



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Annex E Stage 3 Issues Tables

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 E – Stage 3 Issues Tables

CONTENTS

Table E.1: Summary of Section 42 Responses and Consideration by Topic..... 1

a.	Overall Proposals	1
	• Theme: Need Case	1
	• Theme: Safety.....	16
	• Theme: Socio-Economics	23
	• Theme: Accommodation Strategy.....	44
	• Theme: Transport	63
	• Theme: Construction Materials	90
	• Theme: Consultation Process.....	95
b.	Main Development Site	110
	• Theme: Need Case.....	110
	• Theme: Site Suitability	112
	• Theme: Environment - General.....	116
	• Theme: Noise and Vibration.....	124
	• Theme: Air Quality	125
	• Theme: Landscape and Visual.....	126
	• Theme: Ecology	133
	• Theme: Amenity and Recreation.....	135
	• Theme: Historic Environment.....	136
	• Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water	139
	• Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics.....	140
	• Theme: Marine Ecology	142
	• Theme: Climate Change	145
c.	Northern Park & Ride at Darsham	146
	• Theme: Environment - General.....	147
d.	Southern Park & Ride at Wickham Market	148



	• Theme: Need Case.....	148
e.	Two-Village Bypass	153
	• Theme: Need Case.....	153
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment	156
f.	Sizewell Link Road	159
	• Theme: Need Case.....	159
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment	162
	• Theme: Environment - General.....	164
g.	Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements	166
	• Theme: Need Case.....	166
h.	Freight Management Facility	179
	• Theme: Need Case.....	179
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment	183
i.	Transport: Rail Improvements.....	187
	• Theme: Need Case.....	187
	• Theme: Site Suitability	190
Table E.2: Summary of Section 47 Responses and Consideration by Topic.....		198

a.	Overall Proposals	198
	• Theme: Need Case.....	198
	• Theme: Safety.....	200
	• Theme: Accommodation Strategy.....	200
	• Theme: Transport	203
b.	Northern Park & Ride at Darsham	203
	• Theme: Need Case.....	204
	• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment	205
c.	Southern Park & Ride at Wickham Market	206
	• Theme: Need Case.....	206
d.	Freight Management Facility	207
	• Theme: Need Case.....	207
e.	Transport: Rail Improvements.....	208



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- Theme: Need Case 208
- Theme: Site Suitability 212



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

a. Overall Proposals

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Sustainable Energy	Noted benefits of the proposal as being a ‘sustainable’, stable and reliable low-carbon source of energy, without requiring fossil fuels.	<p>Recognition of the sustainable benefits of the proposal welcomed.</p> <p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government. The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK’s energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power.</p> <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025</p>	N

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



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Economic Benefits	Noted economic benefits of the project, for the local area and country, mainly because of employment opportunities.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the recognition that there will be national and local economic benefits related to employment opportunities supported by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project will result in positive economic effects in terms of employment, but also supply chain, spending, and sustainable investment in skills and training pathways from education to in-work upskilling.</p> <p>Full details of the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project are assessed in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	N
Location	Acknowledged benefits of the chosen location for Sizewell C, most commonly because of its proximity to the existing Nuclear sites at Sizewell A and B.	<p>Recognition of the benefits of the site’s location is welcomed.</p> <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		alternative sites. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Principle of Nuclear Energy	Opposition to nuclear energy in general, due to it being outdated and unnecessary.	<p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK’s energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK’s binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		<p>matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
<p>Principle of Nuclear Energy</p>	<p>Suggested that SZC Co. (or the country in general) should be looking to provide renewable or other alternative forms of power generation, as nuclear has been made less relevant by further developments in renewable technologies.</p>	<p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK’s energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK’s binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national</p>	<p>N</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		<p>need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
<p>Economic Viability</p>	<p>Concern about the high financial cost of constructing Sizewell C, including uncertainties about the economic viability of nuclear power and the cost of energy produced by the plant.</p>	<p>For new nuclear power stations to be built, the government has been clear that costs must come down.</p> <p>New nuclear costs are driven by construction and financing and both can be reduced by replicating the design of Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>Evidence shows repetition brings costs down in nuclear development, just like other technology. Many of the design and qualification costs for Sizewell C have been paid for already at Hinkley Point – as well as the costs of setting up the supply chain and training workers. With the right timing, we can directly transfer the skills from Hinkley Point C to Sizewell C.</p>	<p>N</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		Further information regarding the funding of the Sizewell C Project is contained in the Funding Statement (Doc Ref. 4.2).	
Unrealistic Timetable	Concerns about the estimated construction timetable and challenging this as being unrealistic, often commenting on delays experienced at other nuclear power plants	<p>Construction of the Sizewell C nuclear power station is estimated to take 9–12 years. This has been informed by experience in delivering projects of this type and scale across the world. The Evolutionary Power Reactor (EPR) design is now successfully operating at Taishan 1 and 2 in China. By the time a decision is taken on the Sizewell C DCO application, Flamanville and Olkiluoto Nuclear Power Stations in France and Finland (respectively) will also be operating. Civil construction at Hinkley Point C will be 80% complete.</p> <p>The French and Finnish projects experienced delays as a result of an incomplete design. In the case of Olkiluoto, this was not agreed with the regulator until well after construction started. Both projects also faced quality issues arising from restarting new nuclear build after a long gap. Flamanville has had a delay in order to ensure the recommendations of the French regulator are met to the letter.</p> <p>Sizewell C has a stable design and will have an experienced workforce and supply chain and a well-tested schedule. We have a very good understanding of project risks and how to mitigate them. SZC Co. has been able to</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		<p>learn from these experiences and this has informed the construction assumptions set out in the ES.</p> <p>Further details on the anticipated construction timescales for Sizewell C nuclear power station are provided in Chapter 3 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Scale	<p>Concern about the overall size of the project representing a large impact on people and the environment in general.</p>	<p>SZC Co. recognises that the scale of Sizewell C has led to concern regarding its impact on people and the environment.</p> <p>Sizewell C is a major development and comprises a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK’s energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK’s binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating station NSIPs, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		<p>2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Sizewell C Project have been fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures are proposed. Please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p>	
<p>EIA / Site Management</p>	<p>Support for the project as long as environmental criteria are followed, such as a full Environmental Impact Assessment</p>	<p>SZC Co. has taken steps to identify the potential significant effects on the environment during the Sizewell C Project’s construction and operation phases.</p> <p>An extensive and detailed evaluation of the environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act,</p>	<p>N</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>being conducted and followed, or management of the site being given to a relevant authority such as the Suffolk Wildlife Trust.</p>	<p>Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (EIA Regulations 2009) (at Stage 1 and 2) and Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations 2017) (at Stage 3 and 4).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals comprise the most sustainable balance between being appropriately located, comprising an acceptable level of land take, and minimising impacts upon the environment and communities as far as possible. Consultation on Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) was undertaken at Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4. The DCO application is also supported by a comprehensive ES.</p> <p>The approach to the management of the landscaped areas of the main development site are then set out within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.2). This set out the principles that would be applied in the long term management of these areas. SZC Co. have not yet decided whether these areas would be managed as part of the Sizewell Estate, or by an appointed third party.</p>	
Quality of Life	<p>Support for the project as long as the quality of life of local people is protected and</p>	<p>SZC Co. has taken steps to identify the potential significant effects on people and property around the Sizewell C Project’s construction and operation phases.</p>	N

	<p>mitigated to ensure the area remains tranquil.</p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project has been designed to avoid or reduce these potential effects, and to provide mitigation where they may arise as a result of environmental effects. This is set out at a local scale in the Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13).</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project includes a number of measures to ensure people can continue to live close to the Sizewell C Project without significant changes to their quality of life, and mitigation strategies such as the Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) to promote safety and security. The Sizewell C Project also includes a Community Fund, details of which are set out in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The Community Fund will be implemented via the s106 agreement and will help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>In recognition that certain communities closer to the main development site are likely to experience effects across a wider range of social, economic and environmental areas, SCZ Co. will ensure these communities have the potential to access this Fund.</p>	
--	--	---	--



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

<p>Legacy</p>	<p>Support of the project as long as it provides a long-term legacy for the local area through infrastructure upgrades such as improvements to roads.</p>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the Sizewell C Project, and recognises the importance of the Sizewell C Project’s legacy in the area. Road improvements are a significant part of that long-term investment in physical infrastructure, along with improvements and re-provision of habitats, public rights of way and community facilities such as new 3G sports pitch and multi-use games area (MUGA) proposed in Leiston for dual use between workers and communities.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term benefits in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A Community Fund to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life. b) A Housing Fund that will enable empty properties to return to the market, and provide recyclable grants and loans for renovation of homes. c) An Employment, Skills and Education Strategy (Annex A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9)) to support New Anglia LEP and Suffolk County Councils long-term plans for key growth sectors in the region. d) A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast. 	<p>N</p>
---------------	--	--	----------

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		Details of all of these measures are included throughout the EIA, and in particular in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Site Restoration	Support for the Sizewell C Project, as long as the entire Sizewell C Project restores sites that have been used to their original state, with firm assurances these promises are kept.	A DCO requirement is proposed to require all temporary buildings and structures to be removed from the main development site and for the land to be restored. The design details of the landscape restoration would then be secured by a separate DCO requirement, which shall be in general accordance with the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.2).	N
Mitigation	General comments expressing concern about the lack of proposed mitigation for the Sizewell C Project.	<p>The Sizewell C Project has been designed to avoid or reduce potential effects.</p> <p>A full assessment of the impacts and identification of the necessary mitigation measures, including those embedded into the Sizewell C Project proposals and additional measures are identified in the ES (Doc Ref. 6.1 – 6.11) and other relevant application documents, including the Mitigation Route Map (Doc Ref. 8.12) and the heads of terms detailed in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>The Development Consent Order and associated legal agreement will secure the necessary mitigation, to ensure</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		its implementation as part of delivery of the Sizewell C Project.	
Planning Process	Concerns and challenges about the planning process for Sizewell C, often questioning whether SZC Co. has followed policy been correctly.	<p>The Planning Act 2008 is the primary legislation which establishes the legal framework for applying for, examining and determining applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs), including new nuclear power stations.</p> <p>Consent for an NSIP takes the form of a Development Consent Order (DCO). Applications for development consent are determined within the context of relevant National Policy Statements (NPSs).</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites.</p> <p>SZC Co. have appointed an expert team to ensure the compliance of the Sizewell C Project with the provisions of</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		<p>the Planning Act and NPS EN-1 and En-6. Full details can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), which includes an assessment of the continued relevance of the NPSs.</p>	
<p>Cumulative Impact</p>	<p>Concern that construction of other projects will be underway at the same time as construction for Sizewell C, such as a substation at Friston and an offshore windfarm, having cumulative impacts causing a greater effect on local people and environment.</p>	<p>Where required, SZC Co. have engaged with other developers, including Scottish Power Renewables, to ensure the projects area aligned as far as reasonable possible, and that the other projects are adequately considered in the assessment of cumulative effects.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017, Volume 10 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.11) includes an assessment of cumulative effects with other existing and/or approved projects and demonstrates that the Sizewell C Project is appropriate in this regard.</p> <p>The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment Relevant to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (2015).</p> <p>The list of developments for consideration in the cumulative effects assessment, was consulted upon with SCC and ESC, this includes other energy projects in the area.</p>	<p>N</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

<p>Cumulative Impact</p>	<p>Suggestions that effects of other projects should be assessed together with those of Sizewell C, so a more coordinated approach should be taken with respect to the development of all energy projects in the area.</p>	<p>Where required, SZC.Co have engaged with other developers, including Scottish Power Renewables, to ensure the projects area aligned as far as reasonable possible, and that the other projects are adequately considered in the assessment of cumulative effects.</p> <p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 Volume 10 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.11) includes an assessment of cumulative effects with other existing and/or approved projects, and demonstrates that the Sizewell C Project is appropriate in this regard.</p> <p>The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment Relevant to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (2015).</p> <p>The list of developments for consideration in the cumulative effects assessment, was consulted upon with SCC and ESC, this includes other energy projects in the area.</p>	<p>N</p>
--------------------------	---	--	----------

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Terrorism	Concerns about the overall safety of the Sizewell C Project, potential danger to the surrounding community, and risk of terror attacks targeting the nuclear power station.	<p>Safety and security of the proposed development is of utmost importance for SZC Co. and has been an underlying consideration in the development of the proposals.</p> <p>The safety and security arrangements of the Sizewell C nuclear power station are strictly regulated through existing legislation, compliance against which would be assessed by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) prior to the granting of a Nuclear Site License.</p> <p>The ONR will hold SZC Co. accountable for ensuring that the operator fulfils its regulatory and legal responsibilities in this regard.</p> <p>Further information on the proposed safety and security arrangements is provided within Chapter 27 (Major Accidents and Disasters) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Decommissioning	Concern about the decommissioning phase of the Sizewell C Project including the length of time decommissioning will take and the	As part of the development of any new build nuclear power plant, it is necessary to develop plans to demonstrate that the facility can be decommissioned in a safe and environmentally acceptable way. It is expected that the Sizewell C power station will have a lifetime of 60 years, following which it will be decommissioned.	N

edfenergy.com

Building better energy together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>long-term impacts of nuclear power.</p>	<p>Before decommissioning can take place, there is a requirement for the operator to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and prepare an ES under the relevant EIA Regulations, such as Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) Regulations 1999 and the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007. For the Sizewell C UK EPR™ units the preparation and submission of the EIA will take place in the years leading up to End of Generation. The EIA performed at that time would take full account of the environmental impacts of decommissioning. This is a statutory process and the time for the assessment will reflect that. The length of the decommissioning itself will be in accordance with planning permission and ES to ensure that it is decommissioned in a safe and environmentally acceptable way.</p> <p>Operation and decommissioning of the Sizewell C power station would result in the unavoidable generation of quantities of radioactive waste and spent fuel. This is a known and justifiable consequence of nuclear power generation and the UK regulatory permissions regime for nuclear power stations defines precise regulatory requirements and expectations for the management of this waste.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Foreign Ownership	Concern about the ownership of the project by Chinese General Nuclear and SZC Co. being a French company. Includes concerns about reliability, security issues and political influence.	<p>Foreign investment has been used to enable infrastructure development throughout the UK. SZC Co. and Chinese General Nuclear have funded the re-development phase of Sizewell C.</p> <p>However, the funding of Sizewell C may change once the DCO, if granted, has come into force. External finance (equity and debt), is expected to be required to fund the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. has been engaging with a variety of third party investors with a view to attracting the investment required. The ownership of SZC Co. for the construction period is currently expected to be made up of third party investors (some of whom may be foreign).</p> <p>The nuclear industry is subject to a substantial regulatory regime and is regulated by the Office for Nuclear Regulation. Their duty is to ensure that the nuclear industry controls its hazards effectively, has a culture of continuous improvement and maintains high standards.</p>	N
Technology	Concern about the use of the EPR reactor, specifically	The Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) is Great Britain's principal independent regulator for the design, construction and operation of nuclear reactors. The safety of nuclear	N

edfenergy.com

Building better energy together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>that the technology is 'unproven' and not the most efficient.</p>	<p>installations is assured by a system of regulatory control based on a licensing process by which SZC Co. is required to seek a license from ONR.</p> <p>SZC Co. have obtained for generic design acceptance for the EPR™ reactor from the UK regulatory authorities. The UK EPR™ design is based on the Flamanville EPR™ (FA3) plant being built in France but incorporates a number of design changes agreed through the Generic Design Assessment with the UK Regulators.</p> <p>The European Pressurised Reactor (EPR™) is a proven reactor design which is now in full commercial operation in China.</p> <p>The EPR™ has been developed from Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR) designs already operating around the world. More than 270 PWRs have safely generated electricity for millions of people over the last 30 years.</p> <p>The EPR™ offers improved safety and enhanced environmental and financial performance:</p>	



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the most powerful reactor design in the world, capable of achieving around 1,650 MW of power output (compared to 1,450 for the most modern reactors). • It requires 17% less fuel and produces 30% less long-term radioactive waste than other PWR designs. • Four safety systems operate alongside each other. Each one can shut down the reactor safely and automatically. • A 'core catcher' has been specially designed to recover, contain and cool the reactor core in the event of an accident. • A concrete shell is constructed over the most sensitive parts of the installation to protect against the risk of external attack. <p>In 2012, after more than 850,000 hours of engineering studies, the EPR™ successfully completed the UK regulator's Generic Design Assessment. The EPR™ was then awarded Design Acceptance Confirmation (DAC) by the Office of Nuclear Regulation and received a Statement of Design Acceptability (SoDA) by the Environment Agency. The DAC and SoDA demonstrate that the UK EPR™ power station design meets the UK's stringent safety and regulatory requirements.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Four EPR™s will be operational by the time construction starts for Sizewell C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taishan, Guangdong, China 2 units (EDF Energy & CGN) First unit in commercial operation 2018 • Flamanville, Normandy, France 1 unit (EDF Energy) Scheduled to begin operating in 2022 • Olkiluoto, Eurajoki, Finland 1 unit (Areva & Siemens) Scheduled to begin operating January 2020 • Hinkley Point C, Somerset, England 2 units (EDF Energy & CGN) First unit scheduled for operation in 2025. In 2017, EDF SA announced a schedule risk to March 2027 with the project is working to mitigate 	
Safety	Concern about the risk of a nuclear accident or disaster,	SZC Co. recognise that there are concerns relating to the risk of accident or disaster associated with nuclear power.	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and how the area could be safely evacuated.	<p>There are established Emergency Plans developed for the existing power plants at Sizewell under the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019.</p> <p>In conjunction with the local authorities, these plans will be further developed to cover the proposed Sizewell C plant.</p> <p>There also are requirements under the Nuclear Site License (LC 11) to put emergency arrangements in place.</p>	
Waste Management	Concern about spent fuel management, the lack of plans for storing radioactive fuel, and the potential dangers to the surrounding population and environment of radioactive waste.	<p>Safety and security of the proposed development is of utmost importance for SZC Co. and has been an underlying consideration in the development of the proposals.</p> <p>The safety of Nuclear Power Plants (NPP) is assured by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the process of Generic Design Assessment covers safety analysis. This can be found on Her Majesty’s Government (HMG) website. The Generic Design Assessment was approved on 13 December 2012.</p> <p>The design proposals have due regard to the Generic Design Assessment. Further information can be found within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
People and Economy	Support for the people and economy proposals on the basis that specific points/suggestions are followed such as the commitment to education and skills employment is appropriately followed.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the Sizewell C Project’s proposals for people and the economy, and specifically the recognition of SZC Co.’s commitment to education, skills and employment.</p> <p>SZC Co. have developed an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, found in Appendix A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9), that will enhance the positive economic effects of the Sizewell C Project identified in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). This has been developed through engagement with Local Authorities, New Anglia LEP and skills, education and training providers in the local area in order to support and catalyse existing plans and growth sectors.</p>	N
Economic Benefits	Noted benefits that the proposals will bring to the regional and national economy, local businesses and economy, the local community and local infrastructure and amenities	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the recognition that there will be national and local economic benefits related to employment opportunities supported by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project will result in positive economic effects in terms of employment, but also supply chain, spending, and sustainable investment in skills and training pathways from education to in-work upskilling.</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Full details of the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project are assessed in the Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), and the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>SZC Co. also welcomes the support for the Sizewell C Project, and recognises the importance of the Sizewell C Project’s legacy in the area. Road improvements are a significant part of that long-term investment in physical infrastructure, along with improvements and re-provision of habitats, public rights of way and community facilities such as new 3G sports pitch and MUGA proposed in Leiston for dual use between workers and communities.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term benefits in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A Community Fund to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life. b) A Housing Fund that will enable empty properties to return to the market, and provide recyclable grants and loans for renovation of homes. c) An Employment, Skills and Education Strategy to support New Anglia LEP and Suffolk County Councils long-term plans for key growth sectors in the region. 	

