceived increase in noise, light and air pollution and the resultant impact on health as a result of the accommodation strategy. They believed the options provided were not sensitive to the local countryside, designated areas and wildlife and felt they could lead to a possible increase in flooding. Some commented specifically on the effects of light pollution on birds at Minsmere Reserve and on the dark skies the area offered. Some suggested that fencing and buffering for noise and light pollution should be proposed.

2.1.39 Some PILs felt that the area proposed for the caravan site would be inappropriate because Lovers' Lane is often crowded with Sizewell B workers and queues for the refuse centre. They suggested more traffic could increase the likelihood of accidents occurring. They also mentioned the proximity of a primary school and a popular walking route nearby. Others expressed concern that the site would spoil the setting of the AONB and that a period of 10-15 years would be too long for a caravan site to be located here.

2.1.40 Some PILs commented that there was a lack of information about the caravan site proposals, for example the site capacity, the period of use, the commitment to returning the site to greenfield status and the modes of transport to be used to the main development site.

2.1.41 Suggestions for the caravan site proposals included the following:

- a safe crossing point from the caravan site to the Sizewell Sports and Social Club;
- to move it to within the boundaries of the campus site;
- that the U2831 Kemps Hill may need widening for access with a bridleway or footpath within the boundary; and
- that Sizewell B traffic at shift changes should be taken into account and any increased traffic activity on Lovers' Lane should warrant consideration of a speed limit.

d) Consultation Process

2.1.42 Some PILs felt that the consultation process did not take feedback from respondents seriously. They commented that this stage of consultation had not addressed major issues raised at Stage 1 and felt that their concerns had been ignored or merely "glanced over". They stated that there was little

evidence of substantial changes made since Stage 1. Because of this, some PILs believed SZC Co. was exhibiting a lack of interest in minimising the impacts of the development on the local area, and was working to its own agenda despite respondents' concerns.

- 2.1.43 Some PILS felt the consultation lacked detail on issues respondents find most controversial and that there was insufficient solid information, for example regarding transport modes, quantities of material and social impacts. They also felt that too many assumptions had been made and that too much detail had been left until Stage 3. Some PILs argued that this lack of detail prevented them from making confident decisions about the options provided.
- 2.1.44 Some PILs felt that the consultation documentation had been designed to confuse readers and offered choices which encouraged respondents to opt for SZC Co.'s preferred solutions. Some PILs felt that it lacked transparency and had been written with leading language with an 'optimistic' point of view.
- 2.1.45 Some PILs believed the consultation did not present viable option alternatives, commenting that most questions provided almost identical choices with similar negative impacts.
- 2.1.46 Some challenged the content in the consultation documentation as being inaccurate and therefore misleading. For example, describing some agricultural land as 'moderate' when the PILs considered that it was in fact 'good', or not mentioning all listed buildings present. They also felt the assumptions made about the benefits to the economy were overly optimistic and undervalued the estimations of land take. Others commented that maps and plans were poorly presented and annotated, rendering them meaningless. They also felt that the documents were not user friendly, difficult to navigate and that questions were poorly worded.
- 2.1.47 Some PILs highlighted the lack of environmental impact studies, commenting that more environmental information was needed to make an adequate response. They suggested that an EIA and HRA be published as soon as possible.
- 2.1.48 Others were positive about the documentation, stating that it provided additional information in certain areas. They felt the consultation had been well presented and organised, and helpful for SZC Co. to be able to understand public views.
- 2.1.49 Some PILs made suggestions, for example that documentation should be downloadable on a memory stick instead of a disk and that maps should be overlaid onto Ordnance Survey maps. Some made requests for ongoing

dialogue between SZC Co. and other parties with local infrastructure developments to reduce the cumulative impact of the proposals. Others requested that objective data be provided and that questionnaires should be tailored to issues that cover specific areas, with additional space for extra comments.

2.1.50 In reference to the consultation events, some PILs expressed disappointment that some representatives were unprepared and lacked knowledge about certain issues. They also felt that staff displayed rudeness and arrogance. Some PILs commented that exhibitions were not held in areas most affected such as Middleton, Theberton and Yoxford. Some made positive comments, for example that the showcases were excellent and adequate in number.

2.2 Main Development Site

a) Access Road

2.2.1 Some PILs expressed opposition to the proposals for a new access road particularly due to the perceived ecological impact of the route.