edfenergy.com

Building **better energy** together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>d) A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</p> <p>Details of all of these measures are included throughout the EIA, and in particular in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Employment	<p>Challenges to the assumption that the development will provide local opportunities, mainly because of their intention to use the Hinkley supply chain, or that the jobs that are created will be low-skilled jobs, as well as the current lack of unemployment in the area.</p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project will generate a significant demand for labour, in a range of employment sectors and skill levels in both construction and non-construction-related activities, and long-term operational jobs once the power station is built.</p> <p>While Hinkley Point C offers the benefit (to the Sizewell C Project's efficiency and UK economy) of learning and sharing of resources, this does not mean that there will not be local opportunities in terms of contract opportunities for Suffolk companies, and employment of Suffolk residents.</p> <p>The construction phase will run up to 12 years, during which there may be at least one economic cycle, with fluctuating employment/unemployment rates. The Sizewell C Project therefore offers resilience in that sense, but also offers the potential for upskilling of existing roles / people in the local area.</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>EDF has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Training Strategy, provided in Appendix A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9), that sets out measures to support local people into work, into higher skilled work, and to develop sustainable careers in construction, energy and other sectors that support the Sizewell C Project and the wider ambitions for growth in the region.</p> <p>A breakdown of the employment created over the construction phase and its effects on the labour market is set out in Chapter 9, Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), supported by assumptions about the workforce in Appendix 9A of that chapter.</p>	
Local Businesses	<p>Concern that the Sizewell C development may take existing employees away from local businesses and that if local skilled laborers take jobs at Sizewell C there will be fewer plumbers,</p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project will generate a significant demand for labour, in a range of employment sectors and skill levels in both construction and non-construction-related activities, and long-term operational jobs once the power station is built.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognise that while the macro-level effects of the Sizewell C Project are beneficial – creating more jobs, higher skilled jobs and promoting competency in the supply chain, as set out in the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy of Annex A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9). There may be some</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	electricians, builders etc. available locally.	<p>effects on local businesses such as some vacancies being harder to fill.</p> <p>As a result of this feedback, SZC Co. have committed to a Job Brokerage service to support businesses. A breakdown of the employment created over the construction phase and its effects on the labour market is set out in Chapter 9, Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), supported by assumptions about the workforce in Appendix 9A of that chapter.</p>	
Short Term Benefits	Concerned that any benefits for people and the economy will only be short term as they will only last for the duration of construction, thus leaving no long-term benefits, or that the benefits will not outweigh the negative impacts from the development.	<p>SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Training Plan that sets out measures to support local people into work, into higher skilled work, and to develop sustainable careers in construction, energy and other sectors that support the Sizewell C Project and the wider ambitions for growth in the region.</p> <p>At the end of the construction phase, the Sizewell C Project will have created nearly a thousand long-term, high skilled job opportunities, and regular opportunities for outage employment for the lifetime of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Sizewell C Project includes a number of long-term, physical improvements such as road improvements, along</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>with improvements and re-provision of habitats, public rights of way and community facilities such as new 3G sports pitch and MUGA proposed in Leiston for dual use between workers and communities.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term benefits in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A Community Fund to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life. b) A Housing Fund that will enable empty properties to return to the market, and provide recyclable grants and loans for renovation of homes; c) An Employment, Skills and Education Strategy to support New Anglia LEP and Suffolk County Councils long-term plans for key growth sectors in the region; and d) A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast. <p>Details of all of these measures are included throughout the EIA, and in particular in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Local Economy	Raised the impact on businesses and the local economy through transport issues and resulting loss of customers.	<p>SZC Co. recognises that changes to road infrastructure has the potential to change the operation of some businesses that rely on passing trade.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project has been designed sensitively to reduce the potential adverse effects on local economies by providing physical mitigation measures that will improve the strategic road network.</p> <p>Further details regarding the predicted impacts on tourism and the economy are set out below.</p>	N
Tourism	Concerns about the importance of the tourist industry in the area and how the longevity of the proposed development will severely harm on the industry, such that it may never recover.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the importance of the tourist economy within and around the Suffolk Coast, and has undertaken to assess the effects of the Sizewell C Project on tourism in-line with the requirements of National Policy Statement EN-1, as part of Chapter 9, Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>With input from local stakeholders including Local Authorities, and Destination Management Organisation (DMO) (The Suffolk Coast) , as well as other local stakeholders including the National Trust, New Anglia LEP and RSPB Minsmere, SZC Co. developed a Tourism Survey to understand the potential sensitivities of new and returning tourists to the Suffolk Coast.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project offers benefits to tourist accommodation providers in off-peak seasons, generating demand for year-round</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>use of properties at the peak of construction. An Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been developed to minimise harm to the sector during the peak seasons, when tourist and worker demand for accommodation may overlap.</p> <p>Using feedback from the Tourism Survey, SZC Co. has developed a Tourism Fund, details of which are set out in Chapter 9, Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9). This will include funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p>	
Local Economy	<p>Concerns about the mitigation proposals for the local economy being underdeveloped, and the suggested tourism fund being inadequate.</p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project’s effects on the local economy will be overwhelmingly positive – supporting long-term, sustainable careers through employment, skills and training initiatives secured in partnership with Suffolk County Council and New Anglia LEP’s strategic plans for the regional economy.</p> <p>Jobs will be created in construction, non-construction, management, support and operational positions across a range of skill levels – enhanced by the measures set out in the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, Appendix A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>With input from local stakeholders including Local Authorities and Destination Management Organisation (DMO) (The Suffolk Coast) ,</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>as well as other local stakeholders including the National Trust, New Anglia LEP and RSPB Minsmere, SZC Co. developed a Tourism Survey to understand the potential sensitivities of new and returning tourists to the Suffolk Coast.</p> <p>Using feedback from the Tourism Survey, SZC Co. has developed a Tourism Fund, details of which are set out in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). This will include funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p>	
Employment	Suggestion that local suppliers and workers should be employed for all aspects of the development wherever possible.	<p>SZC Co. support the suggestion that wherever possible and practicable the Sizewell C Project should draw on local labour and supply chains, and has developed measures to inform, enable and sustain local benefits such as contracting and upskilling.</p> <p>These measures are set out in the Education Strategy, Appendix A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	Y
Training	Suggestion that SZC Co. should provide skills and training opportunities for local people such as through apprenticeship schemes, to upskill	<p>SZC Co. are committed to supporting and enhancing existing skills, training, education and employment strategies for the region that would benefit the Sizewell C Project itself and the long-term future of the region’s key growth sectors.</p> <p>A number of measures are set out in the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, Appendix A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9), that would enable opportunities for local people</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the local workforce and improve employment opportunities.	through upskilling, increasing employability and implementing programmes for apprenticeships.	
Tourism	Suggestions about how EDF can mitigate the impacts on the tourism industry, or help support it, for example, through the development of a permanent exhibition on nuclear energy or a viewing tower / site tours.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the importance of tourism in the Suffolk Coast and has committed to measures to avoid or reduce any significant effects on it as a result of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>There is an existing visitor centre at Sizewell B, which offers interactive exhibitions on the power station itself and the nuclear energy sector in general. This resource is used widely by tourists and local schools and will be enhanced during the construction of Sizewell C to inform people about the construction project.</p> <p>Site tours are already available if needed in advance – though due to safety and security, tours or viewings of the construction site may be limited.</p> <p>SZC Co. has developed a Tourism Fund, details of which are set out in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). This will include funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Economic Benefits	Challenging/questioning the quoted figures and assumed benefits that EDF have based their proposals on as being overly optimistic, or that they are unlikely to actually occur.	<p>SZC Co. have developed a strong evidence base to suggest that the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project to the local, regional and national economy are achievable and realistic.</p> <p>The Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) sets out the scale of these effects based on the overall Sizewell C Project value, and its potential components, using information gained from other projects including Hinkley Point C, and local information on supply chain potential and labour market opportunity.</p>	Y
Crime	Concern about a potential impact on the character of the area from an influx of workers as well as a potential increase in antisocial behaviour and crime in the area because of an influx of construction workers. Especially alcohol abuse, drug use and prostitution.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern raised by local communities and service providers over the potential effect of workers on crime and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>A full assessment of these potential effects is set out in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). In order to avoid effects before they arise, SZC Co. has been working with Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk County Council to understand concerns about effects on crime and community cohesion, perceptions of safety, mental wellbeing and safeguarding issues.</p> <p>This process has led to the development of a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16), which sets out the potential effects and measures, roles and responsibilities to mitigate them, including direct funding and support, provision of information, and</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		the implementation of a Worker Code of Conduct which includes policies on drug and alcohol testing.	
Local Villages	General concerns about perceived impacts of the proposed development on local villages and their residents, for example the disruption to lives and severing of villages.	<p>SZC Co. recognises that in places close to the Sizewell C Project, residents may experience a range of effects such as changes to the environment, transport network and perceptions of community life.</p> <p>SZC Co. has undertaken to identify these effects through the EIA, and set them out on a spatial basis through a Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13).</p> <p>A Community Fund will be implemented via the s106 agreement and will help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>In recognition that certain communities closer to the main development site are likely to experience effects across a wider range of social, economic and environmental areas, SZC Co. will ensure these communities have the potential to access this Fund.</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Health and Wellbeing	Concerns about the potential impact on people’s health and wellbeing because of the proposals, this includes a loss of quality of life due to the disruption in the area, health risks of radioactivity and health impacts from air pollution.	<p>A full assessment of the potential health and wellbeing effects of the Sizewell C Project is set out in Chapter 28 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>This assesses and addresses potentially significant effects arising from a range of environmental, social and economic health determinants. This includes potential effects on physical health and on quality of life from annoyance and loss of amenity associated with the construction and operation of the proposed development.</p> <p>Measures to avoid, manage and mitigate potential pollution from the Sizewell C Project and address any impacts on the AONB are set out elsewhere in the application, including in the environmental statement (noise, air quality, landscape and visual impact, radiological chapters for example) as well as in the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	Y
Property and Land	Concerns about the how the proposals will impact on property and land. For example, the effects on farmland, decreasing house prices, the inability	<p>SZC Co. have proposed to minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls.</p> <p>EDF and their agents continue to engage with landowners concerning accommodation works in order to minimise impact on holdings as far as possible.</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>for people to sell their homes due to the proposals and damage to property.</p>	<p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and best practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme (PPSS) to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination.</p>	
Local Infrastructure	<p>General concerns about impact on local infrastructure and</p>	<p>SZC Co. has taken steps to avoid negative effects on the local highway network and the sewage/waste systems. In this regard: excavated materials will be used on site; waste movements will be</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>the effects on people e.g. local roads' inability to handle predicted traffic, impacts of congestion and negative effects on sewage/waste systems.</p>	<p>consolidated and taken to local facilities where possible; waste movements are included within transport numbers; and SZC Co. will have a dedicated sewage treatment plant early in the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained within the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), Transport chapters of the ES and Waste Management Strategy.</p>	
Local Services	<p>Concerns about the impact of the influx of people to the area on local community services, including emergency services, medical services, schools and amenities. Services are seen to be overstretched already and this will be exacerbated.</p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project will require a temporary non-home-based workforce who may seek to access public services delivered by County and District Services. Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) sets out an assessment of the potential net additional demand from the workforce for these services, and identifies that there is unlikely to be a substantial demand that would not otherwise be accounted for by general taxation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has undertaken a ward-level assessment of the likely demographic and population change as a result of the temporary, non-home-based construction workforce, and the knock-on implications for housing and public services, and community cohesion as a result. This is included within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>As a result of this assessment, a range of mitigation measures have been developed, summarized in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), to avoid or reduce significant effects – this includes a Housing Fund, a Public Services Fund and implementation strategies like an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected.</p> <p>However, in recognition of the potential demand for some services as a result of workers bringing dependents, the lag time between taxation and central government funding, or related to the specific demographic profile of the workforce, SZC Co. have set up a contingency fund that can be applied where potential additional demand may arise.</p>	
Biodiversity	Comments about the importance of the surrounding	EDF Energy recognises the importance of the ecology/landscape to the local population and visitors and for this reason has	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>ecology/landscape to the local population and visitors, and concern about the impacts on people’s enjoyment of the area.</p>	<p>implemented or proposed mitigation to address the impacts, including for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 67ha habitat creation area at Aldhurst Farm, just west of Lovers Lane, which provides reed-bed and ditch habitats to compensate for loses of these habitats associated with the new power station platform and will provide new recreational opportunities when access arrangements across the wider EDF Energy estate change during construction • Creating off-site habitat compensation areas to create fen meadow habitats and to provide additional habitat for marsh harriers, which might be dissuaded from hunting across the EDF Estate during construction • Implementing mitigation strategies for protected species, such as reptiles, water voles and badgers to ensure that individuals are not killed during construction and populations are sustained across the EDF Energy estate over the long-term • Carefully screening the boundaries of the site, with bunds and hoarding and also making use of natural topography and vegetation including woodland blocks and mature hedgerows to contain the construction site and screen it as much as possible from external views 	

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting up a tourism fund to help support tourism levels in East Suffolk during the construction phase <p>The Environmental Statement considers the impacts of the Sizewell C proposals on landscape, ecology, public rights of way and amenity more widely as well as the socio-economic impacts of the development. Further information can be found in Volume 2 Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
People and Economy	Request for further information or assessment of the people and economy proposals, such as further assessment of impacts on people and Health and Community studies.	<p>The DCO is accompanied by a detailed assessment of the effects of the Sizewell C Project on people and health through Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and Chapter 28 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), and an Equality Statement (Doc Ref. 5.14).</p> <p>EDF have developed these assessments in accordance with legislation, policy and guidance over several years, and have worked with stakeholders including Local Authorities and public services to develop appropriate mitigation strategies that effectively respond to and avoid or reduce any anticipated significant adverse effects.</p> <p>A number of mitigation and implementation strategies have been developed to deal with negative effects where they have the potential to arise, and make sure the positive effects of the Sizewell C Project (such as jobs and supply chain) are enhanced.</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Criticism of the mitigation measures offered as being inadequate and comments that more needs to be done to make the proposals acceptable for people and the economy, for example the Housing Fund and Community fund not extending far enough to villages such as Saxmundham.	<p>The Housing Fund and Community Fund would not be spatially limited – they are designed to be flexible and responsive to mitigate the effects of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Socio-economic EIA, ES Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Doc Ref. 6.3), and implementation strategies, such as Employment and Skills Strategy, Annex A to the Economic Strategy, (Doc Ref. 8.9), Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) and Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) demonstrate that mitigation is adequate to avoid or reduce adverse significant effects, and respond to uncertainty.</p>	N
People and Economy	General/other suggestions about the people and economy proposals such as working with government or to increase business rate retention or to use the site itself as a tourist attraction,	<p>Although Business Rates are collected locally, they are set by central Government which also identifies how much of the business rates collected have to be passed to them to re-distribute across the country. EDF shares the view of the Local Authorities that at least some of the additional rates should be retained locally to support local services. It will however be some years before the new station opens and pays rates and there are likely to be several rounds of changes in Government policy before then. EDF will work with local partners on this issue.</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	funding provided for community services such as policing.	<p>See Local Services question above for position on community services such as policing.</p> <p>There is already a visitor centre at Sizewell B, which offers interactive exhibitions on the power station itself and the nuclear energy sector in general. This resource is used widely by tourists and local schools, and will be enhanced during the construction of Sizewell C to inform people about the construction project.</p> <p>Full details are contained within the Socio-economic chapter of the ES Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Compensation	Suggestion that those directly affected by the proposed development should receive direct financial compensation, including a tourism fund.	<p>SZC Co. have undertaken a detailed assessment of the potential significant adverse effect on those directly affected by the Sizewell C Project, set out in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and have also undertaken a summary of localised effects across all environmental aspects – set out in the Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13)</p> <p>Based on the potential significant effects identified, and to enhance positive effects, SZC Co. has set out plans for several mitigation measures and implementation strategies to help those most significantly affected by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>These measures include a Tourism Fund, details of which are set out in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). This</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>includes funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p> <p>The measures also include a Community Fund which will be implemented via the s106 agreement to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>In recognition that certain communities closer to the Main Development Site are likely to experience effects across a wider range of social, economic and environmental areas, SZC Co. has ensured these communities have the potential to access this Fund.</p>	
Schools	Suggestion that SZC Co. should provide opportunities at schools and higher education facilities to develop skills.	<p>Working with schools, training and skills providers is an intrinsic part of SZC Co.'s plans to develop the local labour market, providing long-term sustainable career opportunities and transferrable skills in-line with New Anglia LEP and Suffolk County Council's growth sectors.</p> <p>SZC Co. (through Sizewell B) already work closely with schools in the area to support curriculum activities and promote STEM, delivered both in the classroom and through resources in SZC Co.'s visitor centre at Sizewell B.</p>	N

edfenergy.com

Building **better energy** together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Plans to enhance this are set out in the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, Annex A to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).	

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Accommodation Strategy	General support for the proposed accommodation strategy and reasons for support, for example reducing the amount of worker traffic on the roads.	<p>SZC Co. notes and welcomes the recognition that the Accommodation Strategy has been developed to complement sustainable management of workers, while also contributing to an efficient Sizewell C Project delivery.</p> <p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks, ensuring an efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project with worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities to promote economic benefits e.g. of off-peak tourist accommodation use.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that although this balanced approach provides benefits and limits effects, there may still be some effects on local</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>housing markets. As such, proposals for a flexible, responsive Housing Fund has been developed to complement the proposals set out by East Suffolk Council’s policy and strategy on housing.</p> <p>Full details are contained within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10)</p>	
Accommodation Strategy	<p>Either support for the proposal to locate the accommodation close to the main development site, or the suggestion that the accommodation should be located closer to the site than is currently proposed.</p>	<p>SZC Co. notes and welcomes the support for locating Sizewell C Project Accommodation (campus and caravan site) close to the main development site. This is part of a considered, balanced strategy developed through consultation to deliver Sizewell C Project efficiencies and attract a high quality workforce, while reducing effects on local housing markets and transport networks.</p> <p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) document how site selection has been undertaken to justify the balanced approach to Sizewell C Project Accommodation – promoting the efficient delivery of the NSIP while limiting environmental effects and community effects.</p> <p>The proposed location of the Sizewell C Project accommodation – the campus and caravan site – has been developed to allow direct access to the site, while maintaining safe distance from the main operations of the site, and has been designed to limit disruption to local residents and workers living there temporarily.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Health and Wellbeing	Concern about the impact of the accommodation strategy on the local community, including impact from influx of workers and effect on residents' wellbeing.	<p>In response to the requirement for a large non-home-based workforce, SZC Co. has developed a balanced Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10). This strategy makes use of existing local accommodation where possible, in order to deliver local economic benefits, but also seeks to avoid impacts on the local accommodation market, by providing temporary project accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that it needs to try to avoid using existing accommodation sources beyond their capacity, or in ways which would have detrimental impacts on the local tourism sector or local communities. The temporary campus and caravan accommodation would help to take the pressure off existing accommodation supply, as well as providing significant operational benefits for SZC Co. and its contractors.</p> <p>Activities with the potential to impact upon local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines of the Environmental Statement, and these have informed the scope and focus of a health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the Sizewell C Project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities. Further detail may be found in Chapter 28 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). Chapter</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>9 sets out how the Sizewell C Project has assessed and proposed to mitigate potential impacts on public services.</p> <p>In addition, a Community Fund is proposed to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life. Further information is contained in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
House Prices	<p>Concern that workers moving to the area will cause rental/house prices to rise and decrease the availability of properties for local people.</p>	<p>SZC Co. note and welcome the recognition that the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been developed to complement sustainable management of workers, while also contributing to an efficient Sizewell C Project delivery.</p> <p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks, ensuring an efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project with worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities to promote economic benefits e.g. of off-peak tourist accommodation use.</p> <p>EDF recognise that through this balanced approach provides benefits and limits effects, there may still be some effects on local</p>	N

edfenergy.com

Building **better energy** together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>housing markets. As such, a flexible, responsive Housing Fund has been developed to complement the proposals set out by East Suffolk Council’s policy and strategy on housing.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme (PPSS) to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination</p>	
Local Services	Concern about the availability of services and infrastructure for the accommodation campus and caravan, and the impact it will	SZC Co. note and welcome the support for locating Sizewell C Project Accommodation (campus and caravan site) close to the main development site. This is part of a considered, balanced strategy developed through consultation to deliver the Sizewell C Project efficiencies and attract a high quality workforce, while reducing effects on local housing markets and transport networks.	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>have on existing services/infrastructure such as local amenities, sewage and waste facilities.</p>	<p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) document how site selection has been undertaken to justify the balanced approach to Sizewell C Project Accommodation – promoting the efficient delivery of the NSIP while limiting environmental effects and community effects.</p> <p>The proposed location of the Sizewell C Project accommodation – the campus and caravan site – has been developed to allow direct access to the site, while maintaining safe distance from the main operations of the site, and has been designed to limit disruption to local residents and workers living there temporarily.</p> <p>Full details are contained within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10)</p>	
Tourism	<p>Concern that the siting of the campus and caravan will negatively impact the tourism industry by putting off visitors to the area.</p>	<p>SZC Co. recognises that tourism is a key strength within Suffolk’s economy, and in particular within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which stretches north and south of Sizewell C.</p> <p>Following Stage 2, SZC Co. continued working with partners including local authorities, Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation (DMO), Visit Suffolk, Visit East Anglia (now Visit East of England), and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to understand and define the tourist sector and to define the key</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>reasons tourists come to the area, the extent to which Sizewell C could have an impact on the attractiveness of the area for tourists, and the opportunities the Sizewell C Project could bring.</p> <p>Further information – including an assessment of potential significant effects on tourism based on a Tourism Survey undertaken by Ipsos MORI and informed by stakeholders - is contained in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9). A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast is proposed.</p>	
Tourism	<p>Concern that workers may rent out holiday rental accommodation, which would limit the amount available to tourists and consequently negatively affect the tourism industry.</p>	<p>SZC Co. recognise the potential for the Sizewell C Project to result in adverse effects on accommodation availability in the local area – particularly in areas close to the Main Development Site.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the effects on the housing market has been undertaken as part of Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and has formed the basis for the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10), which aims to limit effects through the provision of worker accommodation.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project has also developed proposals for a Housing Fund, which will align with initiatives set out in East Suffolk Council's Housing Strategies to avoid and reduce significant effects</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>where they may arise on most vulnerable households, particularly in the private rented sector.</p> <p>SZC Co. do not anticipate that the Sizewell C Project would have a significant effect on property or rental prices, but aims to mitigate where practicable through monitoring homeless presentations and their reasons, and matching the Housing Fund to initiatives accordingly.</p> <p>Full details are contained within the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10)</p>	
Mitigation	<p>Challenges to the proposed mitigation measures for accommodation and concerns that the mitigation proposals are insufficient, for example lighting techniques and sound insulated accommodation not being enough, or the community funds being too low.</p>	<p>SZC Co. is committed to ensuring that the impacts of the proposed accommodation are appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>To minimise the potential for light pollution, the accommodation blocks are orientated east-west so that the gable ends of individual accommodation blocks present unlit facades towards viewpoints to the west including at Leiston Abbey and locations on the local public rights of way network, including the realigned bridleway. Measures will also be put in place to minimise light pollution from the accommodation blocks and ancillary structures. Retained vegetation and proposed planting will contribute to the filtering of views to lighting within the campus area. The Lighting Management Plan, contained in Volume 2, Appendix 2B of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), ensures that external lighting will only be used</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>where strictly needed and at appropriate intensity levels. Further details are contained in Chapter 2 Description of the Permanent Development of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Detailed noise modelling has been undertaken to understand the effects of construction activity on the proposed accommodation campus. The modelling work has shown that during construction phases 3 and 4, mitigation measures will ensure noise is kept to acceptable levels. During construction phases 1 and 2 the accommodation would not be in use. Further details are contained in Chapter 11 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The Community Fund will be implemented via the s106 agreement to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>In recognition that certain communities closer to the main development site are likely to experience effects across a wider range of social, economic and environmental areas, SZC Co. has ensured these communities have the potential to access this Fund. Further details are set out in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Further Information	Requests for more information about	Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) responds to the requirement of National Policy Statement EN-	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>the accommodation strategy, such as how SZC Co. will work with local councils to match local housing supply to needs.</p>	<p>1 to assess the potential significant effects of the Sizewell C Project on tourism.</p> <p>The assessment sets out that there is no evidence to suggest that the specific siting of campus and caravan accommodation would negatively affect the tourist industry by putting people off visiting.</p> <p>SZC Co. commissioned a Tourism Survey, see ES Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Doc Ref. 6.3), undertaken by Ipsos MORI and developed with the input of local stakeholders including the DMO and District and County Councils. The aim of the Survey was to identify the potential perceived risk areas and develop proposals for a Tourism Fund that can be used to mitigate any adverse effects.</p> <p>The Tourism Fund responds to the perceived risks of the Sizewell C Project will include funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p>	
Temporary Accommodation	<p>Concern about the proposal for the accommodation being temporary, and the suggestion that permanent housing</p>	<p>SZC Co. anticipates that some workers will seek to use local tourist sector accommodation for short-term roles on the Sizewell C Project during the construction phase. During the peak of construction, where this coincides with peak tourist seasons, there is potential for this to limit the availability of accommodation in the tourist sector.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	would be more beneficial.	<p>However, as set out in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), this effect is likely to be short-term, temporary and would not be significant. Where these effects occur outside of peak times, they would contribute positively towards spending in the local area.</p> <p>Nonetheless SZC Co. recognise that the perception of the Sizewell C Project’s workforce and construction activity may have the potential to adversely affect tourism – as a precaution, SZC Co. have committed to a Tourism Fund, details of which are set out in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). This will include funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p>	
Site restoration	Suggestion that the site should be restored to its original greenfield state when it is no longer needed	<p>A detailed assessment of the effects on the housing market has been undertaken as part of Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and has formed the basis for a balanced Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10), which aims to limit effects through the provision of worker accommodation.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project has also developed proposals for a Housing Fund, which aligns with initiatives set out in East Suffolk Council’s Housing Strategies to avoid and reduce significant effects where they may arise on most vulnerable households, particularly in the private rented sector.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>This fund – along with the Community Fund – are designed to be flexible and responsive as well as to provide resilience early in the Sizewell C Project to mitigate or compensate for the potential for effects to arise at peak construction activity. They are designed to be proportionate to the potential scale of effects, which are set out in detail in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Accommodation Strategy	<p>Suggestions for the overall accommodation strategy for example providing medical facilities on the sites proposed or providing incentives for workers who commute from home.</p>	<p>SZC Co. have undertaken a detailed study of the Sizewell C Project’s construction workforce and the characteristics of local accommodation, appended to Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) in order to determine the potential significant effects on housing availability, particularly for households who may be considered more vulnerable or at risk of homelessness, assessment set out in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>SZC Co. have consulted on and developed elements of an Accommodation Management Strategy and Housing Fund, working with East Suffolk Council to understand the key issues and vulnerabilities of the sector, and set out the best ways to mitigate any effects of the Sizewell C Project via a Housing Fund that can be used to employ measures already forming part of the Council’s Housing Strategies.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) sets out measures that SZC Co. and contractors will use to monitor effects and manage the distribution of workers, where practicable, in response to sensitivities of the local housing market.	
Recreational Facilities	Concern about the lack of recreational facilities and amenities that will be available for the proposed campus, and suggestions that these should be provided	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of demand created by construction workers for additional sports facilities in the local area set out in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) highlighting relatively small demand for facilities.</p> <p>However, SZC Co. recognises that high-quality living environment and facilities are important to attract a workforce and deliver the Sizewell C Project efficiently. As such, it has developed plans for a 3G pitch and MUGA in Leiston and on-site gym and informal recreation facilities at the accommodation campus.</p> <p>The facilities in Leiston will be dual use, accessible to the community and Alde Valley Academy at certain times of the day/week. This responds to a deficiency of existing all-weather sports facilities in the area, and provides a legacy for the town post-construction</p>	N
Location	Concern about the proposed location of the campus near the small village of Eastbridge and its	SZC Co. have undertaken a detailed assessment of the proposed location of the campus, including potential impacts upon nearby protected areas, and consulted on a number of options.	Y

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>proximity to protected areas.</p>	<p>At the Stage 1 consultation, SZC Co. proposed a 2,000 to 3,000 bed single site accommodation campus and consulted on three potential site options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option 1: Main development site (SZC Co.’s preferred option); - Option 2: Sizewell Gap; and - Option 3: Leiston East. - <p>At the Stage 2 consultation, we explained that the main development site had been chosen for the accommodation campus (Option 1 at Stage 1) and that this had been the site considered appropriate by the highest proportion of respondents at Stage 1.</p> <p>Two potential masterplan layout options were consulted on at Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option 1: three and four storey accommodation blocks east and west of Eastbridge Road and sports facilities on-site. This option required a realignment of Eastbridge Road. - Option 2: three, four and five storey accommodation blocks east of Eastbridge Road only with sub-options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Option 2i: sport facilities to the west of Eastbridge Road; and o Option 2ii: sports facilities located remotely, with respondents asked to suggest possible locations. 	

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Following the Stage 2 consultation, and in consultation with key stakeholders, SZC Co. assessed the accommodation campus site options against the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - feedback to consultation; - environmental considerations; - construction and operational requirements; - transport; - socio-economics; and - planning policy. <p>The preferred location was presented at Stage 3 consultation which was Options 2ii, but with a revised layout to address concerns raised at Stage 2, particularly in relation to massing and 5-storey buildings and to minimise impacts on the surrounding environment. The campus is not considered to have a significant impact on the village of Eastbridge or on protected areas in the vicinity.</p> <p>Full details on the alternatives considered can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2) and the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Scale / Visual Impact	Concern that the four storey workers' campus is too large, with resulting visual	The campus layout has been redesigned to address concerns raised at Stage 2 about height of buildings and massing. As a result of this, the five storey buildings previously proposed were removed and the four storey buildings located in the least visually	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	impacts, and should be reduced in height.	<p>intrusive location on the site. Orientation of the campus buildings east to west will minimise the extent of elevations and built mass along the western edge of the site and the design also incorporates a series of landscape buffers to enhance screening.</p> <p>Full details can be found in Chapter 13 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Split Campus	Suggestion that EDF should consider the ‘split campus’ approach taken with Hinkley Point for Sizewell C, splitting the campus between urban areas.	<p>SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation. At Stage 3 a strategy for a single, on-site accommodation campus was proposed. This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>While a campus in e.g. Lowestoft or Ipswich may be perceived to disperse the effects on the housing market, a split campus approach in this instance would likely increase the number of road trips. This would not be attractive to workers, such that it would affect the efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project – workers moving to an area temporarily would seek to live as close to the site as possible.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Campus Accommodation	General support expressed for the campus accommodation proposals, that it will reduce the amount of traffic and may provide an additional benefit the local economy.	<p>SZC Co. notes and welcome the support for locating Sizewell C Project Accommodation (campus and caravan site) close to the main development site. This is part of a considered, balanced strategy developed through consultation to deliver Sizewell C Project efficiencies and attract a high quality workforce, while reducing effects on local housing markets and transport networks.</p> <p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) document how site selection has been undertaken to justify the balanced approach to Sizewell C Project Accommodation – promoting the efficient delivery of the NSIP while limiting environmental effects and community effects.</p>	N
Caravan accommodation	Opposition to caravan accommodation proposals and concerns about it being ‘archaic’ and ‘unsustainable’, or as having inadequate space for the proposed number of caravans.	<p>A temporary area of hardstanding for caravans, with utilities and welfare provision, has been included as part of the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) in order to respond to demand for such provision from the non-home-based element of workforce. This is based on experience of similar projects elsewhere including Hinkley Point C, Milford Haven and Heathrow Terminal 5.</p> <p>The proposed caravan site is intended to reduce the propensity of unlicensed, un-managed sites coming forward and manage the distribution of the workforce, as well as provide resilience in the early years of the Sizewell C Project before the campus has been constructed.</p>	Y

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The caravan site has been designed using standards set by East Suffolk Council on licensing, management and layout, and so is considered an acceptable size to accommodate the proposed number of caravans. Detailed justification for the site and design details are set out in the Planning Statement, Accommodation Strategy, and Design and Access Statements (Doc Ref. 8.4, 8.10 and 8.1).	
Flooding / Layout	Suggestions given for the caravan accommodation, such as providing flood defences for the site or redesigning the layout of the caravans.	<p>The Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.2) assesses the potential risks to the proposed activities (on-site) and to off-site receptors from the construction and operation of the caravan accommodation.</p> <p>Following the Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. continued to liaise with the key flood risk stakeholders (lead local flood authorities and risk management authorities) to assess and address such risks in our design approach, to ensure that the Sizewell C Project does not cause adverse flood impacts upon the caravan accommodation.</p> <p>The flood mitigation measures proposed take into account all sources of flooding and are detailed in full in the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p>	N
Caravans	Support expressed for the caravan accommodation	SZC Co. welcomes the support for a temporary area of hardstanding for caravans, with utilities and welfare provision, included as part of the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10)	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>proposals and reasons for support, including comments on its ‘acceptability’ and reduced use of tourist accommodation.</p>	<p>in order to respond to demand for such provision from the non-home-based element of (mainly the civils) workforce.</p> <p>The proposed caravan site is intended to reduce the propensity of unlicensed, un-managed sites coming forward and manage the distribution of the workforce, as well as provide resilience in the early years of the Sizewell C Project before the campus has been constructed, and reduce effects on tourist accommodation locally.</p> <p>Detailed justification for the site and design details are set out in the Planning Statement, Accommodation Strategy, and Design and Access Statements (Doc Ref. 8.4, 8.10 and 8.1).</p>	
Accommodation Strategy	<p>Challenging the assumptions and estimates that EDF have made about how the proposed accommodation will work. This included the criticism of the assumption that workers would commute for up to 90 minutes, or that the accommodation</p>	<p>Research and data from CITB and experience at Sizewell B and Hinkley Point C suggests that construction workers will travel up to 50 miles or 90 minutes to get to a site. This has been validated with Suffolk County Council and their consultants, who suggested that, in reality, many will travel further, so a ‘hard cap’ of 90 minutes has been dropped. Realistically, more will live closer to the site, and this is reflected in the Gravity Model, refer to Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>Assessments have included the potential for workers to bring families, based on monitoring data from Hinkley Point C, to inform an assessment on the demand for family-type homes and</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	needed has been underestimated as plans do not take account of workers with families and partners.	community facilities such as GPs and school places in the Socio-economic Chapter of the ES, Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Doc Ref. 6.3).	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Traffic	General concern about the impact of the transport proposals for both strategies e.g. for exacerbating existing difficulties on local roads the predicted amount of traffic and inadequacy of the local road network in handling traffic for both strategies	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>Since Stages 3 and 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road led 	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) then sets out the rationale for the freight management strategy proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the transport impacts from the scheme. Mitigation has been proposed where necessary and the scheme designs have retained access to residential properties. For example, at the</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		A12/A144 junction proposals, access to Stone Cottage was modified to suit the new junction layout. This and all other highway scheme designs have been subject to a Stage 1 safety audit that has been submitted to Suffolk County Council and forms part of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Construction	Concerns about the initial stages of the construction process, before transport mitigation has been implemented. The suggestion that relief roads etc. should be constructed before any work on the development site begins.	<p>SZC Co. has taken steps to ensure that construction traffic impacts are mitigated as far as possible. The construction programme has sought to deliver mitigation early on in the process, whilst allowing the Sizewell C Project to be delivered in a timely manner. The construction of the off-site associated developments would be undertaken early in the construction programme. The construction period of each associated development would vary, however no scheme is likely to take longer than 24 months.</p> <p>An indicative phasing schedule for the Sizewell C Project as a whole is provided in the Implementation Plan, Appendix 8.4I of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Impact on Road Users	Concern about the impact of transport proposals on non-motorised road users, including	SZC Co. has assessed the transport proposals, including non-motorised road users, including cyclists, pedestrians and horseback riders, as well as specific impacts on local drivers.	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	cyclists, pedestrians and horseback riders, as well as specific impacts on local drivers.	The details of this assessment are contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), with impacts on pedestrians and public rights of ways and bridleways set out in Chapter 15 (Amenity and Recreation) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Traffic	Concern about the potential for construction traffic and construction workers' private transport to rat-run through village roads and 'fly-park' in unsuitable areas, particularly if families with several cars move to the local area. Also concern about the lack of mitigation proposed to deal with these impacts.	SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling to understand the impact of construction worker and construction traffic. With regard to the management of workforce car trips and LGV trips, the DCO application is supported by a draft Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8) and Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7), which set out the management measures and regime for construction traffic.	N
Transport Modelling	Suggestions that further assessment is needed for the	SZC Co. has undertaken traffic modelling which provides an assessment of the Sizewell C proposals during the Early Years, Peak Construction and Operational Phase.	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	overall transport proposals, such as traffic modelling assessments.	The details of this assessment are contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Transport Modelling	Suggestions that further information is needed for the overall transport proposals, for example concerning the Gravity Model, diversion strategies, emergency route planning and baseline modelling assumptions.	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The gravity model is fully described in Appendix 7A of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). The strategic modelling is described in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>Arrangements for EDF’s management for buses and HGVs in the event of an incident on the highway are dealt with in the draft TIMP (Doc Ref. 8.6). This is to be secured through the Section 106 agreement (see Draft Heads of Terms appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). Prior to commencement of construction, further liaison with the highways authority and the emergency services will be undertaken to finalise the TIMP.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Visual Impact	Comments and concerns about the proposed helipad, especially the visual impact.	SZC Co. has considered the concerns raised in regard of the location of the helipad to the south of the main development site, particularly in terms of limiting the development of Sizewell C within the AONB. Following Stage 3, SZC Co. decided to remove the helipad from the proposals. Helicopter trips would be limited for both Sizewell B and Sizewell C, and mostly required in the event of an emergency. It has therefore been determined that there is sufficient and suitable space elsewhere on the Sizewell estate to land a helicopter, should it be required.	Y
Transport Mitigation	General concerns about the transport mitigation proposals and comments stating that more mitigation is required for pinch points and dangerous roads and junctions	<p>SZC Co. has sought to provide a comprehensive package of mitigation highway works.</p> <p>This has been developed based on the traffic modelling and assessment of the effects of the Sizewell C Project on highway capacity and road safety.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) which sets out the predicted impacts of the proposals, along with the highway improvements that are proposed to reduce the impacts on the local highway network.</p>	N
Marine-led Strategy	Comments about the marine-led strategy, including	Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “ <i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of</i>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>challenging the decision to remove it, requesting more information about why it has been discarded, support for reinstating it and suggestions about how it could be used.</p>	<p><i>the Project, where cost-effective</i>". The feasibility of a marine led strategy has therefore been considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make as meaningful a contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the BLF is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Transport Strategy	Challenge the proposed transport strategies, for example challenging EDF’s preference for road-led over rail-led and commenting that the transport proposals are not developed enough for this stage of the consultation process.	<p>SZC Co. has evaluated the possibility of moving bulk materials and containerised goods by sea or by rail. This has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluating the capability of the options for sea and rail deliveries, including assessment of potential constraints on delivery (e.g. weather and navigational constraints in respect of sea delivery and rail pathing/infrastructure constraints in respect of rail deliveries); assessing the material requirements that would arise over time during the construction phase, for each area of the Sizewell C Project build, and from this identifying the periods during which demand for materials is greatest; considering the scope to move each major category of materials by sea and rail, taking account of the nature of the materials and possible supply sources; and consideration of the environmental impact of each of the main strategies. <p>Based on the above principles, the Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> beach landing facility 	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • green rail route • Two village bypass; and • Sizewell Link road <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Transport Strategy	Suggest that a combination of marine, rail and road transport be taken forward.	<p>SZC Co. has evaluated the possibility of moving bulk materials and containerised goods by sea or by rail. This has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluating the capability of the options for sea and rail deliveries, including assessment of potential constraints on delivery (e.g. weather and navigational 	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>constraints in respect of sea delivery and rail pathing/infrastructure constraints in respect of rail deliveries);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessing the material requirements that would arise over time during the construction phase, for each area of the Sizewell C Project build, and from this identifying the periods during which demand for materials is greatest; • considering the scope to move each major category of materials by sea and rail, taking account of the nature of the materials and possible supply sources; and • consideration of the environmental impact of each of the main strategies. <p>Based on the above principles, the Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility • green rail route • Two village bypass; and • Sizewell Link road <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Transport Criteria	<p>Suggested criteria on which the choice of transport strategy should be based e.g. whichever option minimises impacts on local communities.</p>	<p>All of the transport strategies that have been considered by SZC Co. include a combination of marine, rail and road transport to different extents.</p> <p>SZC Co. is committed to bringing as much construction material to the site by rail and water, in accordance with The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1). This states at paragraph 5.13.10 that “<i>water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the project, where cost-effective.</i>”</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>As set out at Stage 3 consultation, a marine-led strategy for the movement of construction materials would be difficult to deliver because of the impact on the marine environment of constructing a jetty. Measures to reduce this impact would not fully address those issues. A beach landing facility is therefore proposed for use in both the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>The BLF would be used to deliver large deliveries into Sizewell C by barge. The barge would be loaded with large deliveries at a transshipment port, towed to the shore, moored in position and the barge beached. Large deliveries would then be transported to site along the BLF access road. To support the overall construction schedule, the BLF would need to be constructed and in operation early for large deliveries to enable construction of the initial sea defence.</p> <p>SZC Co. has liaised extensively with Network Rail throughout the consultation process to develop a rail strategy for the delivery of construction material. Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction and SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide 3 trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Transport Assessments	Challenges to the estimates made in the transport assessments, including questioning of the methods used for the assessment.	<p>SZC Co. has sought to provide a comprehensive package of mitigation highway works.</p> <p>This has been developed based on the traffic modelling and assessment of the effects of the Sizewell C Project on highway capacity and road safety.</p> <p>For further details of how the assessment has been undertaken according to industry standards, please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). This also sets out the predicted impacts of the proposals, along with the highway improvements that are proposed to reduce the impacts on the local highway network.</p>	N
Road-led Strategy	General comments expressing opposition to the road-led strategy and reasons that the use of local roads is	<p>Based on the above principles, the Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility • green rail route 	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	unacceptable, including safety issues and inadequate infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two village bypass; and • Sizewell Link road <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Road-led Strategy	Opposition to the road-led strategy specifically because of its adverse impact on the environment particularly from noise and air	<p>Based on the above principles, the Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility • green rail route • Two village bypass; and 	Y

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>pollution generated by vehicles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sizewell Link road <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). Noise and air quality assessments are included in the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	
Road-led Strategy	<p>Concerns about the number of HGVs required for the road-led strategy, and (general) resulting impacts on</p>	<p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The benefits are as follows:</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>local road infrastructure, congestion, the community and the environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability. Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Road-led Strategy	<p>Suggestions relating to the road-led strategy such as widening roads, making sections of them dual</p>	<p>SZC Co. has considered the highway infrastructure works required for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The package of highway infrastructure works included within the application has been informed by extensive traffic and</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	carriageway and traffic management measures	<p>accident data collection, modelling of the highway network and consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>For details, please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the predicted impacts of the proposals, along with the highway improvements that are proposed to reduce the impacts on the local highway network.</p>	
Road-led Strategy	Support and reasons for supporting the road-led strategy in general, as bringing needed infrastructure to the area.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the proposed infrastructure associated with the Sizewell C Project, including the provide legacy benefits for local road users.</p> <p>For details of the proposed highway improvements please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) which sets out the predicted impacts of the Sizewell C proposals, along with the highway improvements that are proposed to reduce the impacts on the local highway network.</p>	N
Rail-led Strategy	General support and reasons for supporting the proposed rail-led strategy over the road-led strategy, for example less congestion and disruption to local	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the proposed rail-led strategy.</p> <p>SZC Co. has liaised extensively with Network Rail throughout the consultation process to develop a rail strategy for the delivery of construction material. Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	roads, environmental benefits and legacy benefits.	SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route. This is summarised in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Rail-led Strategy	Support for the proposed rail strategy based on the provision of replacement bus services in the event of disruption, or the two-village bypass being constructed regardless.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the proposed rail-led strategy. In the event of rail service disruptions affecting construction workers, SZC Co. would consider alternative means of transporting these workers, which could include replacement bus services.</p> <p>SZC Co. has liaised extensively with Network Rail throughout the consultation process to develop a rail strategy for the delivery of construction material. Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route. This is</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>summarised in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>At Stage 3 consultation, the two-village bypass was selected to be taken forward as part of the rail-led and road-led strategies. Both the two-village bypass and Sizewell link road are both proposed as part of the Integrated Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Rail-led Strategy	General/other challenges to the proposals for the rail led strategy, for example that only five additional trains per day have been proposed.	<p>SZC Co. worked closely with Network Rail to establish the maximum number of freight trains a day that could serve the main development site.</p> <p>Due to the hourly passenger service operating between Ipswich and Lowestoft, combined with the existing sections of single track, there is very limited available capacity on the line to accommodate additional freight services required for the Sizewell C Project. With the proposed infrastructure improvements as part of the rail-led strategy, a maximum of five trains a day could serve the site.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route. This is summarised in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). Further information is also contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Rail-led Strategy	Challenging the rail-led strategy as including too much use of road transport, with a large amount of material being transported by HGV, despite the fact it is named 'rail-led'.	<p>SZC Co. worked closely with Network Rail to establish the maximum number of freight trains a day that could serve the main development site.</p> <p>Due to the hourly passenger service operating between Ipswich and Lowestoft, combined with the existing sections of single track, there is very limited available capacity on the line to accommodate additional freight services required for the Sizewell C Project. With the proposed infrastructure improvements as part of the rail-led strategy, a maximum of five trains a day could serve the site.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route. This is summarised in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). Further information is also contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Rail-led Strategy	Challenging the rail-led strategy as being unfeasible and unlikely to be taken forward by SZC Co., including comments on Network Rail’s involvement.	<p>SZC Co. worked closely with Network Rail to establish the maximum number of freight trains a day that could serve the main development site.</p> <p>Due to the hourly passenger service operating between Ipswich and Lowestoft, combined with the existing sections of single track, there is very limited available capacity on the line to accommodate additional freight services required for the Sizewell C Project. With the proposed infrastructure improvements as part of the</p>	N



Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>rail-led strategy, a maximum of five trains a day could serve the site.</p> <p>Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route. This is summarised in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). Further information is also contained in Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Park and Ride	General support for the overall park and ride proposals in reducing the amount of worker traffic around the development site.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the park and ride strategy to reduce the amount of additional traffic generated by the construction workforce on local roads and through local villages.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), Volume 3 (northern park and ride at Darsham) and Volume 4 (southern park and ride at Wickham Market) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4 - 6.5).</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park and Ride	Support for the proposed park and ride scheme as long as, for example, environmental mitigation measures proposals are followed.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the park and ride strategy to reduce the amount of additional traffic generated by the construction workforce on local roads and through local villages.</p> <p>Further information, including in relation to mitigation measures, is contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), Volume 3 (northern park and ride at Darsham) and Volume 4 (southern park and ride at Wickham Market) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N
Park and Ride	Suggestions for the park and ride scheme (not specific to north or south) for example, use of electric buses and consistent air quality monitoring	<p>SZC Co. understands there are concerns about the emissions associated with Sizewell C traffic, both local to the associated developments, including the park and rides, and along the main traffic routes.</p> <p>Air quality modelling has been undertaken for the early year and peak year traffic assessment scenarios for all key road links on the network affected by the Sizewell C Project. The assessment of traffic emissions is presented in the air quality chapters of each of the proposed development site volumes of the Environmental Statement. No significant air quality impacts area predicted as a result of the increased traffic associated with Sizewell C.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>However, proposals for the use of electric vehicles have been considered by SZC Co., including electric buses and the integration of EV charging in the park and rides.</p> <p>Further information, including in relation to mitigation measures, is contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), Volume 3 (northern park and ride at Darsham) and Volume 4 (southern park and ride at Wickham Market) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	
Park and Ride	General opposition to the overall park and ride proposals and reasons for opposition, including land take, pollution and disruption.	<p>SZC Co. included the proposals for a Park and Ride as a means to contribute towards the reduction of the amount of additional traffic generated by the construction workforce on local roads and through local villages and thereby minimise the impact on the local communities.</p> <p>Following completion of construction of the power station, the use of both park and ride sites would cease and the sites would be restored to agricultural use.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), Volume 3 (northern park and ride at Darsham) and Volume 4 (southern park and ride at Wickham Market) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Rail-led Strategy	Suggestions for the overall approach to the rail-led strategy, including further improvements such as double-tracking the rail line, reinstatement of passenger services and a more ‘ambitious’ strategy in general	<p>SZC Co. worked closely with Network Rail to establish the maximum number of freight trains a day that could serve the main development site.</p> <p>Due to the hourly passenger service operating between Ipswich and Lowestoft, combined with the existing sections of single track, there is very limited available capacity on the line to accommodate additional freight services required for the Sizewell C Project. With the proposed infrastructure improvements as part of the rail-led strategy, a maximum of five trains a day could serve the site.</p> <p>Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route. Pursuing a more ambitious rail strategy but which could ultimately have</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>proved undeliverable within the required timeframe would have provided a worse outcome overall.</p> <p>Double tracking the East Suffolk line was considered as part of the feasibility work with Network Rail, but without the other numerous interventions (including upgrades and closures) to level crossings on the line to enable freight trains to operate at a higher permitted speed, it alone would not deliver the required rail capacity on the East Suffolk line. Taken together with Network Rail’s concern around the ability to deliver all the required interventions in time for the peak construction years, the more deliverable integrated strategy was instead proposed.</p> <p>To introduce new passenger services, the Department for Transport would need to instruct a passenger train operator through the rail franchising process, or a train operator could decide to operate a new or enhanced train service if there was a commercial case for doing so. These decisions are outside the control of SZC Co., however none of the rail proposals under the integrated strategy would make it more difficult in the future to enhance or introduce passenger services.</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Rail-led Strategy	General opposition to the proposals for the rail-led strategy, for example because of the inability of the infrastructure to meet demands and insufficiency in alleviating road congestion.	<p>SZC Co. worked closely with Network Rail to establish the maximum number of freight trains a day that could serve the main development site.</p> <p>Due to the hourly passenger service operating between Ipswich and Lowestoft, combined with the existing sections of single track, there is very limited available capacity on the line to accommodate additional freight services required for the Sizewell C Project. With the proposed infrastructure improvements as part of the rail-led strategy, a maximum of five trains a day could serve the site.</p> <p>Given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains per day to the main development site via the green rail route.</p>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The residual construction traffic assigned to the highway network is being mitigated through a package of highway improvement schemes, which include the two-village bypass and Sizewell link road as well as a series of other junction improvements.</p> <p>In addition to the proposed package of highway infrastructure works, the DCO application is supported by a Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8) and Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7), which set out the management measures and regime for construction traffic.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 (Transport) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Machinery / Programme	General/other concerns about construction materials, including	Construction would commence following the grant of a Sizewell C Draft Development Consent Order (Doc Ref. 3.1) (assumed 2022, Year 1), and is likely to be completed approximately nine to twelve years later (Years 9 to 12).	N

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	concerns about the size of construction machinery and the length of time of construction.	<p>The size and location of construction machinery will be controlled through DCO requirements that would provide the maximum heights for construction activities.</p> <p>Details of the construction stage of the Sizewell C Project are set out in Chapter 3 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Sourcing of Materials	Alternative suggestions to the proposals for construction materials, such as sourcing of materials from aggregates in the sea.	<p>The detailed procurement strategy for the materials required for the construction of the Sizewell C Project is unknown at this stage. Assessments have assumed within this application that, apart from bulk earthworks fill, not all materials would be available to be sourced regionally (within Suffolk), and that the majority would be sourced nationally (within the UK).</p> <p>In order to source more material by sea, a jetty (rather than a beach landing facility) would be required, which would result in several significant environmental impacts including: severe underwater noise during construction and a greater habitat loss associated with its footprint.</p> <p>Further details are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2).</p>	N

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Concern about the environmental impact of construction materials including carbon emissions, air quality impacts, and the use of concrete.	<p>EDF recognise the concerns held regarding the impact on the environment during construction. The EIA Regulations 2017 require that the Environmental Statement details the nature and quantity of the construction materials and natural resources (including water, land, soil and biodiversity) used.</p> <p>The descriptions of development for the main development site and the associated development sites provide details of materials types and quantities required during construction.</p> <p>Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of construction-related impacts arising from the use, and handling of materials on the main development site. The assessment also identifies management and mitigation measures associated with excavations (incl. proposed borrow pits), transportation, stockpiling, processing and use of materials on each of the proposed development sites.</p> <p>The scope of the assessment includes impacts on air quality from dust and emissions from plant and machinery; noise associated with transportation and handling; landscape and visual impacts from stockpiling; pollution risk to ground and surface waters, and also greenhouse gas emissions. It is demonstrated that these environmental impacts will be</p>	N

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		appropriately mitigated to ensure that the Sizewell C Project will be appropriate in this regard.	
Further information	Requests for further information about the construction material proposals including assessment of impacts, and the types and sourcing of materials.	<p>SZC Co. has carefully considered where aggregates for the construction of the Sizewell C Project are sourced from.</p> <p>Aggregates sourced either directly from the sea (dredged) or delivered by sea would require a jetty. The significant environmental impact of constructing a jetty resulted in this option being terminated following Stage 2.</p> <p>Materials will be sourced predominantly from the UK and be transported by rail and road. It may be possible to utilise local ports for some materials for onward movement by road or rail.</p> <p>Further details are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2).</p>	N
Quarry Pits	General/other concerns about spoil heaps and quarry pits, including the severe overall impact on the community, height	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concerns regarding the impact of the quarry pits.</p> <p>Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of construction-related impacts arising from the use, and handling of materials on the main development site. The assessment also identifies management and mitigation</p>	N

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>and visual impact and resultant water and air pollution.</p>	<p>measures associated with excavations (incl. proposed borrow pits), transportation, stockpiling, processing and use of materials on each of the proposed development sites.</p> <p>A Materials Management Strategy is provided as an appendix to Volume 2 Chapter 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and sets out how SZC Co. intends to manage excavated materials generated by the proposed development. A specific borrow pit risk assessment has been undertaken, and is presented in an appendix to Volume 2 Chapter 19 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and concludes that the risk to groundwaters can be managed through a number of measures including maintain a minimum unsaturated zone thickness of 2 m below the base of the void and lime treatment of alluvium used to fill the borrow pits.</p> <p>In addition, Volume 2 Chapter 12 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the impact assessment of dust, and proposes measures to control and mitigate dust impacts, and Volume 2 Chapter 13 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents an assessment of landscape and visual impacts associated with stockpiling of materials on site for the duration of construction.</p>	

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Questionnaire	Comments about the consultation questionnaire, such as criticisms that pictures or sketches could not be submitted and the confusing/loaded nature of the questions themselves.	<p>Pictures and sketches could be submitted in writing and were received at all stages of consultation.</p> <p>SZC Co. provided the Stage 3 Questionnaire for guidance on the issues raised in the consultation (see Appendix E.6 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1)). Respondents had the option to either complete the questionnaire or respond by letter or email.</p> <p>SZC Co. produced a questionnaire that was as clear and straight-forward as possible given Sizewell C is a complex major infrastructure project.</p> <p>At Stage 3 we also commissioned an Easy-Read version of the summary document for hard-to-reach audiences. This version used more images and simpler language to convey the proposals.</p>	N
Misleading	Criticism of any information or documentation as being biased or misleading, for example the computer-generated videos and the	<p>SZC Co. made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner. This was in accordance with the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2016) Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Care was taken to ensure that the material presented was factual, did not mislead and was not biased.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	naming of the ‘rail-led’ strategy.	<p>The CGI was labelled as providing a general representation of the local area with functions within the technology that can help to avoid misrepresentation, such as removing trees or switching to different seasonal characteristics. SZC Co. was grateful for any feedback on inaccuracies in documentation. They were immediately fed back to the Team so they were aware should the issue be raised at exhibitions and events.</p> <p>The content under ‘rail-led strategy’ showed that it was the correct, clear and unambiguous title – particularly when compared with the road-led strategy. See Stage 3 Sample Consultation Material, Appendix E.9 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. has been committed to an honest and fair approach to consultation throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	
Consultation Documents	Criticism of information or documentation being too complicated, lengthy or lacking in	<p>Sizewell C is a complex major infrastructure project and an array of issues need to be addressed in the consultation.</p> <p>For anyone who felt that the consultation material was too complicated, an Easy-Read version was available. A Stage 3 Consultation Summary Document addressing the key</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	sufficient detail on key points.	<p>issues was also provided, see Appendices E.2, E.3 and E.4 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>On the point about sufficient detail, comments in this regard mainly referred to SZC Co. not having completed the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA). The Stage 3 consultation documents included three volumes of Preliminary Environmental Information, see Appendix E.5 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). The DCO application is accompanied by a full EIA – please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p>	
Environmental Impact Assessment	Comments about the lack of a sufficient Environmental Impact Assessment at this stage of the consultation.	<p>The Stage 3 consultation documents included three volumes of Preliminary Environmental Information, see Appendix E.5 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Further to ongoing engagement with stakeholders, the review of all consultation feedback, the completion of all additional surveys and assessments, and the identification of appropriate mitigation, the DCO application is accompanied by a full Environmental Impact Assessment. Please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p>	N
Consultation Documents	Criticisms of the documentation or other consultation information as	<p>SZC Co. made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner. This was in accordance with the Updated Statement of</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	being inaccurate for example names of places being labelled incorrectly or outdated information.	<p>Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2016) Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. have been committed to an honest and fair approach to consultation throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. was grateful for any feedback on inaccuracies in documentation. They were immediately fed back to the Team so they were aware should the issue be raised at exhibitions and events. For example, there was an error on the main map where Wenhaston was incorrectly labelled as Westleton, so this was corrected immediately both on the exhibition boards and in the summary documents.</p>	
Consultation Documents	Positive comments about on the quality of the consultation information or documentation.	Positive comments welcomed.	N
Consultation Documents	Specific suggestions for the consultation documentation, for example being transparent in what	The Stage 3 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2016), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC), Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>can change and be influenced, or holding further consultations for longer periods, as all previous rounds of consultation had been over summer months.</p>	<p>The Updated SOCC required the consultation period to run for at least 8 weeks. Stage 3 consultation ran for 12 weeks (4 January 2019 to 29 March 2019).</p> <p>Previous rounds of consultation took place in autumn/winter.</p> <p>SZC Co. made every effort to make it clear within the consultation documents what was being consulted on and how respondents could influence the evolution of the Projects. Feedback from each stage of consultation has influenced the proposals as set out in the Issues Tables at Annexes A, D, G, and J and within Chapters 4, 6, 9 and 10 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>In total, the period of formal public consultation for Sizewell C, taking into account all four statutory stages, was 44.5 weeks.</p> <p>This took place over seven years and informal consultation and community engagement continued throughout the time between formal stages of consultation. Full details of SZC Co.’s approach to consultation are contained within Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Stages	Comments about previous consultation stages, such as how they have been inadequate since concerns raised previously about a lack of detail continued to be raised.	<p>Comments raised in relation to a lack of sufficient detail mainly referred to SZC Co. not having completed the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>Technical work was ongoing throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project. The amount presented at each stage of consultation reflected the stage that the Sizewell C Project was at. Early environmental work was consulted on at Stage 1 within the Environmental Report Supporting Document (Stage 1). At Stage 2, the Consultation Document (Stage 2) contained the technical and preliminary environmental information which was available at that stage of the Sizewell C Project. The Stage 3 consultation went on to include three volumes of Preliminary Environmental Information. Please see Appendices B.5, D.7, E.2, E.3 and E.4 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The DCO application is accompanied by a full EIA – please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p>	N
Consultation Period	Comments about the timing overlapping with other development projects and the short period in	The Stage 3 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2016), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC), Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	which the consultation took place.	<p>In line with the Updated SoCC, SZC Co. sought to avoid overlap with consultations on other projects. Scottish Power Renewables launched their Stage 4 consultation on the location of the substation for the Galloper Wind Farm after SZC Co. had completed all its public exhibitions.</p> <p>The Updated SOCC required the consultation period to run for at least 8 weeks. Stage 3 consultation ran for 12 weeks (4 January 2019 to 29 March 2019).</p>	
Consultation Events	Negative comments about the consultation events, for example that they were not helpful, informative or reassuring and that staff were uninformed.	<p>On the rare occasion that a specific criticism was raised, this was addressed by the team in pre-briefings before each consultation event.</p> <p>SZC Co. selected team members with the specific experience and expertise required to be helpful to the public. Many of the team members were also from the local area and so know the area well.</p> <p>In order to have a fair and independent measure of the quality of the consultation, including literature, exhibition materials and the conduct of staff, SZC Co. commissioned The University of Suffolk to survey people who attended the exhibitions as they left. The aim was to find out about people's experience of the exhibition and consultation – not their views on Sizewell C.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>A total of 291 interviews took place across the exhibition venues. The overall levels of satisfaction with the exhibition boards and with interactions with EDF members of staff have increased, in some cases by a very significant amount, since the Stage 2 Consultation in 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 93% of visitors left feeling ‘much better informed’ or ‘a little better informed’ as a result of the exhibition. • 90% of visitors found information ‘very easy’ or ‘quite easy’ to follow. • 96% of visitors found EDF staff ‘very helpful’ or ‘quite helpful’. 	
Consultation Events	Positive comments about the consultation events including the staff being helpful or the materials presented there clear.	<p>Positive comments welcomed.</p> <p>SZC Co. selected team members with the specific experience and expertise required to be helpful to the public. Many of the team members were also from the local area and so know the area well.</p> <p>In order to have a fair and independent measure of the quality of the consultation, including literature, exhibition materials and the conduct of staff, SZC Co. commissioned The University of Suffolk to survey people who attended the</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>exhibitions as they left. The aim was to find out about people’s experience of the exhibition and consultation – not their views on Sizewell C.</p> <p>A total of 291 interviews took place across the exhibition venues. The overall levels of satisfaction with the exhibition boards and with interactions with EDF members of staff have increased, in some cases by a very significant amount, since the Stage 2 Consultation in 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 93% of visitors left feeling ‘much better informed’ or ‘a little better informed’ as a result of the exhibition. • 90% of visitors found information ‘very easy’ or ‘quite easy’ to follow. • 96% of visitors found EDF staff ‘very helpful’ or ‘quite helpful’. 	
Consultation Period	Suggestion that a further stage of consultation is needed.	<p>Since the Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co.’s team of technical and environmental specialists undertook further work to inform the evolution of the proposals, taking into account the Stage 3 consultation feedback.</p> <p>The updated scheme proposals and options were consulted on at Stage 4 from 18 July 2019 to 27 September 2019.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in Chapter 10 (Stage 4 Consultation) of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Consultation process	Challenging the consultation process by commenting that further assessment in certain areas (or many areas) is needed.	<p>Technical assessment work was ongoing throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The amount presented at each stage of consultation reflected the stage that the Sizewell C Project was at. The Stage 3 consultation included three volumes of Preliminary Environmental Information. Please see Appendices E.2, E.3 and E.4 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The DCO application is accompanied by a full EIA – please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p>	N
Consultation process	Consultation process considered invalid and undemocratic mainly because of the amount of new information presented at this late stage and because the public feel they are not	<p>It is a statutory requirement that SZC Co. must undertake consultation with the public and key stakeholders, and take the feedback received into account. The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) demonstrates that we have fully complied with such requirements in accordance with the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>SZC Co. has been committed to ensuring that the feedback received has informed the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	being/have not been listened to.	As set out in the Stage 1 and 2 Issues Tables, SZC Co. took into account all feedback received at the Stage 1 and 2 consultations, Annexes A and D of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). This feedback, in addition to further technical assessment work, informed the content of the Stage 3 consultation.	
Consultation process	Challenges to the consultation process for being inadequately publicised (including events) or poorly distributed.	<p>The Stage 3 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2016), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC), Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 9 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1), Stage 3 was widely publicised through traditional and social media. Sizewell C Community Forum members, Parish Councils and statutory stakeholders received emails announcing the start of consultation two months prior to its launch on 4 January 2019.</p> <p>Over 40,000 newsletters (increased due to the inclusion of the freight management facility sites) were sent to homes and businesses announcing the consultation and advertising the events.</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		All publicity and activity was undertaken in accordance with the Updated SOCC.	
Consultation process	Challenges to SZC Co.’s willingness to change due to the consultation process and accusations that the public do not really have any influence in the decision making.	<p>As the developer, SZC Co. has the responsibility to consult on its proposals. Adequacy of consultation is a test in the DCO process which SZC Co. has to demonstrate – showing how it responded to the feedback raised by the public.</p> <p>It is a statutory requirement that SZC Co. must undertake consultation with the public and key stakeholders, and take the feedback received into account. The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) demonstrates that we have fully complied with such requirements in accordance with the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>SZC Co. has been committed to ensuring that the feedback received has informed the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>As set out in the Stage 1 and 2 Issues Tables, SZC Co. took into account all feedback received at the Stage 1 and 2 consultations, Annexes A and D of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). This feedback, in addition to further technical assessment work, informed the content of the Stage 3 consultation.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Documents	Positive comments about the consultation process, the quality of the documents provided and comments thanking SZC Co. for the opportunity to respond.	Positive feedback welcomed.	N
Decision Making	Specific requests for more information, such as about the decision-making process and timeline for further stages.	<p>SZC Co. outlined information on the decision-making process in the consultation documents.</p> <p>Page 3 of the ‘Consultation Summary Document’ and Page 10 of the ‘Stage 3 Pre-Application Consultation Document: Volume 1 – Development Proposals’ explained the planning process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). They also signposted to the PINS website for more information on the process, see Appendices E.1 and E.5 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>In July 2019, a newsletter explaining the timescales for the Stage 4 consultation was issued to over 40,000 addresses.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		SZC Co. has also invited PINS to present the next stages of the process (post-submission of the DCO application) to its Autumn/Winter 2019 meeting of the Community Forum.	
Consultation Process	Specific requests for further/ongoing engagement with either themselves or other organisations.	<p>SZC Co. has continued to engage with community groups, local representatives and interested parties throughout the time between formal stages of consultation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has always made clear that members of the Sizewell C Project team would be available to individuals, groups and organisations to discuss the Sizewell C Project on request.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Chapter 11 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N
Consultation Process	Suggestions for the way the consultation process is conducted, for example to be more transparent and engaging and to have a longer period to respond.	<p>It is a statutory requirement that SZC Co. must undertake consultation with the public and key stakeholders, and take the feedback received into account. SZC Co. has been committed to our consultation work being of a high quality and transparent.</p> <p>The Stage 3 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) (November 2016), as agreed with Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC), Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N

edfenergy.com

Building better energy together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>SZC Co. selected team members with the specific experience and expertise required to be helpful to the public. Many of the team members were also from the local area and so know the area well.</p> <p>In order to have a fair and independent measure of the quality of the consultation, including literature, exhibition materials and the conduct of staff, SZC Co. commissioned The University of Suffolk to survey people who attended the exhibitions as they left. The aim was to find out about people’s experience of the exhibition and consultation – not their views on Sizewell C.</p> <p>A total of 291 interviews took place across the exhibition venues. The overall levels of satisfaction with the exhibition boards and with interactions with EDF members of staff have increased, in some cases by a very significant amount, since the Stage 2 Consultation in 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 93% of visitors left feeling ‘much better informed’ or ‘a little better informed’ as a result of the exhibition. • 90% of visitors found information ‘very easy’ or ‘quite easy’ to follow. 	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 96% of visitors found EDF staff ‘very helpful’ or ‘quite helpful’. <p>In terms of the length of the consultation period, the Updated SOCC required the consultation period to run for at least 8 weeks. Stage 3 consultation ran for 12 weeks (4 January 2019 to 29 March 2019).</p>	

b. Main Development Site

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Sites	Suggestions about the main development site proposals in general, including alternative sites and locating it closer to Sizewell A and B.	<p>The Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) presents a description of the site selection process which SZC Co. has undertaken in relation to development on the main development site.</p> <p>The Sizewell C main platform abuts the Sizewell B power station complex, including the need to relocate certain Sizewell B facilities. There is therefore no meaningful ability to locate Sizewell C closer to Sizewell A and B. Further details on the design of Sizewell C in relation to Sizewell A</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		and B are set out in the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).	
Access Road	Suggestions for the new access road, such as combining access to Sizewell B and C.	<p>The Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) presents a description of the site selection process which SZC Co. has undertaken in relation to development on the main development site.</p> <p>The existing Sizewell power station complex access road to Sizewell A and B was not considered to be an option for the primary route to Sizewell C. This is because it would not be able to provide the regular capacity required during both the construction and operational phases, due to its routing past Sizewell B. In addition, the space constraints around the main platform for Sizewell C would limit the opportunity to provide operational car parking adjacent to a southern entrance to the station.</p> <p>There is a regulatory requirement for two separate accesses to the operational power station and the existing Sizewell power station complex access road would provide this secondary access.</p>	N
Access Road	General opposition and concern about	The decision to progress with the option for crossing the Sizewell Marshes SSSI via a causeway over culvert, rather	N

edfenergy.com

Building **better energy** together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the new access road, due to its impact on Sizewell Marshes SSSI.	<p>than a bridge, has been a balanced consideration of a wide range of environmental and construction related considerations.</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) presents a description of the site selection process which SZC Co. has undertaken in relation to development on the main development site. A comparison of the environmental effects is also presented Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Size of Main Site	Concern about the size of the main development site and the project as being too large for the surrounding community and	<p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK's energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. The Government's Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1)</p>	Y



Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>setting, and for proposing two nuclear reactors within 32 hectares.</p>	<p>states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power.</p> <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>The drawings presented at Stage 3, which showed the main development site, indicated the constraints of the site. They also indicated that the power station can be adequately accommodated within the area available. See drawings within 'Stage 3 Pre-Application Consultation Document: Volume 1 – Development Proposals', Appendix E.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>In order to help address concerns with regards to size of the development proposed, every effort was made by SZC Co. to find solutions to limit the development. As such, buildings were deleted and facilities merged within structures to reduce the number of buildings on site. For example the deletion of the EDF Site Office building and the incorporation of these office facilities within the Operational Service Centre. Furthermore, a very significant change was the removal of the Training Centre from the Goose Hill area, by accommodating the essential on-site training facilities within</p>	

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		the Operation Service Centre. This also reduced concerns of further development in the AONB.	
Relocation	Concern about the proposals to relocate some of the Sizewell B facilities to be used for Sizewell C, specifically the impact on Pill Box Field, Coronation Wood and Goose Hill.	<p>Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) records that the proposed development includes measures to retain existing vegetation as far as practicable. This is both within and around the perimeter of the site, to provide visual screening to existing and proposed structures and other elements of the proposals.</p> <p>There will be a loss of 229 mature/semi mature trees predominantly within Coronation Wood. Of these, circa 73% are assessed by the Arboricultural Assessment, which formed part of Town and Country Planning Act application as being category ‘C’ or less, typically comprising plantation trees with limited life expectancy and limited public visual amenity value. This is balanced by the proposed planting of approximately over 2,500 juvenile woodland trees at Pill Box Field, including a mix of broadleaf and coniferous species which are known to tolerate prevailing soil and coastal conditions, including exposure and salinity.</p> <p>Consideration of landscape, visual and protected landscape matters has also informed the planning and design of the proposals and proposed measures to mitigate effects. The</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>assessment of effects considers that these measures have been incorporated. Measures include the location and design of the outage car park in Pillbox Field, including its location north of rising landform and reprofiling of land and new planting. An assessment of the effects on the siting of the pillbox on Pillbox Field is presented in Chapter 16 (Terrestrial Historic Environment) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref 6.3). The assessment concludes that the effect of the proposed development would give rise to minor adverse effects, which is not significant and appropriate mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>Relocation of Sizewell B facilities does not relate to Goose Hill.</p>	
Site Location	Challenging the chosen location of Sizewell C as being unsuitable for several reasons, including proximity to designated areas and local communities.	<p>NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6 were formally designated in July 2011. As well as setting out the important need case for new electricity generation, EN-1 also provides policy for the assessment of generic effects of energy projects. EN-6 provides additional policy for the assessment of those effects and identifies eight potential sites for delivery of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>Sizewell C has been identified as a potential site for the delivery of a new nuclear power station; the principle of</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>development at Sizewell is therefore accepted by Parliament.</p> <p>In developing the proposals for a Sizewell C however, SZC Co. has considered potential for impacts on the surrounding environment, including designated areas and local communities and sought to avoid or minimise impacts as far as reasonably possible, and where this is not, SZC Co. has sought to compensate significant impacts. Full details are set out throughout the ES chapters (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p>	

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	Concern about the overall impact of the environment of the project as a whole, and the severity and long-term nature of the damage.	<p>An extensive and detailed assessment of the environmental effects of the Project has been undertaken in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations 2017).</p> <p>This assessment is reported in Volumes 1-10 of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) which presents the assessment of impacts for the main development site and the off-site associated developments, as well as project wide effects and cumulative</p>	N

edfenergy.com

Building better energy together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>effects with other projects. The assessment considers the construction, operational and decommissioning impacts of the Sizewell C Project, including any impacts associated with the removal and reinstatement of associated development sites.</p> <p>Where significant effects have been identified, measures are proposed to mitigate or compensate.</p>	
Environmental Assessment	Specific requests for more environmental information or assessment to be taken, such as assessing the impacts on designated areas.	<p>Volumes 1-10 of the ES (Doc Ref Book 6) submitted with the DCO application provides details on the assessment of potential impacts on designated areas relevant to each element of the proposed development. The ecological designations are defined within the Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology chapter of each volume and similarly the landscape designations are defined within the Landscape and Visual chapter of each volume.</p> <p>In addition, the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) report (Doc Ref. 5.10), presents the assessment of the effects on European protected sites.</p>	N
Environmental Impact	General concerns about the environmental impact of construction as a result of the number of HGV's in the area	<p>Stage 3 Consultation provided Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) (Doc Ref. 5.1), Appendices E.2, E.3 and E.4, on the potential significant impacts associated with proposed road-led and rail-led strategies. This included impact associated with traffic movements, as well as the potential impacts that would arise from the construction and operation of the associated developments for each of the strategies.</p>	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	and the workforce, without specifying what type of impact they expect that will produce.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) submitted with the DCO application present the assessment of impacts arising from the construction and operational traffic, including freight (HGV) and workforce traffic, and the associated impact from traffic noise and emissions. The traffic model and the assessment methods have been developed in consultation with SCC and/or ESC as appropriate, to ensure that all impacts are appropriately mitigated.	
Environmental Mitigation	Comments that stress the importance of mitigation to reduce the impact on the environment and concerns that proposed environmental mitigation is insufficient for example SZC Co. saying they will ‘take into account’ the need to mitigate is	<p>SZC Co. recognise the importance of mitigation to avoid or minimise impacts from the Sizewell C Project. The Environmental Impact Assessment process is an iterative process with the development of the project proposals. Where impacts have been identified, SZC Co. have sought to mitigate the impacts through the design or through the proposals of additional management measures and controls. These are identified throughout the Environmental Statement as primary, secondary or tertiary measures which will be secured through the DCO process via the most appropriate means, for example through Requirements.</p> <p>The full scale and details of the mitigation, or in some cases, compensation could not be defined until the assessment work</p>	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	not the same as actively doing so.	<p>has completed and therefore could not be fully detailed at Stage 3; but an indication of likely measures were identified.</p> <p>It should be recognised that prior to the submission of the DCO application SZC Co. has advanced some mitigation and compensation works, including the development of wetland habitat as part of the Aldhurst Farm Habitat Creation Scheme to compensation for the potential loss of wetland habitat within Sizewell Marshes SSSI. SZC Co. has also created reptile habitats, for the future translocation of reptiles from the main development site, and advanced planting in areas around the site to help screen the development in the future, should development consent be granted.</p>	
Environmental Mitigation	Suggestions about how to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the environment, for example wildlife protection, protection of rare species, visual mitigation, and	<p>Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) defines measures which will help mitigate the impacts of the development. Measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 67ha habitat creation area at Aldhurst Farm, just west of Lovers Lane, which provides reed-bed and ditch habitats to compensate for losses of these habitats associated with the new power station platform • Creating off-site habitat compensation areas to create fen meadow habitats and to provide additional habitat for marsh harriers, which might be dissuaded from hunting across the EDF Estate during construction 	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>protection for the AONB.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing mitigation strategies for protected species, such as reptiles, water voles and badgers to ensure that individuals are not killed during construction and populations are sustained across the SZC Co. estate over the long-term • Carefully screening the boundaries of the site, with bunds and hoarding and also making use of natural topography and vegetation including woodland blocks and mature hedgerows to contain the construction site and screen it as much as possible from external views • In the longer-term the operational masterplan will establish extensive areas of acid grassland, characteristic of the Suffolk Sandlings, using the approaches summarised in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) across the SZC Co. estate; • The finish and colour of the larger buildings will be informed by local planning guidance on the use of colour developed by the AONB partnership, to enable the landscape effects on the AONB to be minimised 	
Stakeholders	<p>Suggestion that EDF work with local experts and specific groups to better</p>	<p>Throughout the pre-application stage of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has actively engaged with a range of statutory and non-statutory consultees.</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>understand the nature of potential environmental impacts on the local area, and for them to help mitigate against these impacts e.g. RSPB, Natural England and National Trust.</p>	<p>The experience and local knowledge of many of the consultees has helped inform the evolving development proposals, the scope and approach to the environmental assessments and the mitigation and compensation proposals. Consultees include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SCC and ESC - The Marine Management Organisation - The Environment Agency - Natural England - Historic England - The RSPB - The Suffolk Wildlife Trust. - The National Trust - The Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - The Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation - The New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership <p>Further details are contained within the relevant chapters of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p>	
Environmental Impact	<p>Concern about the environmental impact of the campus and caravan site, many mentioning the</p>	<p>SZC Co. has consulted on a number of options for the campus, and also the proposals for the caravan site. A factor in the location of the campus is that it would reduce workforce traffic commuting daily to site and also provide project efficiencies.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	siting on greenfield land, proximity to wildlife and pollution.	<p>The decision on the final options and proposals has considered the potential environmental impacts, and where necessary mitigation measures are proposed.</p> <p>The campus or caravan site alone, are not considered to have any significant impacts.</p> <p>Full details are provided in the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Environmental Impact	Concern about the general impact on the environment arising from the overall park and ride proposals, including light pollution and damage to the landscapes.	<p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Northern and Southern Park and Ride proposals has been undertaken and is reported in Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4-6.5). Specifically the impact on the landscape, a visual effects of the proposed lighting are assessed and presented in Chapters 6 of Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES. The assessment considers the potential construction, operation and removal and reinstatement impacts of the developments.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed. This includes the implementation of a Code of Construction Practice to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution, as well as other measures such a lighting strategy which seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety standards. In addition, landscaping</p>	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		and buffer zones are proposed to protect receptors and screen the development.	
Environmental Impact	Concerns about environmental impact of the new access road such as impact on wildlife and impact of the crossing of Sizewell Marshes SSSI.	<p>The potential environmental impacts of the new access road, including upon on wildlife and the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, have been fully assessed by SZC Co.. This assessment is set out within Chapter 14 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The impacts on wildlife and the potential for severance of the new access road and the SSSI Crossing in particular will be minimised by ensuring the culvert is suitably sized to retain the existing bank sides and bed substrates. It is acknowledged that vegetation would be lost overtime in the central part of the culvert due to shading.</p> <p>The slopes of the embankment would be planted with native shrubs to soften the entrances to the culvert and also to strengthen the connectivity of habitats to the north and south of the crossing, particularly for bats.</p> <p>Hydrological modelling does not predict significant effects, either on groundwater or surface water, from the SSSI crossing.</p>	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Noise and Vibration	Concern about the impact of noise and vibration on people and wildlife, and the feeling that not enough is being done to mitigate these impacts from the Main Development Site, or from the accommodation sites.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact of noise from the Sizewell C Project. Chapter 11 (Noise and vibration) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes an assessment of noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment for the main development site considers the impact on ecological receptors, including bats and birds, as well as residential and other sensitive receptors such as users of public rights of way, or Leiston Abbey.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified in the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6), and includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boundary treatments, including acoustic fences and landscape bunds to screen impacts; - Construction noise management and monitoring measures to control impacts arising from construction activities; and - Provision of new foraging land for marsh harriers that may be affected by noise generated from the main development site construction. <p>Where significant noise impacts cannot be readily mitigated, SZC Co. has identified compensation where appropriate. Further details are contained within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Air Quality			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Air Quality	Concerns about the negative impact on air quality, especially from vehicle pollution.	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact on air quality from the Sizewell C Project, including from vehicle pollution, and dust and emissions impacts during the construction phase.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Air Quality) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes the assessment of air quality impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network. The air quality, and associated impact assessments considers the impact on residential receptors as well as ecological receptors, including surrounding habitats (Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology)), and users of public rights of way and and Amenity and recreation (Chapter 15 (Amenity and recreation)).</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified and are detailed in the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6). No significant effects are predicted to arise from vehicle emissions.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Visual Impact	Concern about the visual impact of construction infrastructure and of the development itself on the coastal landscape.	<p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and together with Chapter 3.10 (Nuclear Impact: Landscape and Visual Impacts) of NPS EN-6, it recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in this regard in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Landscape and visual) Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) assesses the landscape and visual impact of the Sizewell C Project in detail. It defines measures which will help mitigate the impacts of the development. Measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carefully screening the boundaries of the site, with bunds and hoarding and also making use of natural topography and vegetation including woodland blocks and mature hedgerows to contain the construction site and screen it as much as possible from external views. • In the longer-term, the operational masterplan will establish extensive areas of acid grassland, characteristic of the Suffolk Sandlings, using the 	N

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>approaches summarised in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) across the SZC Co. estate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new coastal sea defences would support vegetation characteristic of coastal dunes and grasslands using seeds and surface sands sourced from these areas cleared during construction. • The finish and colour of the larger buildings will be informed by local planning guidance on the use of colour developed by the AONB partnership, to enable the landscape effects on the AONB to be minimised. <p>The ES acknowledges that there would be some significant adverse effects on landscape character of the AONB arising as a result of the development although the effects have been minimised as far as possible. The Sizewell C Project is therefore considered appropriate in this regard, and in the context of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6.</p>	
Visual Impact	Concern about the proposals for overhead pylons and the subsequent visual impact, as opposed to underground power	Overhead pylons, as opposed to underground power transmission, are proposed following consideration of a range of alternatives. The Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) presents a description of the site selection process which SZC Co. has undertaken in relation to development on the main development site, including the approach taken for overhead power lined.	N

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>transmission as proposed in the Stage 2 consultation.</p>	<p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and together with Chapter 3.10 (Nuclear Impact: Landscape and Visual Impacts) of NPS EN-6, it recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in this regard in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites.</p> <p>Chapter 13 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) assesses the landscape and visual impact of the Sizewell C Project, including the impact of the overhead pylons, in detail.</p> <p>It acknowledges that there would be some significant adverse effects on landscape character of the AONB arising as a result of the development, including the overhead pylons, although the effects have been minimized as far as possible. The Project is therefore considered appropriate in this regard, and in the context of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6.</p>	

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Design	<p>Concern about visual impact and negative effects on the landscape of the accommodation including its height and design, particularly on the AONB.</p>	<p>At Stage 3, the accommodation buildings were proposed to be 3-4 storeys (up to 14m) in height.</p> <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and together with Chapter 3.10 (Nuclear Impact: Landscape and Visual Impacts) of NPS EN-6, it recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in this regard in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites.</p> <p>Chapter 13 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) assesses the landscape and visual impact of the Sizewell C Project, including the campus, in detail.</p> <p>The ES acknowledges that there would be some significant adverse effects on landscape character of the AONB arising as a result of the development, including the campus, although the effects have been minimized as far as possible.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The effects on the AONB are minimised by restricting accommodation blocks to four storeys in height (three storeys along western edge), strengthening the hedgerow planting along the eastern side of Eastbridge Road to screen the campus and by minimising lighting spill. The Project is therefore considered appropriate in this regard, and in the context of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6.	
Impact on Designated Areas	Concerns about the impact of the proposed development on specific designated areas such as Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, Sizewell Marshes SSSI and Minsmere Reserve.	<p>The impact on the AONB has been minimised as far as possible by setting the construction area as sensitively as possible within the retained landscape, using natural screening of the landform and retained woodland and hedges supplemented by a high quality approach to boundary treatments.</p> <p>In the longer-term the impacts would be minimised by the measures defined in the operational masterplan and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) which will establish extensive areas of acid grassland, characteristic of the Suffolk Sandlings, across former arable areas of the SZC Co. estate. The finish and colour of the larger buildings will be informed by local planning guidance on the use of colour developed by the AONB partnership, to enable the landscape effects on the AONB to be minimised</p> <p>The impacts on the SSSI have been minimised as far as possible through the advanced creation of replacement habitats</p>	N

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>at Aldhurst Farm, through the offsite creation of fen meadow habitats, by minimising the impacts of the SSSI crossing and well as by protected species translocations, particularly for water voles.</p> <p>The impacts on Minsmere will be limited in part by the distance of the development to most of the reserve, but also by specific measures to address possible impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of surface water levels during construction though use of control structures on the Leiston drain • The use of a 5m noise barrier along the northern edge of the construction area to minimise noise spill to the north and to screen the construction site from long-range views from Minsmere to the north • The creation of on-site and off-site habitats for hunting Marsh Harriers, to support the Minsmere population during construction if they forage less over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI • Monitoring of any increase in visitor numbers to the outer part of the Minsmere reserve in response to ‘recreational displacement’ from Sizewell and measures to mitigate possible increased disturbance. 	

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Overall, with the proposed mitigation measures, the proposals are considered to be appropriate with regard to the impact upon these designated areas. Further details are contained within Chapters 13 (Landscape and visual) and Chapter 14 (Terrestrial ecology and ornithology) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Light Pollution	Concern about the impact of light pollution on people and wildlife, including impact on the ‘dark sky’ designation, including concern over 24-hour working at the main site.	<p>The landscape and visual impact of the development, including the impacts on dark skies and the interface with lighting are assessed in detail within Chapter 13 (Landscape and visual) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The assessments are informed by a Lighting Management Plan appended to Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES(Doc Ref. 6.3) (Description of the permanent development) which was prepared following the Stage 3 consultation for both the construction and operational phases. It states that 24-hour working would be limited to large scale concrete pours and steel erections, which cannot be completed in a single working day. Lighting would be required in the relevant parts of the site during these events.</p> <p>The LMP sets measures, which when implemented, would minimise light spill from the development. With the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Project is considered appropriate in this regard.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Light Pollution	Concern about the impact of light pollution from the accommodation on people and wildlife.	<p>The landscape and visual impact of the development, including the impact of light pollution from the proposed accommodation on wildlife are assessed in detail within Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) and Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Both assessments are informed by a Lighting Management Plan appended to Chapter 2 of Volume 2 of the ES, which has been prepared for both the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>The LMP sets measures, which when implemented, would minimise light spill from the development. These measures include minimising light spill to adjacent areas (for example to minimise impacts on bats). With the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Project is considered appropriate in this regard.</p>	N

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Ecology	Concerns about the impact of the development on ecology and wildlife,	The impacts of the development on ecology and wildlife, including protected species and marine ecology are assessed in detail in Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and	N

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	including protected species, birds in Minsmere Reserve, habitats, marine ecology etc.	<p>Ornithology) and Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology) of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> <p>A range of mitigation and compensation measures are proposed to minimise the effects on both habitats and species. These include the advanced creation of replacement habitats at Aldhurst Farm, offsite creation of fen meadow habitats and protected species translocations.</p> <p>More specifically, the impacts on Minsmere will be limited in part by the distance of the development to most of the reserve, but also by specific measures to address possible impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of surface water levels during construction though use of control structures on the Leiston drain. • The use of a 5m noise barrier along the northern edge of the construction area to minimise noise spill to the north and to screen the construction site from long-range views from Minsmere to the north. • The creation of on-site and off-site habitats for hunting Marsh Harriers, to support the Minsmere population during construction if they forage less over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. 	