2.2.2 Some PILs requested further information about the access road proposals, including:

- Whether land take for the bridges options will be reduced when the temporary parts are removed.
- If there is a requirement for the crossing to play a flood defence role, or the provision of alternative flood defences.
- More information about environmental impacts of each option.
- Clear maps of each options showing the boundaries with designated areas.

2.2.3 Some PILs commented that details such as the options presented for the access route were not relevant at this stage of consultation and would require a level of professional expertise to respond constructively.

2.2.4 Some PILs expressed concern about the position of the access route coming from the B1122 as they felt the use of the B1122 for primary access would be unsuitable. They suggested that alternatives be explored, such as connecting the current access route from Sizewell B to Sizewell C.

2.2.5 Some PILs believed that adverse ecological effects made the proposals entirely unsuitable for their location. Some also felt that the impacts of the

proposed access route could not be mitigated or compensated, especially with regards to effects on the SSSI.

2.2.6 Some PILs expressed support for the access route options that contained bridges, namely Options 2 and 3, because they would have the least effect on water flow particularly between Sizewell Marshes and Minsmere Levels. Some commented that a single-span bridge (Option 2) would have the least effect on Sizewell Marshes SSSI, whereas others expressed support for the three-span bridge (Option 3) suggesting that it would require less land take.

2.2.7 Some PILs expressed concern that the proposed access routes would sever wildlife corridors, creating a physical barrier across the SSSI. Because of this, they requested that the access route be built with considerable environmental sensitivity. Others suggested that the access road be unlit and subject to speed restrictions to reduce impact on wildlife.

2.2.8 Some PILs expressed opposition to the causeway options, namely Options 1 and 4, because of the adverse effect on the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, interference with the natural water flow and the increase in flood risk. Conversely others were supportive of the causeway over culvert (Option 1) as they felt it would have less of an impact on the SSSI and would be more appropriate to adjacent landscape features.

i. Construction materials

2.2.9 Some PILs expressed opposition to the construction materials proposals. They claimed that the proposals had not been properly considered and that the impact on local people and the environment would be unacceptable. Others expressed support for the proposals because they believed excavating materials near the main development site would minimise traffic on local roads. Some suggested that land should be returned to its original state after construction.

2.2.10 Some PILs requested further information about the construction materials proposals, including:

- the impact of the transportation of materials from borrow pits to the main development site on the environment along the route;
- an explanation about the process of de-watering of the borrow pits;
- the depth of peat and clay to be excavated;
- information about amelioration or mitigation to those living in close proximity;

- information about the ecological value of land take required;
- potential ecological and hydrological impacts of the borrow pits; and
- adverse impacts of the stockpile on the SSSI and how it is intended for it to be managed.

2.2.11 Some commented that they could not select an option until more detail about impacts and the long-term effects of each had been provided.

2.2.12 Some PILs made alternative suggestions on the handling of construction materials, including sending spoil directly to sea for land reclamation at RSPB Wallasea or transporting materials to other inland sites where there would be less of an impact on fragile habitats.

2.2.13 Some PILs expressed support for Option 3 of the construction materials options as it would be located further from Eastbridge residents, reducing impact on them and on Potters Farm.

2.2.14 Some PILs felt that the construction materials proposals for the overall project would have too great an impact on the surrounding area, including on Ash Wood, RSPB Minsmere Reserve, Sizewell Levels, Sizewell Belts. They suggested these areas and surrounding woodland would be impacted by dust being blown over by the wind. They also commented that construction materials would be located too close to designated sites, creating danger from runoff contamination. Others suggested the plans would result in the release of CO₂ stored in the peat. Some PILs specifically commented on the potential damage of the lay-up area, hard standing and concrete batching plant on the environment.

2.2.15 Some PILs felt that no effective mitigation for the impact of the construction materials proposals had been proposed and that it would be impossible to restore the area to its former environmental condition. They commented that Aldhurst Farm compensation could not compensate for the loss of SSSI at the main development site. Some PILs also suggested that very little assessment had been undertaken on the likely impacts of the loss of SSSI land.

2.2.16 Some PILs requested more information about the habitat types that would be lost from the SSSI for each option. Some commented that potential effects on birds and invertebrates were not mentioned in the documentation, both of which form part of the SSSI designation.

2.2.17 Some PILs suggested that the access route and construction materials option selections should be based on whichever has the least environmental impact, or that the decision be based on local or expert opinion.

b) Noise, vibration and light pollution

2.2.18 Some PILs expressed concern that the introduction of noise and light from the access road would disturb wildlife at all hours, affecting amphibians, reptiles, insects and bats. They believed the functionality of the corridor would be impacted by the access road and that hunting grounds for threatened birds of prey would be affected and must be assessed.

2.2.19 Some PILs were concerned about noise and vibration impacts from movements around the spoil heaps. They suggested that all impacts from noise, vibration and light pollution should be further assessed.

c) Air quality

2.2.20 Some PILs expressed concern about the amount of dust generated by the stockpiles. They commented on the impact of prevailing winds blowing this dust onto farms and fields, Eastbridge and RSPB Minsmere, upsetting the delicate balance of water and ecosystems. Some commented that subsoil sand has a small amount of loam which is very light and blows about in dry conditions, which could cause pollution and badly affect homes in Eastbridge.

d) Landscape and visual

2.2.21 Some PILs commented on the visual impact of the power station itself. They felt the design would scar the landscape and suggested that the domes and the colour of the buildings should be similar to Sizewell B, to blend in with the background and prevent adverse impact on long distance views.

2.2.22 Some PILs also commented on the negative visual impact of the stockpiles, commenting that their height would be a blot on countryside views. They believed the stockpiles could impact views of the coastline, destroy the character of the area and as a result, affect the local tourism trade.

2.2.23 Other PILs commented that the proposed access road would scar the AONB landscape.

e) Historic environment

2.2.24 Some PILs expressed concern about the effects of the main development site proposals on Bridleway 19. They commented that a historic walkway with well-established ancient hedges and trees could be lost.

2.2.25 Others raised concern about the impact on the settings of listed buildings resulting from the construction materials.

f) **Groundwater, surface water and coastal geomorphology**

2.2.26 Some PILs commented on the potential interference of the SSSI crossing with the two-way flow of water between the Minsmere Sluice and the Leiston Water catchment area. They suggested that changes to the hydrological regime could result in significant adverse impacts on the SSSI, and suggested that any structure should not impede the flow of water. Others commented that fen meadow communities are particularly vulnerable to hydrological changes, raising concern that rises in groundwater levels could have a catastrophic impact on habitats.

2.2.27 Some PILs felt there was the possibility of petro-chemical runoff from the access road fouling water sources. They commented that contaminated water may be pumped into Leiston Beck along with surplus water from the site, travelling to the North Sea via Minsmere Levels. They also believed that water will be very acidic, creating a knock-on effect to RSPB Minsmere, particularly affecting food supplies for Bittern, Egret and Eels. Others highlighted the potential impact to Leiston Sewage Works, which depends on the integrity of the water courses situated in the Minsmere Valley.

2.2.28 Some PILs felt that there was no evidence provided to support the claim made by SZC Co. that there will be “no impact on water resources”.

2.2.29 Some PILs commented that the quarrying of gravel at stated depths means millions of cubic meters of water would need to be pumped out. They believed this could overwhelm culverts and increase flood risk, which is already a danger, especially for RSPB Minsmere.

g) **Coastal geomorphology**

2.2.30 Some PILs requested further information about amount of water to be pumped out during de-watering and the resultant effect on Sizewell Beach.

h) **Amenity and Recreation**

2.2.31 Some PILs commented that the public currently enjoys access to a network of trails through the Sizewell Belts, and felt there appeared to be no provision for the maintenance of access to the beach along the south boundary of Goose Hill. They also commented that the proposals would prevent access from Kenton Hill to Goose Hill, isolating the popular Kenton Hills Walk.

2.2.32 Others believed the adverse effect from the main development site proposals on residents, visitors to Eastbridge, the caravan sites for holiday lets and Eels Foot Inn would be unacceptable. They commented that the route from the southeast for visitors driving to Minsmere, Aldeburgh, Snape would be

negatively impacted, as they would not want to pass through “waste management operations”.

2.3 Rail Improvement Options

a) General

2.3.1 With regards to the use of rail, the Stage 2 consultation questionnaire presented the option of a temporary rail extension or a new, temporary rail terminal at Sizewell Halt. However, some PILs commented on the wider use of rail as part of the proposals as well as expressing their preference for Sizewell Halt.