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of any increase in visitor numbers to the outer part of the Minsmere reserve in response to ‘recreational displacement’ from Sizewell and measures to mitigate possible increases. <p>Overall, with the proposed mitigation measures, the proposals are considered to be appropriate with regard to the impact upon these designated areas. Further details are contained within the abovementioned chapters of the ES.</p>	

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Infrastructure	Comments and concerns about impacts, including severance and closure, on footpaths/public rights of way (PRoW) and bridleways.	<p>SZC Co. have sought to minimize the impacts of the Project on amenity and recreation, including footpaths. The impacts in this regard are assessed in detail in Chapter 15 (Amenity and Recreation) of Volume 2 of the ES and within the Recreational Strategy appended to the ES.</p> <p>A range of mitigation proposals are set out in the ES to minimise the effects on PROW users including diversion proposals and enhancements in the local area, such as within the Kenton Hills car park.</p>	Y

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

Theme: Historic Environment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Heritage Assets	Concerns about the impact of the	SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the project, including on	Y

Theme: Historic Environment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>proposals on heritage assets, such as listed buildings and archaeological remains including Leiston Abbey or Farnham Hall.</p>	<p>designated heritage assets such as Leiston Abbey and Farnham Hall.</p> <p>Where possible, impacts are proposed to be avoided or reduced by design or by embedded mitigation measures such as screening. Where required, additional mitigation will take the form of agreed schemes of archaeological investigation of s106 commitments.</p> <p>For Leiston Abbey, impacts are proposed to be reduced through retention of established vegetation and appropriate landscape proposals, as well as best practice noise mitigation measures. Additional mitigation would also be provided in the form of a Section 106 agreement to provide for enhancements to the visitor experience to allow perceptual aspects on the assets to be better appreciated.</p> <p>For Farnham Hall, significant residual impacts would be avoided through standard code of construction practice measures to limit noise disturbance; retention of existing vegetation where possible and woodland planting along the western side of the cutting as the route passes Farnham Hall to provide visual screening. An overbridge would also be</p>	



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Historic Environment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>provided across the route to maintain connectivity with Foxburrow Wood.</p> <p>Following Stage 3, further archaeological evaluation has been carried out including archaeological geophysical survey and trial trenching. This scope of this was agreed with SCC Archaeological Service who also monitored the fieldwork.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (Preservation by Record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified to date.</p> <p>Please see the historic environment chapters of the ES (Chapters 16 and 23 of Volume 2 and Chapter 9 of Volumes 3-9) for full details (Doc Ref. 6.3-6.10).</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Hydrological Processes	<p>Concerns about the impact on hydrological processes, waterbodies (including lakes and rivers but not the sea), drainage, water discharge and flood risk. Often this concern stems from pollutants entering the water table from the filled in quarry pits.</p>	<p>SZC Co. has carried out a number of assessments in relation to groundwater, surface water, drainage and borrow pit infill. We recognise the potential for the main development and associated development sites to impact on the hydrological and hydrogeological regimes, through the introduction of buildings, hardstanding, drainage infrastructure, materials handling and infill, often within floodplains, in proximity to watercourses and adjacent to sensitive ecological receptor sites. Impacts could include the effects on water quantity, flow, location and quality, and over time.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) relating to flood risk adaptation and mitigation was consulted on at Stage 3 (see Doc 5.5, Appendices E.2, E.3 and E.4). Chapter 19 (Groundwater and surface water) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) provides full details of the proposed approach to flood adaptation and mitigation, and demonstrates that the Sizewell C Project is appropriate in this regard.</p> <p>Further information, including mitigation, is presented in the Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 2, Chapter 2, Appendix 2A of the ES), the Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 5.2) and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	N

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Coastal Processes	Concerns about the impact of the development of coastal processes, such as costal erosion, and concerns about the possible impact coastal processes will have on the development, for example sea level rises will endanger the full site.	<p>SZC Co. have performed a significant amount of modelling of coastal processes to assess the impact of the sea defences, to ensure they are sufficiently robust and resilient to climate change to protect the power station. This has included using expert judgement from independent specialist on how this part of the Suffolk coast might evolve naturally over the next 100 years.</p> <p>The design of the proposed ‘hard coastal defence feature’ (hCDF) allows for a further 4m height to be added should sea level rise be greater or faster than currently predicted. We need to be confident that the power station is sufficiently protected for safety reasons</p> <p>Our assessments show that the presence of the sea defences will have no impact on coastal processes apart from reducing erosion at the northern end of the site (which is not predicted to have any effects further afield).</p> <p>The coastal defences will have no impact on ecology. Full details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) and Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology and Fisheries) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Beach Landing Facility	Any comments, concerns and suggestions about	The Beach Landing Facility (BLF) has been designed with a small number of vertical piles and a removable road/bridge section. This is so that when not in use it is discrete in terms of	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>the beach landing facility, such as impacts on marine ecology and coastal processes.</p>	<p>both its visual appearance and environmental impacts, while still providing an important facility for delivery of very large items to site. When not in use, only the piles will remain in situ and apart from some very localised scour around those piles, which is not significant from an environmental perspective, will have no impact.</p> <p>When the BLF is in use, only occasionally during operation of the power station (once every 5 years or so during outages) but more frequently during the construction phase, the road/bridge bed will be in place, however, this will not cause any environmental impacts.</p> <p>To allow the barges to dock at the BLF some small scale dredging for the approaches will be required but again apart from some very localised changes in the local bathymetry (depth and formation of the seabed), no significant environmental impacts will occur.</p> <p>The presence of the BLF, and associated maintenance dredging of the approaches to allow deliveries, is not predicted to have any influence on coastal processes, either locally or further afield.</p> <p>When deliveries are being made, it is expected that there will be a short period when access across the beach at this point will be</p>	

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>restricted for safety reasons (while vehicles are moving across the BLF and access road) however such periods would be minimised as much as possible, with banksmen on the shore to guide the public.</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Marine Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Marine Ecology	<p>Concerns about the proposed rock armour defence (e.g. that it is inadequate and may be undermined by the sea, so should go below the water line) and impact on marine ecology and coastal processes.</p>	<p>Studies and detailed design of the rock armour defence (the ‘hard coastal defence feature’; hCDF) were ongoing following Stage 3. This was to ensure that it is sufficiently robust to withstand the environment and protect the station from coastal events throughout the operational life of the power station and beyond into the decommissioning period.</p> <p>The design presented at Stage 3 was the basic design and provided to illustrate the concept and general appearance of the hCDF.</p> <p>Following Stage 3, SZC Co. appointed the contractor for the project enabling works to allow the detailed design of the hCDF to be progressed and completed. As part of the detailed design process</p>	Y

Theme: Marine Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the engineers use studies that have modelled the likely scour and erosion along the SZC frontage under severe conditions taking into account climate change and associated sea-level rise and increased storminess.</p> <p>The sedimentary (sandy) defence feature (the ‘soft coastal defence feature’; sCDF) that will be placed seaward of the hCDF is designed to be sacrificial and erode during such storms, providing protection of the hCDF behind it. Erosion of the sCDF will also provide sediment into the local sediment system and help maintain the shoreline position locally. SZC Co. will mitigate the loss of material from the sCDF by ‘recharging’ it with additional sediment.</p> <p>SZC Co. have performed a significant amount of modelling of coastal processes to assess the impact of the sea defences, to ensure they are sufficiently robust and resilient to climate change to protect the power station. This has included using expert judgement from independent specialist on how this part of the Suffolk coast might evolve naturally over the next 100 years.</p> <p>The design of the hCDF allows for a further 4m height to be added should sea level rise be greater or faster than currently predicted. We need to be confident that the power station is sufficiently protected for safety reasons</p>	

Theme: Marine Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Our assessments show that the presence of the sea defences will have no impact on coastal processes apart from reducing erosion at the northern end of the site (which is not predicted to have any effects further afield).</p> <p>The coastal defences will have no impact on ecology. Full details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) and Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology and Fisheries) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Marine Ecology	Concerns about lack of detail relating to impacts on protected aquatic species and proposed mitigation.	<p>Adverse effects on marine ecology and fisheries would be not significant during both the construction and operational phases, as set out in Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology and Fisheries) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Additional mitigation measures to achieve this outcome include Low Velocity, Side Entry intake heads to minimise the number of fish entrapped in the cooling system, a Fish Recovery and Return (FRR) system, comprising one FRR tunnel per unit, to recover entrapped fish and return as many to sea as possible unharmed and a Marine Mammals Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) to minimise effects of underwater sound from specific construction activities, such as piling.</p>	N

Theme: Marine Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Details of project alternatives that were considered and do not form part of this application, such as Acoustic Fish Deterrents (AFDs) and other forms of biota exclusion technology, are set out in Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).	

Theme: Climate Change			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Carbon Emissions	Concerns about the carbon emissions and/or climate change impact of the proposed development. Challenges to the claim that the project is 'low-carbon'.	<p>It is well understood that both concrete production and steel manufacture make up the vast majority of carbon emissions as a result of the high amount of energy required for their production. These areas, together with fuel fabrication, are by far the highest throughout the entire life-cycle analysis which also includes operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>Sizewell C will be the same design as Hinkley Point C. From a full lifecycle perspective, the greenhouse gas emissions associated with 1 kWh of electricity generated from Hinkley Point C are calculated to be 4.75 g CO₂e/kWh.</p> <p>The CO₂ emissions from Hinkley Point C are small when compared with the emissions of CO₂ from a typical UK coal plant of around 900 g/kWh, based upon the operational stage</p>	N

Theme: Climate Change			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>alone. Typical emissions from a gas-fired CCGT plant are around 490 g/kWh. They are also comparable with offshore wind, which is around 5g CO2e/kWh.</p> <p>EDF recognise the concerns held regarding the impact on the environment during construction. The EIA Regulations 2017 require that the Environmental Statement details the nature and quantity of the construction materials and natural resources (including water, land, soil and biodiversity) used.</p> <p>The descriptions of development for the main development site and the associated development sites provide details of materials types and quantities required during construction.</p> <p>Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of construction-related impacts arising from the use, including the effects arising from climate change.</p>	

c. Northern Park & Ride at Darsham

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Light Pollution	Concerns about the northern park and ride proposals, including the effect of increased traffic on Darsham, the impact on the dark skies designation and impact on the Darsham community.	<p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Northern Park and Ride at Darsham has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 3 of the ES. The assessment considers the potential construction, operation and removal and reinstatement impacts of the development.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed. This includes the implementation of a Code of Construction Practice to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution. In addition, landscaping and buffer zones are proposed to protect receptors and screen the development.</p>	N
Further Information	Request for more information about the northern park and ride proposals, including more information about what will happen to the site post-construction	Chapter 2 of Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4) provides a description of the proposed development and explains how the site would be used. This chapter confirms that once the need for the park and ride facility has ceased, the buildings and associated infrastructure, would be removed in accordance with a demolition and restoration plan. This would maximise the potential for re-use of building modules and materials. When the site has been cleared, the area would be returned to agricultural use.	N

d. Southern Park & Ride at Wickham Market

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Southern Park and Ride Criteria	Comments suggesting certain criteria need to be met, in order for respondents to support the proposals for the Southern Park & Ride, such as if residents of Wickham Market supported it, or as long as no Sizewell traffic used the A1120 to Earl Soham.	<p>The southern park and ride proposals have been assessed using several criteria. These are explained below:</p> <p>Locational requirements - the geographic distribution of the workforce estimated by the gravity modelling work supports two park and ride developments to help reduce traffic from construction workforce movements. One is needed to intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the south, and one is needed to intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the north. Both park and ride developments would intercept traffic movements from locations west of the A12. The purpose of both park and ride sites remains to reduce construction worker traffic on the A12 between the two park and ride sites and on the B1122 between Yoxford and the construction site, including at Theberton and Middleton Moor. The southern park and ride would reduce these flows through Snape and Tunstall on the B1069, Leiston and surrounding settlements. The proposed park and ride sites at Wickham Market and Darsham are considered the most suitable sites to mitigate transport impacts.</p> <p>Operational requirements - the southern park and ride site would need to be able to provide for up to 1,250 car parking</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>spaces to meet the Project’s needs as well as space to provide associated buildings and structures to facilitate the site’s use (e.g. amenity and welfare building for us by workers).</p> <p>Planning policy – consideration of how the site fits with local plan objectives and any relevant site allocations on the local plan Policies Map.</p> <p>Land availability – consideration as to whether the land is available for use, for example, whether planning permission has already been granted for a conflicting use on the site.</p> <p>A further consideration was also the outcomes of the environmental assessment process and consultation feedback to avoid significant environmental effects where possible, and where this is not possible, to mitigate and manage any remaining effects.</p> <p>For further details please refer to Chapter 3 of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Southern Park and Ride Mitigation	Suggested alternatives for the southern park and	Following feedback from the community, there has been further consideration of how to minimise delays to through traffic in and around Wickham Market. As well as the two	Y

edfenergy.com

Building better energy together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>ride mitigation, including alternative mitigation diversion routes deemed more suitable by councils, or traffic calming measures</p>	<p>options presented at Stage 3, namely a) the temporary removal of on-street parking on the B1078 or b) a diversion route (with associated highway improvements) via Valley Road and Easton Road, a further option has been explored.</p> <p>The alternative option included working with the Parish Council to bring forward a public realm improvement scheme within the public highway which would represent the first phase of the implementation of the Wickham Market Neighbourhood Plan. This would consider footway and pedestrian crossing provision as well as the optimal location of on-street parking to meet parking demand.</p> <p>This alternative option was consulted on at Stage 4 and is anticipated to be agreed through the Section 106 Agreement. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Chapter 3 of Volume 4 of the ES.</p>	
Mitigation Measures	<p>Concerns about the mitigation proposals, including concerns about the removal of on-street parking and insufficiency in</p>	<p>Concern over delays, increased traffic and the need for junction improvements through Wickham Market have been addressed through engagement with the Parish Council to bring forward a public realm improvement scheme within the public highway representing the first phase of the implementation of the Wickham Market Neighbourhood Plan proposals (rather than temporarily removing on-street parking</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	accommodating traffic movements	<p>on the B1078 or constructing a diversion route via Valley Road and Easton Road). These improvements are proposed to be brought forward as part of the Section 106 Agreement under the DCO submission.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Chapter 3 of Volume 4 of the ES.</p>	
Mitigation Measures	Concerns about the mitigation proposals, especially the unsuitability of Glevering Bridge, the potential to exacerbate the situation and associated dangers.	<p>Development of the highway, pedestrian and cycleway improvements to meet the objectives of the draft Wickham Market Neighbourhood Plan removes the need for a diversion route and the use of Glevering Bridge would not be required.</p> <p>The proposed diversion route would rely on narrow roads which would require enhancements of their own only to serve a temporary diversion. The option of improving the public realm in Wickham Market itself has the benefit of creating long-lasting, permanent benefits for the residents of the village whilst also helping to reduce the impact of traffic through the village during construction of Sizewell C.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Volume 4 of the ES.</p>	N
Environmental Impacts	Concerns about the southern park and	An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market has been undertaken and	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	ride proposals, including environmental and pollution impacts, negative effects of increased traffic on the community and the insufficiency of the mitigation proposals against these impacts.	<p>is reported in Volume 4 of the ES. The assessment considers the potential construction, operation and removal and reinstatement impacts of the development.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed. This includes the implementation of a CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution. In addition, landscaping and buffer zones are proposed to protect receptors and screen the development.</p>	
Southern Park and Ride Proposals	Comments in support of the overall southern park and ride proposals and mitigation options, in reducing traffic particularly on the A12., but some requesting that the site be fully restored post-construction	<p>Chapter 2 of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5) provides a description of the proposed development and confirms that once the need for the park and ride facility has ceased, the buildings and associated infrastructure would be removed in accordance with a demolition and restoration plan. This would maximise the potential for re-use of building modules and materials. When the site has been cleared, the area would be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>If the proposed cycle and footway enhancements through Wickham Market are developed, in consultation with the Parish Council and East Suffolk and Suffolk County Councils, in accordance with the objectives of the draft Wickham Market Neighbourhood Plan, the scheme would provide a legacy</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		benefit to Wickham Market, providing permanent long-term improvements to pedestrian and vehicle movements in the village.	

e. Two-Village Bypass

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Traffic Flow	Support for the proposed two-village bypass to improve traffic flow and reduce impact on Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew.	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the two-village bypass of Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham. The proposals for the two-village bypass have been shaped by a number of considerations, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a narrowing of the road and tight bend in the A12 within the historic centre of Farnham, which slows traffic significantly and creates potential conflicts when two large vehicles travelling in opposite directions meet at the bend; • a locally perceived highway safety issue at the bend, particularly when two large vehicles pass each other at the bend; and • the impact on amenity in Farnham due to the scale of traffic flows on the A12 and the immediate proximity of traffic to the frontage of properties. 	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in Volume 5 (Two Village Bypass) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Further Information	Request for more information about the proposed two-village bypass, such as more detailed information about noise and air pollution, species mitigation and ecological assessment	<p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Two village bypass has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 5 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6). The assessment considers the potential construction and operational impacts of the development.</p> <p>The route and design has sought to minimise land-take and the impact on the surrounding environment, including impacts on landscape, heritage and ecological features, noise and emissions impacts on residential properties, and pedestrian amenity.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed, including the implementation of a CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution, as well as other measures such the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors and screen the development. It is also proposed to develop a lighting strategy which seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety standards. Full</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		details can be found in Chapters 3 to 12 of Volume 5 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Re-routing East of Foxborrow Wood	Suggestions for the proposed two-village bypass, such as re-routing it to the east of Foxborrow Wood and specific mitigation suggestions such as planting of trees to screen the road from view	<p>SZC Co. have considered options for the alignment of the bypass. Full details of the options assessed are contained within the Site Selection Report appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>The alignment of the proposed two-village bypass has been carefully designed to avoid Foxborrow Wood (a designated Ancient Woodland) and be located as far away as possible from residential properties in the vicinity of the route. Planting is also proposed on the east side of the proposed Foxburrow Wood footbridge, adjacent to Foxburrow Wood and Farnham Hall Farmhouse to provide visual screening and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>Further details are contained in Volume 5 (Two Village Bypass) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6), Chapter 6 of which deals with Landscape and Visual matters.</p>	N
Congestion	Concerns about the proposals for the two-village bypass, including its inadequacy in preventing	As set out at Stage 3 consultation, there are no highway capacity issues with the A12 in three of the villages but there may be a capacity issue at Farnham bend. This is due to the narrowing of the road compounded by the tight radius of the bend in the immediate proximity of adjacent properties.	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	congestion problems on the A12 and environmental impacts from construction and traffic.	<p>The broad requirement for the two-village bypass was therefore to mitigate the impacts of traffic travelling to and from the main development site on the A12 around the Farnham bend.</p> <p>Further information on the transport impacts are set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the environmental impact assessment is contained in Volume 5 (Two Village Bypass) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Little Glemham and Marlesford	Suggested alternative to the proposed ‘two-village bypass’, to include Little Glemham and Marlesford, suggesting this could be a positive legacy of the	<p>At Stage 3, road improvements to the A12 were proposed. This comprised a bypass of both Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew (a two village bypass), with design changes predominantly aimed at reducing environmental impacts.</p> <p>Traffic associated with Sizewell C will increase traffic levels along the A12 throughout the construction phase. The estimated daily increase in all vehicle traffic at Farnham would be approximately 7% in the Early Years of Sizewell C construction. Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) would make up the majority of this traffic increase. The increases in traffic</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	Sizewell C construction.	<p>volume and HGV proportion would make congestion at Farnham bend and on the approaches more likely during Sizewell C construction due to the narrowing of the road.</p> <p>EDF can only take land required to provide mitigation for the impacts of the Sizewell C Project, with any additional land-take requiring sufficient justification. The broad requirements for the highway improvement works are to seek to mitigate the impacts of traffic travelling to and from the Main Development Site on the A12 around the Farnham bend. As such, there is little justification to warrant a bypass for Little Glemham and Marlesford. It would be a disproportionate intervention to mitigate the effects of Sizewell C traffic and could not be included as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Furthermore, a four village bypass would also have significant adverse environmental impacts that could not be justified given the potential impact is around the Farnham bend only. Further information is contained within Chapter 2 (Alternatives and design evolution) of Volume 5 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	
Environmental Impacts	Opposition to the suggested 'four-village bypass' as being unnecessary	The Transport Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.5) aims to minimise the impact of traffic associated with the construction of Sizewell C on the road network. Nevertheless, the temporary increase in journeys on the network in some cases justifies specific	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>or damaging environmentally.</p>	<p>mitigation to relieve potential problems at particular locations. The works proposed at points on the highway network are where they are considered necessary for highway safety and/or highway capacity reasons.</p> <p>A detailed technical study was undertaken by SCC in 2006 (A12 Four Villages Study which looked at a number of bypass alignments.</p> <p>The 2006 study also looked at a four village bypass, but it concluded that the combined environmental, landscape, and heritage impacts arising from the construction of a full four village bypass (bypassing Marlesford, Little Glemham, Stratford St Andrew, and Farnham) would be unlikely to be deemed acceptable against the tests set by planning policies at that time. The study recommended that two other options were preferable to the full four village bypass. SZC Co. reviewed the study and concluded that, out of the routes analysed, the most appropriate route for a bypass of Farnham would be to the north of the village. This route was put forward as part of the Stage 1 consultation.</p> <p>However, further to outcomes of the Stage 1 consultation and suggestions that mitigation is required for all four villages, SZC</p>	

edfenergy.com

Building **better energy** together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Co. considered that the impact of Sizewell C traffic would not be sufficient to justify a bypass of all four villages. A bypass of this scale would have significant environmental impacts, as noted in the 2006 study, and would bring benefits to some but would be to the detriment of others. A four village bypass would be a disproportionate intervention to mitigate the effects of Sizewell C traffic, and therefore it could not be included within the application for development consent for the Sizewell C Project. However, it did remain necessary to give further detailed consideration to more local issues and, particularly, issues arising from the bend in Farnham.</p> <p>See the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further information.</p>	

f. Sizewell Link Road

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Traffic	<p>Concerns that the Sizewell link road will be inadequate in performing its purpose, and will</p>	<p>SZC Co. have proposed the Sizewell Link Road to help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>not work to relieve local roads of construction traffic, as well as not having any legacy benefits.</p>	<p>Further detail on the Sizewell Link Road, in the context of the wider construction transport strategy, is provided in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). It would reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton by approximately 92% during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project according to Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment. The flow remaining on the B1122 would be about a tenth of the current traffic volume.</p> <p>The Sizewell Link Road would be constructed in the early years of the construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. The traffic using the Sizewell Link Road would comprise all park and ride buses from both the northern and southern park and ride sites and all heavy goods vehicles delivering freight to the Sizewell C construction site.</p> <p>In addition, the Sizewell Link Road would be used by some of the construction workers arriving by private transport as well as some of the LGVs generated by the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Once operational, it would have a legacy benefit in that it would also be open to the public and would be used by SZC Co. during the construction phase of the Sizewell C main</p>	