2.3.2 Some PILs expressed opposition to the rail proposals because they felt the impacts of constructing a new rail line and the increased number of freight trains with high polluting diesel engines would be significant. Others believed rail should be more widely used in the proposals to reduce road transport. They felt that the use of rail would reduce air pollution, impacts on the environment and that upgrades could provide long-term legacy benefits. Some expressed support for the rail proposals, on the condition that impacts on people and the environment would be minimised.

2.3.3 Some PILs suggested that residents on the Saxmundham to Leiston line should be consulted separately, as many believed that only the green rail route would be used.

2.3.4 Some PILs felt the rail strategy proposing a maximum of five trains per day was too low, highlighting National Rail’s claim that greater capacity could be achieved.

2.3.5 Some PILs requested more information about the rail proposals, this included:

- Ecological surveys and assessment were needed to determine the impacts and whether mitigation measures were likely to be acceptable.
- The proportion of freight that would arrive by rail in practice.

b) Site Suitability

2.3.6 Some PILs suggested that the option chosen for Sizewell Halt should be based on several criteria. This included whichever maximises the use of rail, subsequently minimising road use and resultant traffic congestion, or whichever is preferred by local residents and independent experts.

- 2.3.7 Some PILs expressed support for Option 1, a temporary rail extension, because of the perceived view that it would cause less disruption to Leiston residents and would enable materials to be taken as close as possible to the main development site.
- 2.3.8 Some PILs expressed concern about the closure of Buckleswood Road as proposed for Option 1, suggesting this would increase traffic pressure on other nearby roads and confuse navigation for emergency services and tourist drivers. Some suggested the construction of a new level crossing at this location.
- 2.3.9 Some PILs commented on Option 1, suggesting the proposed footpath diversions were inadequate. They also felt traffic disruption caused by a level crossing on Abbey Road and the proximity to Leiston Abbey and the Pro Corda Music School were issues with a temporary rail extension which needed to be addressed. They also felt there would be noise and pollution impacts from queuing traffic and potential intrusion into the rural landscape.
- 2.3.10 Other PILs expressed support for Option 2, the new temporary rail terminal, because it would place less pressure on local roads, would not require the closure of Buckleswood Road and would be better for allowing the unloading of bulk material.
- 2.3.11 Others opposed Option 2 for being costlier, worse at sustaining HGVs on surrounding roads and for causing danger by requiring drivers to pass the waste disposal site. Some PILs also commented that the Lovers' Lane and B1122 junction is already congested and would become more dangerous with increased traffic, since the new rail terminal would require materials to be forwarded to site by road. Additionally, they commented that this increase in road traffic would cause excess noise, vibration, light and pollution, and that the halt area would not be big enough to take the HGVs required.

c) Environmental impacts

- 2.3.12 Some PILs expressed concern that the green rail route would damage the AONB landscape and adversely impact wildlife including species of bat, newts, owls and woodpeckers. Some felt inadequate consideration had been given to the effect of noise, vibration and lighting on habitats, particularly for foraging bats.
- 2.3.13 Some PILs suggested additional hedge planting to allow a wildlife corridor and to shield the countryside. Others suggested a sunken rail line with noise proofing.

2.3.14 Some PILs commented on the impact of noise and vibration from train movements on residents, potentially during the night. They requested that those living near the line be properly consulted by SZC Co.

d) **Community impacts**

2.3.15 Some PILs commented on the potential disturbance and disruption to those living near the proposed rail options. Some felt that the green rail route would take up farmland, making farms unviable, whilst leaving no legacy benefits for Leiston once construction had finished.

2.3.16 Some PILs felt SZC Co. had not considered the impact on the tranquillity of the area and on people's lives due to the rail proposals. Some PILs suggested that there had been little consideration of the effects on well used paths and ancient walkways with connections to Leiston Abbey, churches and farms, and the resultant impact on residents. Some PILs also felt that the proposed footbridge would be unsuitable for elderly walkers, inhibiting recreational amenity.

2.3.17 Others suggested there was potential for traffic congestion resulting from the railway proposals, and that this could cause dangerous driving and resultant safety issues, for example due to HGVs on Lovers' Lane.