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>development site to transport construction workers arriving by car, buses from both northern and southern park and ride sites, and goods vehicles (both light and heavy) delivering freight to the Sizewell C main development site. It is proposed to be a permanent development.</p> <p>Further information on the Sizewell Link Road can be found in Volume 6 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p>	
Environmental Impacts	<p>General opposition to the proposed Sizewell link road and other concerns, including the environmental impact of land take and effect on wildlife.</p>	<p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Sizewell Link Road has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 6 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.7). The assessment considers the potential construction and operational impacts of the development.</p> <p>The route and design have sought to minimise land-take and the impact on the surrounding environment, including impacts on landscape, heritage and ecological features, noise and emissions impacts on residential properties, and pedestrian amenity.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed, including the implementation of a CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) to control</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		construction impacts such as risk of pollution, and other measures such as the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors and screen the development. It is also proposed to develop a lighting strategy that seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety standards. Full details can be found in Chapters 3 to 12 of Volume 6 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.7).	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative 'D2' Relief Road	Suggestions for the alternative 'D2' relief road, or the similar 'Route W'. Comments about the benefits of this road as opposed to the current proposed Sizewell Link Road.	For the D2 route and Route W, the engineering works to traverse the landform were considered to likely have a significant adverse effect on the existing landscape character. Route W (north and south) traverses a landscape typically characterised by a series of small to large scale arable and pasture fields, intersected by a network of B-roads and PROWs with occasional villages and numerous dispersed hamlets and farmsteads. Blocks of ancient semi-natural woodland are scattered throughout the area. The western section of the route comprises the landscape between the A12 and Hill Farm. Here, the topography of the landscape is formed by a series of narrow valleys that are	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>well-vegetated. This creates a sense of intimacy that would be disrupted by the necessary engineering works that would be required to facilitate a highway through this area, which could result in significant adverse effects. It was also considered that the route could have an adverse effect on the setting of the existing nearby heritage assets including Hurts Hall and Leiston Abbey as they are situated approximately 450m north and 300m north of Route W respectively. The length of Route W/D2 was longer than other considered (Routes X and Z). Route W would also impact a greater number of PRow, roads and railways compared to the other routes considered.</p> <p>Route W is located to the south of Saxmundham. Whilst Route W was the most southerly, and therefore best placed to intercept the Sizewell C heavy goods vehicles (HGV) from the south, it would not provide traffic relief to either Middleton Moor or Theberton, which was one of the objectives of the proposed link road. Instead, it would provide an alternative route for traffic otherwise using the A1094 / B1069 through Leiston and Knodishall and Saxmundham crossroads. Whilst this would be a benefit to those places, Route W would not address the concerns raised by Middleton Moor and Theberton residents.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Please refer to the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.	
Mitigation	Suggestions for the Sizewell link road, including mitigation measures, further assessment to be taken and minor alternative route alterations.	The design of the proposed Sizewell link road has evolved through consultation and as a result of design development and environmental assessments. Please refer to the Site Selection Report in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details of route sections. Please refer to the Chapter 3 of Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.8) for information regarding design evolution.	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Congestion	Concerns about the proposed Sizewell link road, specifically regarding the increase in congestion traffic and emissions with	No congestion is predicted along the Sizewell link road because the peak construction daily flow is approximately 8,500 vehicles per day and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) identifies that congestion on a single carriageway road is unlikely to occur below approximately 23,000 vehicles per day.	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	resulting air quality impacts.	<p>The modelling and assessment of traffic emissions associated with the Sizewell C and other traffic is presented in the Environmental Statement. No significant air quality effects are predicted to arise during construction or operation of Sizewell C.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 12 (Air quality) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Noise/Light Pollution	Concerns about the proposed Sizewell Link Road, particularly potential impacts on the local community, including noise/light pollution, cutting off villages and lack of legacy benefit.	<p>The Sizewell link road is proposed to mitigate impacts (in particular significant traffic noise impacts) on the villages local to the B1122, including Middleton Moor and Theberton by rerouting traffic away and providing an alternative route between the A12 to the west and the B1122 to the east, close to the Sizewell C main development site entrance. It would be retained as a permanent highway and would provide a legacy benefit for users of the local highway network.</p> <p>A few properties have the potential to be impacted by the proposed new road scheme and SZC Co. has sought to mitigate impacts through measures such the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors and screen the development, where possible.</p>	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found Volume 6 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.7).	

g. Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Traffic	Concerns about the proposed road improvements for the A1094/B1069 south of Knodishall, the A12/A1094 Friday Street north of Farnham, A12/A144 south of Bramfield, A12/B1119 at Saxmundham and	<p>SZC Co. have considered the highway infrastructure works required to support the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The package of highway infrastructure works included within the DCO application has been informed by extensive traffic and accident data collection, modelling of the highway network and consultation with stakeholders. Chapter 11 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) summarises the proposed off-site highway works.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>the B1078/B1079 east of Easton and Otley College, that the proposals will be inadequate in handling traffic flow and reducing dangerous impacts from traffic increase.</p>	<p>Some of the highway works are required for capacity reasons and others are proposed to improve road safety. For example, the two-village bypass provides the benefit of replacing the existing A12/A1094 Friday Street junction with a roundabout. The junction has a significant accident history and a higher accident rate than would be expected given the traffic flows it currently carries. A roundabout has the lowest accident rate of any feasible solution at this junction and would provide sufficient capacity for the forecast traffic flows.</p> <p>SZC Co.'s proposal, which is supported by Suffolk County Council, for SCC to promote a speed limit reduction through the A1094/B1069 junction from the national speed limit (60mph for cars) to 40mph would improve safety at this junction. Junction modelling reported in the Transport Assessment shows that the junction has sufficient capacity to accommodate the flows expected in the Early Years, Peak Construction and Operational Phase.</p> <p>The A12/A144 junction is currently a ghost island layout. During the morning peak period, there is queuing and delay for the right turn movements towards the A12 south. Traffic modelling has indicated that this would be exacerbated by the Sizewell C traffic flows. The traffic modelling work has</p>	



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>indicated that a single lane dualling improvement (a physical central island and waiting area) would increase capacity and mitigate the impact of Sizewell C traffic.</p> <p>Daily traffic flow volumes are predicted to increase above Reference Case levels at the A12/B1119 junction by around 6% in the early years phase and by around 5% at peak construction. The impact on the overall junction performance would be minimal. Proposed improvements should reduce the number of collisions at the A12/B1119 junction by providing better guidance, visibility and vehicle placement for right-turning traffic and mitigate the impact of additional Sizewell C traffic on the junction.</p> <p>Traffic flows at the B1078/B1079 junction are forecast to increase by 2% in the Early Years, which would make little difference to junction operation. At peak construction, the Sizewell C increase is circa 11% and the junction modelling shows a disproportionately large increase in queuing and delays because the junction performance has already been eroded by the Ipswich Garden Suburb development. Notwithstanding the additional traffic from Ipswich Garden Suburb, SZC Co. propose to implement works on the B1078 during the early years to mitigate any safety risk in advance of peak construction.</p>	

edfenergy.com

Building **better energy** together

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in Volume 7 (Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements) of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Road Improvements	Suggestions for the proposed road improvements for the A1094/B1069 south of Knodishall, such as a slip road and improvements in non-vehicle road user routes.	<p>The improvement scheme for this junction that is proposed in the DCO is described in the Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.8) and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>The A1094/B1069 junction is at grade and slip roads are associated with much busier grade-separated junctions, so the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges would not allow such provision at this junction.</p> <p>According to traffic survey data, a small number of cyclists use the junction, but the number would not increase significantly during Sizewell C construction. This is because it is at the upper limit of how far workers would cycle to work. There were no accidents involving cyclists recorded during the period May 2014 to May 2019 inclusive. There is a designated cycle route to the west of the junction along Priory Road, the A1094 and Mill Road through Friston.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Notwithstanding this, SZC Co.'s proposal, which is supported by Suffolk County Council, for a speed limit reduction through the junction from the national speed limit (60mph for cars) to 40mph would improve conditions for cyclists at this junction.</p> <p>Further information is set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	
Road Improvements - Roundabout	Suggestions for the proposed road improvements for the A12/A144 south of Bramfield. such as suggestions for a roundabout instead.	<p>The A12/A144 junction is currently a ghost island layout. During the morning peak period, there is queuing and delay for the right turn movements towards the A12 south. Traffic modelling has indicated that this would be exacerbated by the Sizewell C traffic flows. The traffic modelling work has indicated that a single lane dualling improvement (a physical central island and waiting area) would increase capacity and mitigate the impact of Sizewell C traffic. This is the scheme that is proposed in the DCO, described in Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.8) and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>A roundabout would take additional land and is not required to mitigate the expected impact from the Sizewell C construction traffic.</p>	N
Cycle Lane	Suggestions for the proposed road improvements for	There is a Sustrans National Cycle Route link between Saxmundham station and NCN Route 1 to the west that passes through this junction. However, traffic survey data	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>the A12/B1119 at Saxmundham, including the addition of a cycle lane.</p>	<p>from June 2016 shows very few cyclists using this route. There have been no accidents recorded involving cyclists during the period May 2014 to May 2019 and Suffolk County Council have not raised any concerns about cyclists at the junction with SZC Co.. The number of cyclists at the junction would be unlikely to increase because of Sizewell C because it is beyond the distance that workers would be willing to cycle to work.</p> <p>The improvement scheme for this junction that is proposed in the DCO is described in Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref 6.8) and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	
Community Impact	<p>Concern about the proposed Yoxford roundabout, including potential negative impacts on the community and heritage and insufficiency in negating the effects of the Sizewell Link Road for Yoxford.</p>	<p>Following Stage 3, SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the proposed roundabout. Loss of heritage significance through change to setting has been assessed for individual designated assets and the Conservation Area. No significant residual effects are predicted following mitigation in the form of the introduction of appropriate landscape proposals and standard CoCP measures to limit noise disturbance.</p> <p>Further archaeological evaluation has been carried out including archaeological geophysical survey and trial</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>trenching. This scope of this was agreed with SCC Archaeological Service who also monitored the fieldwork.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (Preservation by Record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified to date.</p> <p>Further information may be found in Chapter 9 (Terrestrial Historic Environment) of Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p> <p>Activities with the potential to impact upon the environment and the quality of life of local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines. These have informed the scope and focus of a health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities. Further detail may be found in Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>A Community Fund would also be provided to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life. Further detail may be found in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The Sizewell Link Road reduces the traffic volume using the Yoxford roundabout and has traffic benefits for Yoxford. SZC Co. would require all Sizewell C HGV and buses from and to the south to use the new road, thus avoiding the need to travel up the A12 to Yoxford to join the B1122. The traffic modelling shows that Sizewell C cars and LGV, which would not be on fixed routes, would choose to use the new road (and thus avoid Yoxford) since it is the best route to reach the construction site. Further information is included in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	
Heritage and Ecological Impacts	Suggestions for the proposed Yoxford roundabout, including further considerations, heritage and ecological	<p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Yoxford roundabout has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.8). The assessment considers the potential construction and operation of the development.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed. This includes the</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	mitigation measures and completing the roundabout prior to the 'early years'	<p>implementation of a CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution, as well as other measures such the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors. It is also proposed to develop a lighting strategy which seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety.</p> <p>As detailed in the Implementation Plan appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), the Associated Developments will be phased in the Early Years of construction to minimise disruption to the A12 and ensure traffic flows are maintained.</p>	
Construction Traffic	Concern about the proposed road improvements for the A140/B1078 west of Coddendam, mainly that this route will not be able to handle construction traffic even with the proposed improvements, and	<p>No HGV or buses related to Sizewell C would use the B1078 east of the A140 junction. The peak construction daily traffic volume would be some 9,300 vehicles per day. This would be an 8% increase over the Reference Case flow of 8,600 vehicles per day.</p> <p>The A140/B1078 junction has been tested for capacity and the results presented in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), which sets out the predicted impacts of the proposals, along with the highway improvements that are proposed to reduce the impacts on the local highway network.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	further improvements should be proposed.		
Safety Measures	Suggestions about the proposed road improvements for the B1078/B1079 east of Easton and Otley College, such as additional safety measures including reducing speed limits and widening junctions	<p>SZC Co.'s proposals for this junction, set out in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) include additional signage to improve safety on the B1078 between the Easton and Otley College access and the B1079 junction.</p> <p>The speed limit on this section of the B1078 is 40mph and there were six accidents on this length between May 2014 and May 2019. SZC Co. would have no objection to Suffolk County Council promoting a speed limit reduction to 30mph if they felt it would be beneficial.</p> <p>At the B1078/B1079 junction, the great majority of traffic turns right from B1078 onto the B1079 and little traffic turns left. Widening the junction approach would not be effective and is not necessary to mitigate the impacts of Sizewell C traffic.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the predicted impacts of the proposals, along with the highway improvements that are proposed to reduce the impacts on the local highway network.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Overall concern for the proposed road improvements, including concerns that they are inadequate to mitigate the impacts of construction traffic.	<p>SZC Co. has sought to provide a comprehensive package of mitigation highway works.</p> <p>This has been developed based on the traffic modelling and assessment of the effects of the Sizewell C Project on highway capacity and road safety.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the predicted impacts of the proposals, along with the highway improvements that are proposed to reduce the impacts on the local highway network.</p>	N
Traffic Assessments	Request for more information about the proposed road improvements, including more data resulting from traffic assessments.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) includes details of the strategic modelling (Chapter 9) and standalone modelling (Chapter 10) undertaken to assess the effects of the Sizewell C Project and inform the design of the highway improvement schemes.	N
Road Improvements	Suggestions for the proposed road improvements, including specific areas where further improvements are	<p>SZC Co. have considered a total of 45 junctions, which have been agreed with Suffolk County Council, in the assessment of potential road improvements.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) includes details of the strategic modelling (Chapter 9) and standalone</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	required such as other parts of the A12, B1125 and B1121	modelling (Chapter 10) undertaken to assess the effects of the Sizewell C Project and inform the design of the highway improvement schemes.	
Noise and Light Pollution	Concerns about impacts on the local community from the proposed Theberton Bypass, including effects from noise and light pollution, proximity to residents, impact on property and farms, increase in traffic and reduction in air quality	<p>At Stage 3, as part of the rail-led strategy, the Theberton bypass was proposed to mitigate impacts (in particular significant traffic noise impacts) on the village of Theberton by rerouting traffic away and providing an alternative route to the Sizewell C main development site entrance. It has been replaced by the Sizewell link road in the DCO proposals.</p> <p>A small number of properties have the potential to be impacted by the Sizewell link road and SZC Co. has sought to mitigate impacts through measures such the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors and screen the development. It is also proposed to develop a lighting strategy which seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p>	N
Traffic	Concern about the proposals for the Theberton bypass	SZC Co. has continued to strive to maximise the use of rail to deliver materials to the main development site.	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>as being inadequate in relieving traffic impacts and the B1122 as being inadequate in handling construction traffic</p>	<p>However, given the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line under the rail-led strategy, Network Rail was unable to guarantee that the works would be ready in time for peak construction.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore sought to identify the optimum rail strategy that could be delivered within their control. For this reason, the integrated strategy has been taken forward for the DCO application, which would provide three trains direct into the main development site via the green rail route.</p> <p>As part of the integrated strategy, the Sizewell Link Road is proposed to mitigate impacts (in particular significant traffic noise impacts) on the villages local to the B1122, including Middleton Moor and Theberton by rerouting traffic away and providing an alternative route between the A12 to the west and the B1122 to the east, close to the Sizewell C main development site entrance. The Theberton bypass is therefore not being taken forward as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Suggestions for the proposed Theberton Bypass, including wildlife, heritage, visual and pollution mitigation	<p>Responses provided on the proposed Theberton bypass during the Stage 3 consultation process have been taken into consideration and helped inform the development of proposals. Subsequently, the Sizewell link road was proposed in the DCO and the Theberton bypass was not taken forward.</p> <p>SZC Co. has sought to mitigate impacts through measures such as the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors and screen the development. It is also proposed to develop a lighting strategy which seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety standards.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p>	Y

h. Freight Management Facility

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Impact of HGVs	Support for the freight management facility in	SZC Co. welcomes support for the proposed freight management facility.	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	general for reducing the impact of HGVs	<p>This will provide spaces for up to 154 heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and would allow a controlled pattern of deliveries to the Sizewell C Main Development Site with reduced movements during peak or sensitive hours on the network. It will provide facilities where paperwork and goods can be checked prior to delivery to the main construction site, and a location where HGVs are held while they wait to enter the site or in the event of an accident on the local road network which prevented access to the site.</p> <p>Further information is contained in Volume 8 (Freight Management Facility) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.9).</p>	
Freight Management Facility Location	Criteria on which the option choice for the freight management facility location should be based on, such as legacy value and ecological and drainage impacts	<p>The freight management facility proposals have been assessed using several criteria. These are explained below:</p> <p>Locational requirements - The principal requirement of the freight management facility is that it is located on the strategic road network and close enough to the Main Development Site to allow the accurate management of HGVs.</p> <p>The transport strategy predicts that the majority of HGV road traffic will come from the south on the A14 from the east and west, as the port of Felixstowe would play a role in the delivery of materials, before reaching the MDS via the A12. Therefore,</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>any site for the FMF needs to consider HGVs arriving on the A14 from the east and west whilst also being in proximity to the A12.</p> <p>Operational requirements - the facility would need to be sufficiently sized to accommodate the expected number of HGVs to allow a controlled pattern of deliveries to the site with reduced movements during peak or sensitive hours on the network. The site would also need space to accommodate associated buildings/structures such as an amenity and welfare building and search areas, as well as appropriate landscaping.</p> <p>Planning policy – consideration of how the site fits with local plan objectives and any relevant site allocations on the local plan Policies Map.</p> <p>Land availability – consideration as to whether the land is available for use, for example, whether planning permission has already been granted for a conflicting use on the site.</p> <p>A further consideration was also the outcomes of the environmental assessment process and consultation feedback to avoid significant environmental effects where possible, and</p>	

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>where this is not possible, to mitigate and manage any remaining effects.</p> <p>For further details please refer to Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 8 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.9).</p>	
Visual Impact	<p>Opposition to the entire freight management facility, including both proposed options, and reasons for concern such as the visual impact of the infrastructure and increase in traffic on surrounding roads.</p>	<p>Whilst there was considerable support for a dedicated freight management facility, concerns were raised at Stage 1 consultation regarding its potential location and environmental impact. At Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. progressed with the concept of two electronic web-based ways of managing heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements rather than a physical intervention. Concerns were however raised at Stage 2 consultation that this would not manage HGV movements satisfactorily. The Stage 2 feedback showed that there was significant support for a dedicated physical freight management facility and therefore one was reinstated within the proposals for Stage 3.</p> <p>Further details regarding the potential impacts of the proposals can be found in Volume 8 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.9).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Location of Freight Management Facility	Opposition to and concerns about locating the freight management facility at Seven Hills Junction, mainly because of congestion impacts on the A12, conflict with Trinity Park traffic as well as heritage impacts.	<p>The site at Seven Hills is preferable to the other sites considered for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal detours of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) are required to access/egress the freight management facility; • No additional HGVs would use the westbound diverge slip of the Seven Hills junction; • No U-turns would be required at the Seven Hills junction; • There would be no unnecessary HGV movements across the Orwell Crossing; • The site is located to the east of the Orwell Crossing, which in the event of a bridge closure, would enable EDF to hold HGVs between SZC and A14 at the freight management facility. <p>The environmental impact assessment has confirmed that there are not expected to be significant adverse residual heritage impacts.</p> <p>As such, SZC Co. proposed the freight management facility at the Seven Hills site. Further details can be found in Chapter 3 (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of Volume 8 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.9).</p>	N
Location of Freight	Opposition to and concerns about	In the DCO, SZC Co. proposed the freight management facility at Seven Hills rather than at Innocence Farm. The site at	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Management Facility	locating the freight management facility to Innocence Farm, mainly because of access issues, greater distance from A12/A14 and congestion.	<p>Seven Hills is preferable to the other sites considered for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal detours of HGVs are required to access/egress the freight management facility; • No additional HGVs would use the westbound diverge slip of the Seven Hills junction; • No U-turns would be required at the Seven Hills junction; • There would be no unnecessary HGV movements across the Orwell Crossing; • The site is located to the east of the Orwell Crossing, which in the event of a bridge closure, would enable EDF to hold HGVs between SZC and A14 at the freight management facility. <p>The Stage 3 Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) (Volume 2b, page 575, paragraph 10.14.1) also showed that the Innocence Farm site option was more likely to generate a significant noise effect (at one receptor) during the construction and removal and reinstatement phases (although that effect would be relatively short-term).</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found in Chapter 3, Volume 8 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.9).	
Location of Freight Management Facility	Suggestions that: alternative locations for the Freight Management Facility (FMF) are identified closer to the main development site; the FMF is sited to the west of Orwell Bridge; and traffic management systems are proposed to support the FMF, such as moving vehicles at night or making the whole of the A12 a dual carriageway.	<p>A number of sites were considered however the site at Seven Hills was considered to be most suitable for providing the freight management facility from a transport perspective. Analysis by SZC Co. identified the absence of a full movement junction at the Innocence Farm site which would mean that HGVs would need to undertake a 9.5mile detour. HGVs arriving from the east would need to U-turn at the Seven Hills roundabout, which would result in all arms of the roundabout junction needing to give-way to the HGVs. The egress route for HGVs arriving from the west and east would require the same. These movements would place additional pressure on the westbound diverge slip, particularly at AM and PM peak hour and create unnecessary additional movements.</p> <p>A freight management facility at the Seven Hills location would however offer the shortest detour of HGVs required to access/egress the freight management facility compared to Innocence Farm.</p> <p>A Freight Management Facility closer to the construction site would not enable SZC Co. to manage HGV movements on the A12 at Martlesham and Woodbridge and wider road network in response to prevailing traffic conditions, as required.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>No suitable site was found west of the Orwell Bridge and a site in this location would unnecessarily draw HGVs from Felixstowe over the bridge. A site east of the bridge enables SZC Co. to manage HGVs that have left the construction site in the event that the bridge is closed.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 3 of Volume 8 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.9) and the Site Selection Report appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details regarding the site selection process.</p> <p>Some HGV would travel to/from the construction site in the evening, subject to the environmental requirements, e.g. noise control, being met.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) demonstrates that the impacts do not justify a A12 dual carriageway from Wickham Market to Lowestoft.</p>	