2.3.18 Some PILs questioned whether rail service capacity would be increased on the Ipswich line. Others commented that the Saxmundham to Leiston line would require considerable investment to take large volumes of freight.

e) **Other suggestions**

2.3.19 Other suggestions made by PILs for the use of rail included the following:

- A permanent facility should be considered.
- The rail line should be double-tracked between Leiston and Ipswich with a passing loop at Saxmundham, to increase freight capacity.
- A rail passenger terminal should be included in the proposals for workers to travel to the main development site, to ease congestion and reduce the need for accommodation.
- The existing line should be upgraded to provide legacy benefits.
- Automatic barriers should be in place at Buckleswood Road Rail crossing for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

2.3.20 Some PILs requested information about how the proposals for Sizewell Halt will impact Direct Rail Services Ltd operations at Leiston railhead.

2.4 Sea Transport Options

a) General

2.4.1 Some PILs supported the use of sea transport for the development because it would reduce the amount of freight transported by roads, which would reduce congestion and disruption to residents. They commented that sea transport would also minimise noise, light and air pollution.

2.4.2 Others expressed opposition to sea transport as they believed none of the options presented would be practical, or because of the potential effect on/off tide surges, erosion and shifting sandbanks.

2.4.3 Some PILs commented that further assessment would be required regarding the impact of the proposed sea infrastructure options on coastal erosion, water course obstruction, shore and habitat destruction and RSPB Minsmere water levels. Some felt that a full EIA was needed to assess each of the options.

2.4.4 Others suggested that without a more definitive proposal, it was difficult to give a complete response. They requested more information regarding the types of landing craft to be used, the methods of loading and unloading materials and the types of loads to be delivered.

2.4.5 Some PILs suggested criteria on which the sea transport option should be chosen, including:

- Whichever is most suitable according to expert opinion.
- Whichever maximises sea delivery.
- Whichever is the most effective, efficient and can handle the most bulk materials.
- Any facility that will be temporary only.

2.4.6 Some PILs commented that use of a jetty should be a priority, but were unsure which would be best in terms of beach erosion and marine ecology.

2.4.7 Some PILs supported Option 1 (the temporary wide jetty) because it would take the most pressure of the road network and would be able to handle bulk materials. Some commented that Option 1 should be chosen if it could withstand the unpredictable tides and surges.

- 2.4.8 Others were opposed to Options 1 (the temporary wide jetty) and 2 (the temporary narrow jetty) because of damage to wildlife and the potential acceleration of coastal erosion, such as the impact of pile driving and construction on coastal drift.
- 2.4.9 Some PILs were supportive of Option 3 (the beach landing facility) because it would provide continued use after construction.
- 2.4.10 Some PILs expressed concern that when sea transport is unavailable due to rough seas, the use of road transport would increase.
- 2.4.11 Other PILs commented that machinery would be needed to carry heavy loads across the dunes bisecting Heritage Coast Footpath 21, and may become a permanent feature in the landscape. They suggested that this is a favoured walk of visitors and locals and could be a loss to the recreational amenity of this footpath.

b) Environmental Impacts

- 2.4.12 Some PILs felt there would be significant impacts of the sea transport proposals on the beach environment, tidal beach erosion, marine ecology, water levels and waste water. They commented on the potential for increase in flood risk inland because of the jetties, particularly for RSPB Minsmere.
- 2.4.13 Some PILs commented that a full EIA with impacts of each option should be provided. They suggested that coastal impacts further afield should also be assessed. Some stated that they could be supportive of the proposals if environmental impact is proven to be minimal.

2.5 Park and Ride Options

a) General

- 2.5.1 Some PILs expressed support for the park and ride proposals because they would reduce the number of road journeys made by workers to the main development site, particularly on the A12 and B1122. Others were opposed to the schemes because of the traffic created by buses on the unsuitable B1122 and through Yoxford, with many movements per day.
- 2.5.2 Some commented that the proposed locations of the park and ride facilities required expert appraisal and assessment of the pros and cons to enable residents to be able to respond usefully.
- 2.5.3 Some PILs requested further information about the park and ride proposals, such as how many movements per day the facilities will generate, whether

buses would travel to Sizewell A and B as well as C and why the chosen sites were the preferred options.

b) **Site Suitability**

- 2.5.4 Some PILs suggested consideration of a park and ride facility in an alternative location where a proposed ‘four-village bypass’ would meet the A12.
- 2.5.5 Other alternative approaches suggested were that park and rides should be located closer to railway stations to encourage the use of rail transport, and that both sites should be replaced by a central site where the A12 meets a new suggested relief road connecting to the main development site (the ‘D2’).
- 2.5.6 Some PILs highlighted the perceived benefits of options proposed at previous stages of consultation in comparison to sites chosen in Darsham and Wickham Market.
- 2.5.7 Some PILs expressed opposition to the northern park and ride site at Darsham because of its proximity to residences, suggesting it should be located on the other side of the railway station. Others felt that the site may lead to further development in this area, commenting that the local planning authority should make clear its intention for the long-term use of the land.
- 2.5.8 Some mentioned the current difficulty in accessing and egressing their properties, suggesting that the northern site should be on the other side of the road to prevent further congestion and road safety issues. They believed a planned hotel development opposite the site entrance would exacerbate this issue.
- 2.5.9 Some PILs expressed support for the proposed site at Darsham for offering an interchange with the rail network, for capturing traffic coming from Lowestoft and Norwich and for offering facilities that provide long-term legacy benefits to Darsham. Some suggested that car parking is kept permanently to be used for the rail station.
- 2.5.10 Some PILs expressed opposition to the southern park and ride site at Wickham Market because it would exacerbate congestion that already exists on the A12.
- 2.5.11 Others expressed support for the proposed southern site because it offers a logical location to capture traffic from Ipswich and Cambridge/Felixstowe via the A14. They suggested that it should be located sufficiently far from the village to prevent local disruption.

2.5.12 Some PILs felt that the park and ride proposals may have an effect on existing traffic both north and south on the A12, especially during peak times and in the summer months. They commented that it is already one of the most heavily impacted roads in the east. They argued that the narrow and twisty B1122 would be inappropriate for the large buses. They also felt that many workers would chose not to use the park and ride scheme.

2.5.13 Some PILs expressed concern about residents and visitors that would wish to access the area around Sizewell Beach. Others questioned whether Sizewell A and B workers will also be required to use the park and ride schemes.

c) Environmental Impacts

2.5.14 Some PILS commented that the noise, light and air pollution, disruption of views, security issues and intense traffic outside their homes as a result of the park and ride facilities would destroy enjoyment of their properties, potentially their lives, and make homes unsellable.

2.5.15 They also commented on the potential for noise and light pollution to impact roosting and foraging bats, suggesting no reference was made to mitigating this impact. Some PILs commented on noise and vibration impacts of the development due to the operational hours during the night. They also felt the noise could negatively affect their livestock.

2.5.16 Others suggested there would be negative environmental impacts of the northern site, such as on drainage, which could potentially lead to residential properties on the eastern boundary becoming saturated during periods of high rainfall. They also felt this could be exacerbated by the increase in surface water runoff. Some felt this would impact on bat habitats and breeding birds.

2.5.17 In relation to mitigation measures for the northern park and ride, some PILs felt that more work would be required. Specifically they suggested better buffer zones and planting to reduce visual impact and further mitigation to improve road safety at Darsham Junction.

2.5.18 Some PILS were concerned about impacts on protected and priority species and visual impact on the landscape.

2.5.19 Some PILs commented that ecological surveys were needed for both proposed locations, without which respondents could not assess the impacts and appropriateness of mitigation measures for either.

2.6 Road Improvements – A12

a) General

- 2.6.1 Some PILs commented on the need for upgrades to the A12 at Farnham because of the amount of traffic that would pass during construction and because the Farnham bend is awkward and restrictive to negotiate. Some commented that regardless of Sizewell C construction these improvements would be needed due to the amount of congestion that already exists.
- 2.6.2 Some PILs commented that although the proposals will improve traffic through Farnham, congestion will be pushed further north on the A12, creating bottlenecks at Yoxford. Some PILs disagreed with the statement in the consultation document that Sizewell C traffic will cause a “limited” increase in traffic.
- 2.6.3 Others felt there was a lack of information provided for each option, so it was difficult to make a true comparison between each of them. Some PILs also commented that without including a four village bypass as a choice in the consultation, the need for this option could not be assessed. Finally, some PILs requested further detail about mitigation proposals for businesses, the adverse effects of construction and construction timescales for each option.

b) Site Suitability

- 2.6.4 Some PILs suggested alternatives to the options presented in the consultation document. This included the four village bypass to include Marlesford and Little Glemham as well as Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham, suggesting SZC Co. work with Suffolk County Council to provide funding towards this. Others commented that the ‘D2 route’ would be more beneficial than these proposals.
- 2.6.5 Some PILs suggested criteria on which to base the choice of option. This included choosing the option preferred by local residents and local councils, or the option that presents the greatest long-term legacy benefits.
- 2.6.6 Some PILs expressed support for any option that involves a bypass, without specifying which bypass they would prefer. Others were opposed to any form of bypass because of the damage they felt it would cause to local businesses.
- 2.6.7 Some PILs opposed Option 1, no change, because of the resultant danger and congestion from the increase in traffic here. They felt residents living along the A12 would get no relief from the noise, vibration and pollution impacts of construction traffic. Some also commented on the difficulty of

trying to cross the road in their village with the constant stream of traffic if no change is made.

- 2.6.8** For Option 2, Farnham bend road widening, some PILs did not believe it would solve the problem of congestion and suggested it did nothing to mitigate the impacts of construction traffic for Farnham residents. Some felt it would be more dangerous, without specifying how. Others were supportive of Option 2 for being the simplest, with the fewest impacts, and because it can be quickly implemented. Some supported the option but only as the minimum that should be done, feeling ideally SZC Co. should commit to doing more substantial improvements.
- 2.6.9** Some PILs supported Options 3A and 3B for reducing the amount of traffic through Farnham, benefitting the community by limiting noise, light and air pollution. Some also commented that there is no justification for any more than a one village bypass. They felt that it would have minimal impact on homes and that it could be completed within a relatively short time period. Others believe Options 3A and 3B would be insufficient for the amount of traffic using the A12, having no benefit for the residents of Stratford St. Andrew and having negative impacts for the residents of Farnham Hall. They also commented on the environmental impacts of these options, such as the effects on the River Alde, floodplain grazing marsh, priority habitats, Foxborrow Wood and on surface water and groundwater flow. Some made suggestions such as including a slip road or safety refuge, lowering the speed limit to 40mph, relocating the existing child's play area and creating a safer entrance to Mollett's Farm.
- 2.6.10** For Option 3A specifically, some PILs commented that this route would be shorter, faster, impact fewer homes and would be more economical.
- 2.6.11** More PILs supported Option 4, a two village bypass, commenting that it is essential as it would benefit the most people and would improve the A12 for future use. They believed it is the safest option and would remove air pollution, noise and light from the villages of Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew.
- 2.6.12** They commented on the perceived loss of local services and employment Option 4 would cause, specifically the petrol station and shop in Stratford St. Andrew and the Farnham Leisure Caravan Centre, which will lose passing trade. Some suggested that additional signage should be provided as mitigation.
- 2.6.13** Some PILs commented that although it removes impacts from the villages, the two village bypass would introduce new noise, vibration, air pollution (including nitrous oxides), groundwater, severance and health issues to

dwellings at Farnham Hall and Mollett's Farm. They felt that inadequate information has been provided about the potential impacts, and that careful consideration should be given to this before adopting the scheme. They commented that the route would sever two footpaths between Farnham village and Foxborrow Wood and a historic right of way from Mollett's Farm to Friday Street, inhibiting access to village amenities. Some PILs also believed it would affect the attractiveness of tourism businesses and that the quality of life of residents would be negatively impacted by these effects.

- 2.6.14 Others commented that the proposed route of Option 4 would affect many species of wildlife and the setting of Grade II listed buildings.
- 2.6.15 Some PILs expressed the belief that by choosing Option 4 without plans to adopt a four village bypass in the future, the area would be left with a road unwanted by residents, the local council and SZC Co. Some believed Option 4 would not be a justifiable cost.
- 2.6.16 Some PILs suggested relocating the proposed roundabout for Option 4 away from property to reduce air and noise impacts.
- 2.6.17 Some PILs felt that this route along the A12 would be entirely unsuitable even after undergoing the proposed improvements. They commented that the A12 would be unable to cope with the weight and volume of traffic predicted.
- 2.6.18 Some PILs commented on the potential impacts on drainage, Foxborrow Wood and protected species as a result of the proposals for the A12. They also expressed concern about the perceived effect on the peace and tranquillity of the area.
- 2.6.19 Some PILs believed that the A12 proposals could reduce the value of their properties, meaning it would be difficult for them to relocate to avoid the negative impacts of construction. Some suggested that there should be measures to provide householders, landowners and local businesses with legal advice and compensation for the blight caused.
- 2.6.20 Some PILs were concerned that the increase in traffic would greatly disrupt their everyday lives, affecting safety, access, tourism and the economy. They also felt the A12 proposals could have a knock-on effect on traffic in Yoxford.
- 2.6.21 Some PILs considered the proposed mitigation to be inadequate, commenting that noise and visual mitigation should be more thorough. Some felt that the proposed pedestrian underpass would be susceptible to flooding. Others suggested a roundabout should be included on the A1094 junction, as well as additional mitigation measures such as suitable drainage design,

enhancement to open spaces, improvements to access between villages and improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.

2.7 Road Improvements – Yoxford/B1122

a) General

2.7.1 Some PILs stated that the neither of the option proposals would resolve the traffic issues in Yoxord. They commented that structural improvements would be greatly required for the B1122 to be able to handle HGVs. Some asserted that with the alternative D2 route, neither of these options would be necessary. Others questioned whether the proposed improvements are necessary.

b) Site Suitability

2.7.2 Some PILs felt that the use of the B1122 as the primary construction route would be altogether inappropriate and should be reconsidered. They commented that the route is too narrow and twisty, with many residences situated along it, making it impractical and dangerous.

2.7.3 Some PILs suggested that specific design work has not been thoroughly completed, for example suggesting local changes for pedestrian crossings do not take into account condition of the road surface, current pedestrian flows and safety issues.

2.7.4 Some PILs expressed concern that the use of the B1122 would be unsuitable for the following reasons:

- The nature of the road would make it an inappropriate evacuation route, especially when being used as the main artery for construction traffic;
- It will not be able handle construction traffic as well as emergency vehicles, school buses, agricultural vehicles and tourist coaches;
- Its location through historic villages, past Leiston Abbey, several listed properties and a retirement home;
- The infrastructure of the road itself is already failing and would be severely damaged by HGVs; and
- The road is not wide enough for two HGVs to pass each other without encroaching on the pavement, or causing wing mirror strikes on pedestrians.

- 2.7.5** Some PILs suggested that a comprehensive environmental and social impact study should be carried out regarding the B1122 and Yoxford, including studies for the alternative D2 or a similar bypass.
- 2.7.6** Some PILs suggested alternatives to the proposed use of the B1122 as the main construction route, which would eliminate the need for Option 1 or 2 for Yoxford/B1122. These alternatives included a new relief route, namely the ‘D2’. They commented that this route would be more beneficial in terms of emergency access, reducing effects on residents and wildlife. They also believed it would provide legacy benefits for Leiston and surrounding areas and avoid negative impact from construction traffic in Yoxford. Other PILs commented on the need for a ‘relief road’ but did not specify a particular route.
- 2.7.7** Some PILs commented that the option choice for Yoxford/B1122 should be based on whichever is preferred by local people, or whichever has the least environmental impact.
- 2.7.8** Some PILs opposed Option 1, the Yoxford roundabout; because they believe it would be inappropriate for the setting and would create congestion issues. Others were supportive of Option 1 because they believe it would facilitate better flow of traffic, preventing the junction from becoming congested.
- 2.7.9** Other PILs objected to Option 2, traffic lights, because they felt they would not resolve the issues at this junction and would lead to drivers seeking alternative routes through surrounding villages. They commented on the congestion, impacts and disruption to the residents of Yoxford. Others supported Option 2 because it would prevent some drivers from refusing to ‘give way’ and would be beneficial during times of heavy traffic.

c) Environmental Impacts

- 2.7.10** Some PILs commented on the perceived impact of light pollution and the damage to the ‘dark sky’ environment of the road improvements.
- 2.7.11** They commented on the potential noise and vibration impacts to local residents and particularly to the Pro Corda School of Music and the Grade I listed Norman church, St. Peter’s. Additionally, they commented on the increase in air pollution and the perceived impact of diesel emissions on health.
- 2.7.12** Some PILs suggested there would be a devaluation of their properties whilst others felt that there would be severance of communities inhibiting access to work, doctors, dentists and supermarkets. They also expressed opposition to the compulsory purchase of land.

- 2.7.13 Some PILs commented that the B1122 is currently regularly used by agricultural machinery, for example combine harvesters, tractors and transporting horses. Some mentioned that traffic would also prevent access and egress to their drive which would subsequently impact the viability of their farming operations. They specifically commented that inclines on the road block views of approaching vehicles, which would become more dangerous with construction traffic and would need to be mitigated.