i. Transport: Rail Improvements

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Level Crossings	Support for the proposals for the level crossings on the East Suffolk line as part of the rail-led strategy, to ensure public safety and legacy benefits.	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.’s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.	N
Safety Equipment	Suggestions for the proposed updates and closures to the level crossings on the East Suffolk line for example to update the safety equipment instead of closing the crossings.	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.’s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.	
Safety Equipment	Support and positive comments about the upgrades to the nine level crossings as part of both the railway and road strategies, such as safety suggestions and automatic barriers.	As set out in Chapter 2, Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), eight of the existing level crossings on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line are proposed to be upgraded. The Sizewell level crossing will not be upgraded as freight trains would not be using Sizewell Halt, with a temporary rail terminal to be built at land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) for deliveries by rail in the early years. As such, no trains would use the Sizewell level crossing and no upgrade works are necessary.	N
Level Crossings	Opposition to all proposals for the level crossings on the East Suffolk line and for upgrades to the nine level crossings for reasons such as disruption, belief that closures/changes are unnecessary and impact on community access.	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		There are currently no regular freight services on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line which is currently only used by occasional maintenance trains. None of the level crossing works would involve the permanent stopping up or diversion of PRowS, with only temporary closures to the crossings as the upgrade works are carried out. These upgrades are required to support the delivery of freight by rail, to ensure safety for users of the level crossings, and to maintain community access during operation of the rail improvement works.	
Further Information	Suggestions for the upgrades to the nine level crossings as part of both the railway and road strategies, such as suggestions for statistics provided in the documentation.	There are currently no regular freight services on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line which is currently only used by occasional maintenance trains. User numbers for pedestrians (and vehicles where appropriate) using the level crossings are not included in the DCO submission but none of the level crossing works would involve the permanent stopping up or diversion of PRowS, with only temporary closures to the crossings as the upgrade works are carried out. These upgrades are required to support the delivery of freight by rail, to ensure safety for users of the level crossings, and there would be minimal impact on community access during the upgrade works.	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Melton Bromeswell Level Crossing	Opposition to and concerns about the proposal to close the Melton Bromeswell level crossing, including comments about the inadequacy of the proposed diversion.	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line, including the Melton Bromeswell level crossing, are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.	N
Level Crossing and PROW	Opposition to the closure of any or all level crossings and connecting public rights of way, and related concerns, due to the impact on pedestrians and effect on recreational walking.	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> <p>On the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line, all of the proposed upgrade works will ensure that the level crossings remain in use. There are no proposals to permanently stop-up or divert any PRowWs whilst the branch line is in operation.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 2, Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Modes of Transport	<p>Opposition to and concerns about Option 1, including the temporary closure of Buckleswood Road and the inadequacy of the proposed footbridge for certain pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and being disruptive in preventing vehicle access.</p>	<p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), further to the consultation responses, SZC Co. concluded that the visual impact of the proposed footbridge together with the disruption and inconvenience to the public through the closure of Buckleswood Road to motor vehicles (including for delivery and emergency access) made the footbridge option less suitable than Option 2 (a level crossing).</p> <p>Whilst the level crossing would cause some short delays during periods when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements are likely to be spread throughout the day. SZC Co. held initial discussions with representatives of the Office of</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Rail Regulation (now the Office of Rail and Road) on this issue, who confirmed the potential acceptability of a new temporary level crossing.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 2 of Volume 9 of the ES.</p>	
Further Information	Request for more information about the Sizewell Halt or new rail siding options to allow better evaluation of options	<p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4a of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the neither the Sizewell Halt nor the rail siding options should be taken forward. Instead the rail spur option introduced at the Stage 4 consultation is proposed in the application for development consent.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Visual Impact	Opposition to and concerns about the reconfiguration of the Sizewell Halt rail terminal to include an overhead conveyer system, mainly because of its visual impact and lack of efficiency	<p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. removed Sizewell Halt and the conveyor over King George’s Avenue following the Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>SZC Co. is progressing with the rail spur option consulted upon at Stage 4 as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE.</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Disruption to Businesses	Opposition to and concerns about the option for a new rail siding, such as disruption, intrusion, greater amount of construction required and proximity to businesses and homes.	<p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. removed the rail siding following the Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>SZC Co. is progressing with the rail spur option consulted upon at Stage 4 as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. This option does not follow the existing rail alignment adjacent to Eastlands Industrial Estate and instead involves a spur, which is further from many of the existing properties.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Alternative Options	Suggestions and alternatives to the proposed options for off-loading materials to the main development site, such as leaving the siding as legacy.	<p>Provision of rail infrastructure directly into the main development site is an important component in the reduction of freight movements on the road network.</p> <p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. removed the rail siding following the Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>SZC Co. is progressing with the rail spur option consulted upon at Stage 4 as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE.</p> <p>Rail infrastructure on the main development site would be removed at the end of the construction period and the land reinstated. Sizewell Halt would be retained as a permanent development and a further rail freight legacy is not considered necessary.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Safety Risks	Safety concerns and potential risks involved with closures of the level crossings as part of the rail led strategy.	<p>On the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line, all of the proposed upgrade works will ensure that the level crossings remain in use. There are no proposals to permanently stop-up or divert any PRoWs whilst the branch line is in operation, with only temporary closures to the crossings as the upgrade works are carried out. These upgrades are required to support the delivery of freight by rail whilst also ensuring safety for users of the level crossings.</p> <p>Any closure of a level crossing would increase the level of safety in that location.</p> <p>No works are now proposed to the level crossings on the East Suffolk line.</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), Chapters 2 and 3 of Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 8.10).	
Location	Comments, suggestions and concerns about the proposed ‘passing loop’ between Melton and Wickham Market, including reasons for support due to legacy benefits, or concerns about the chosen location.	<p>The proposed location of the passing loop was based on modelling by, and advice from, Network Rail who considered this to be the optimum location to allow for increased freight capacity on the East Suffolk Line.</p> <p>However, as set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.’s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. The upgrades on the East Suffolk line, including the passing loop, are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found in Chapter 3 of Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10).	
Impacts on Passenger Services	Comments about the crossover at Saxmundham Junction, most of which are supportive because of the reduction of impacts on passenger services.	<p>The crossover at Saxmundham Junction proposed at Stage 3 would have increased rail capacity at this location and would have been a legacy to the railway.</p> <p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The upgrades on the East Suffolk line, including the crossover at Saxmundham Junction, are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> <p>However, there would still be junction improvements where the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line meets the East Suffolk line, to allow for a faster, quieter and more reliable transfer of trains between the lines. Whilst the crossover works would not be as substantial as under the rail-led strategy, the upgrades now proposed in the DCO submission would require upgrading the existing junction and the provision of an additional</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>crossover on existing Network Rail land, providing a legacy benefit to passenger and freight travel at the junction.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapters 2 and 3 of Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Heritage Impacts	<p>All comments about the proposed ‘green rail route’, including support to reduce HGV traffic, concerns about heritage impacts on Leiston Abbey, ecology and cycling and suggestions.</p>	<p>Utilising the green rail route into the main site would significantly reduce the numbers of HGVs on the local roads and is the most efficient way of getting bulk and containerised materials to the main construction site.</p> <p>It was acknowledged during the consultation process (for all of the green, blue and red rail routes) that there would be some potential for impacts on the setting of Leiston Abbey. However, further investigation has shown that any impact would be sufficiently mitigated. Any impact would also be temporary as the green rail route would be removed and the land reinstated to agricultural use once it is no longer needed.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapters 2, 3 and 9 of Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	N

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

a. Overall Proposals

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Cumulative Impacts	Concern that construction of other projects will be underway at the same time as construction for Sizewell C, such as a substation at Friston and an offshore windfarm with resulting cumulative impacts on people and the environment	<p>In accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 Volume 10 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.11) presents the assessment of project-wide and cumulative impacts with other existing and/or approved proposals.</p> <p>The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note 17: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects (2015).</p> <p>The list of developments for consideration in the cumulative effects assessment, was consulted upon with SCC and ESC, this includes other energy projects in the area.</p>	N
Location	Suggestions about the overall project, including suggestions that the site should be in other places in the UK.	The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.	N

² Note: Comments in bold and shaded grey within Table G.1 were also raised by Section 47 consultees. They have not been repeated in Table G.2 to avoid unnecessary repetition.



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

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

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Health and Welfare	Concern about the health and welfare of the workforce because of the proximity to nuclear materials.	<p>The Ionising Radiation Regulations 2017 define the exposure limits to staff working with or in proximity to nuclear materials.</p> <p>The radiological dose limits set by the company are within those prescribed by government and are continuously monitored. Staff are and will be routinely health checked.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Restoration / Carbon Neutral	Support as long as the site is restored to its pre-construction state and that construction is as	A DCO requirement is proposed to require all temporary buildings and structures to be removed from the main development site and for the land to be restored. The design details of the landscape restoration would then be secured by a separate DCO requirement, which shall be in	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	carbon-neutral as possible.	<p>general accordance with the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.2).</p> <p>Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of construction-related impacts arising from the use, including the effects arising from climate change.</p>	
Accommodation Strategy	General concerns that the proposed accommodation strategy is inadequate or insufficient for the number of workers.	<p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council. This was in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks, ensuring an efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project. This included proposing worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities to promote economic benefits e.g. of off-peak tourist accommodation use.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that although this balanced approach provides benefits and limits effects, there may still be some effects on local housing markets. As such, a flexible, responsive Housing Fund has been developed to complement the proposals set out by East Suffolk Council’s Housing Strategies.</p>	N



Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3) of the ES .	
Accommodation Strategy	Support for a strategy that aims to reduce the amount of local accommodation required for workers.	<p>SZC Co. notes and welcomes the recognition that the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been developed to complement sustainable management of workers, while also contributing to an efficient Sizewell C Project delivery.</p> <p>The Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) has been carefully designed through engagement with East Suffolk Council. This was in order to promote a balanced approach between limiting effects on local housing markets and transport networks, ensuring an efficient delivery of the Project. This included proposing worker accommodation close to the site that is attractive to the workforce, while still integrating some of the workforce in local communities to promote economic benefits e.g. of off-peak tourist accommodation use.</p> <p>EDF recognise that through this balanced approach provides benefits and limits effects, there may still be some effects on local housing markets. As such, a flexible, responsive Housing Fund has been developed to complement the proposals set out by East Suffolk Council’s Housing Strategies.</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 (Doc Ref. 6.3) of the ES .	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Road-led Strategy	Support for the road-led strategy on the basis that specific points/ suggestions are followed, such as construction of the two-village bypass or the improvements being completed before construction begins.	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides the most appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project. This strategy includes the two-village bypass and the Sizewell link road as well as a package of junction improvements, along with improvements to the branch line and construction of the Green rail route. An indicative phasing schedule for the Sizewell C Project as a whole is provided in the Implementation Plan, Appendix 8.4I of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	N

b. Northern Park & Ride at Darsham

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Compulsory Park & Ride Scheme / Site Restoration	Support for the northern park and ride proposals on the basis that specific points/suggestions are followed e.g. that the scheme must be compulsory for workers, or that the site must be returned to greenfield afterwards.	<p>The park and ride strategy includes an actively managed parking permit system for the construction workforce. This would limit and control the allocation of permits for the car park on the main development site during construction.</p> <p>Only workers living inside the area bounded by the A12, River Blyth and River Deben (except those living in the Leiston area) would be issued a parking permit. Each worker arriving at the site by car would need a valid parking permit to enter the site, i.e. workers, not vehicles, would be allocated permits. In this way, SZC Co. seeks to eliminate the possibility of workers from outside the area bounded by A12 and the rivers Blyth and Deben driving into the zone, parking at another worker’s house or elsewhere and getting a lift to the site car park. This will therefore mean that all workers from outside this zone would be required to use the park and ride facilities.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4) provides a description of the proposed development and explains how the site would be used. This chapter confirms that once the need for the park and ride facility has ceased, the buildings and associated infrastructure, would be removed in accordance with a demolition and restoration plan. This would maximise the potential for re-use of building</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		modules and materials. When the site has been cleared, the area would be returned to agricultural use.	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Location	Alternative suggestions for the northern park and ride proposals such as leaving the parking as a legacy for Darsham station, or moving the site to the other side of the A12.	<p>A number of sites were assessed however the site at Darsham is considered to be most suitable for providing the park and ride facility.</p> <p>Of the three options presented at Stage 1, more respondents identified Option 2 (Darsham) as an appropriate location for the northern park and ride than the other options. The fewest number of respondents identified Option 1 (Yoxford Road) as an appropriate location. The environmental effects expected at Option 2 (Darsham) are considered capable of being mitigated. Option 2 (Darsham)'s proximity to Darsham railway station would facilitate worker interchange between rail and bus. It therefore has the potential to reduce overall traffic movements compared with the other sites considered. An A12 location for the park and ride is also considered more suitable than Option 1 (Yoxford Road) as it would enable traffic to be intercepted on the network prior to reaching the B1122.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Retaining the proposal as a legacy car park for Darsham train station (as suggested by some respondents), would go beyond the scope of the mitigation required for the Sizewell C Project and would require further justification for this permanent land take.</p> <p>Should the site however be returned to its existing use once the need associated with Sizewell C has ceased, this would not prevent others from applying for planning permission for alternative uses in the future.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 3 of Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.</p>	

c. Southern Park & Ride at Wickham Market

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Restoration / B1078 Use	Support for the southern park and ride proposals on the basis that specific points/suggestions are followed including that the	Chapter 2 of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5) provides a description of the proposed development and confirms that once the need for the park and ride facility has ceased, the buildings and associated infrastructure, would be removed in accordance with a demolition and restoration plan. This	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	site is fully restored post construction or that no Sizewell C traffic continues to use the B1078.	would maximise the potential for re-use of building modules and materials. When the site has been cleared, the area would be returned to agricultural use. Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) shows that no Sizewell C traffic is forecast to use the B1078 at Wickham Market in the Operational Phase.	

d. Freight Management Facility

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Greenfield Land	Support for the freight management facility on the basis that specific points/suggestions are followed such as the site that uses the least greenfield land is chosen, or that local expertise is relied on for the decision making.	The support is welcomed. Consultation comments received from the local community informed the selection of the freight management facility site. Please refer to the Site Selection Report appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.	N
Further Information	Requests for more information about the	A description of the proposed development, how it would be constructed, operated and removed and reinstated can	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	proposed freight management facility, to be able to assess which Option is more appropriate.	be found in Chapter 2 (Description of Development) of Volume 8 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.9).	

e. Transport: Rail Improvements

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Public Safety / Legacy Benefits	Support for the proposals for the level crossings on the East Suffolk line as part of the rail-led strategy, to ensure public safety and legacy benefits.	<p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Safety Equipment	Suggestions for the proposed updates and closures to the level crossings on the East Suffolk line for example to update the safety equipment instead of closing the crossings.	<p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades (or closures) on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p>	N
Disruption / Community Access	Opposition to all proposals for the level crossings on the East Suffolk line and for upgrades to the nine level crossings for reasons such as disruption, belief that closures/changes are	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	unnecessary and impact on community access.	<p>deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> <p>There are currently no regular freight services on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line which is currently only used by occasional maintenance trains. None of the level crossing works would involve the permanent stopping up or diversion of PRowS, with only temporary closures to the crossings as the upgrade works are carried out. These upgrades are required to support the delivery of freight by rail, to ensure safety for users of the level crossings, and to maintain community access during operation of the rail improvement works.</p>	
Further Information	Request for more information about the upgrades and closures of the level crossings on the East Suffolk line and on the Saxmundham-Leiston branch line as part of the	As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>rail led and both rail and road led strategies.</p>	<p>Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades (or closures) on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> <p>There are currently no regular freight services on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line which is currently only used by occasional maintenance trains. None of the level crossing works would involve the permanent stopping up or diversion of PRowS, with only temporary closures to the crossings as the upgrade works are carried out. These upgrades are required to support the delivery of freight by rail, to ensure safety for users of the level crossings, and to maintain community access during operation of the rail improvement works.</p> <p>Further details on the final proposals for the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line can be found in Chapter 2, Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Upgrade Works	Suggestions for the upgrades to the nine level	As set out in Chapter 2, Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10), eight of the existing level crossings on the	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	crossings as part of both the railway and road strategies, such as safety suggestions and automatic barriers.	Saxmundham to Leiston branch line are proposed to be upgraded. The Sizewell level crossing will not be upgraded as freight trains will not be using Sizewell Halt, with a temporary rail terminal to be built at LEEIE for deliveries by rail in the early years. As such, no trains would use the Sizewell level crossing and no upgrade works are necessary.	

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Sites	Concerns about the proposals for the Stennets 2, Westerfield Footpath, Wickham Market, Brick Kiln, Blaxhall 2 and Bloss crossing / Wilford Bridge level crossings.	<p>The proposed diversion routes were defined by Network Rail in line with the required safety regulations.</p> <p>SZC Co. conducted site walkovers on all accessible proposed routes to ensure they were suitable. A number of amendments were made to the original alignments and new routes were proposed and presented at Stage 3 consultation.</p> <p>The proposals were not taken forward to the application for development consent as they did not form part of the integrated freight management strategy. No works are required on the East Suffolk Line under this strategy and</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>no permanent diversions or closures to existing PRowS are proposed.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the Site Selection report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Selection Criteria	<p>Comments suggesting whatever Buckleswood option is chosen, it should be based on certain criteria such as whichever is the least disruptive to local people as determined by local community groups, or by engineer's best judgement.</p>	<p>The choice of options for Buckleswood Road was based on the views of local residents, engineering judgement and advice from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) team.</p> <p>As Buckleswood Road is not a heavily trafficked road (both by car and non-motorised users), the need for a significant structure like the proposed footbridge was considered to be unnecessary, having a greater visual impact on the area.</p> <p>It was therefore considered that the level crossing option was more appropriate in the circumstances and would have less disruption for users of Buckleswood Road.</p> <p>Further details are contained in Chapter 3 (Alternatives) of Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Further Information	Request for more information about the options for Buckleswood Road, and potential impacts of each option.	<p>The options presented at both Stages 3 and 4 for Buckleswood Road were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that part of Buckleswood Road to be stopped up to vehicular traffic with the construction of a new footbridge connecting the intersected parts of Buckleswood Road (Option 1); or • no stopping up of the road but with a new level crossing on Buckleswood Road (Option 2). <p>The consultation feedback raised concerns over the visual impact of the proposed footbridge connecting the two parts of Buckleswood Road, but feedback from Summerhill School in particular raised safety concerns regarding the closure of Buckleswood Road. The school stated that Buckleswood Road was a vital route for the emergency services when travelling between the school and Ipswich Hospital.</p> <p>There were also concerns raised regarding the disruption that short-term closures of the level crossing option would entail. Whilst the level crossing would cause some short delays during periods when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>significant, especially as most train movements are likely to be at night.</p> <p>The proposed rail extension route was largely unchanged from the Stage 2 proposal at both Stages 3 and 4, but the options for the crossing at Buckleswood Road developed into the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: part of Buckleswood Road would be stopped up and a new footbridge would be constructed; or • Option 2: a new level crossing would be provided on Buckleswood Road. <p>SZC Co. also considered a road bridge to carry Buckleswood Road over the rail line at this location. However, the embankments required to raise the road would be likely to result in a significant visual impact, particularly since the close proximity to the railway junction restricts the possibilities for lowering the railway line in cutting within an acceptable gradient.</p> <p>Following Stage 4, the level crossing option (Option 2) was taken forward into the DCO submission as Option 1 was</p>	

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>considered to be disruptive due to the stopping up of the highway, and the proposed footbridge would have a greater visual impact within the landscape.</p> <p>Full details of both options can be found in Chapter 3 of Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Buckleswood Road	Opposition to and concerns about both options for Buckleswood Road as being inadequate.	<p>The options provided at Stage 3 presented the most feasible solutions to mitigate impacts from the construction and operation of the temporary green rail route in association with the Sizewell C Project. Following Stage 3, further consideration was given to a road bridge to allow vehicles on Buckleswood Road to cross the proposed rail extension. However, the embankments required to raise the road would be likely to result in significant visual impacts.</p> <p>Furthermore, the height of the structure would be substantial as the rail extension route cannot be placed in a deep cutting due to its proximity to the proposed junction with the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line.</p> <p>Given the current low traffic flows on Buckleswood Road, such a substantial engineering operation for a temporary associated development would not be justified to mitigate</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the impact of the Sizewell C Project. As such, the options presented are considered to be the most appropriate to meet the objective of mitigating the impact of the Sizewell C Project on the users of the road and nearby footpath.</p> <p>Further details on impacts to users of the road and nearby footpath can be found in Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), and Chapter 8 Amenity and recreation of Volume 9 (Doc Ref. 6.10) of the ES.</p>	
Further Information	Suggestions for the Buckleswood Road proposals, for example including wildlife corridors, and including requests for more information.	<p>The proposed options for Buckleswood Road are unlikely to pose any significant ecological effects. Mitigation such as wildlife corridors would therefore not be required or justified.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 7 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology of Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	N
Sizewell Halt and New Rail Siding Options	General opposition and concerns about the Sizewell Halt or new rail siding options, and comments that both options are inadequate or disruptive.	<p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. removed Sizewell Halt and the rail siding from the application for development consent.</p> <p>Rail facilities will instead access LEEIE via the rail spur included in the Stage 4 consultation.</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The rail spur consulted upon at Stage 4 consultation was chosen as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. Longer trains are able to remove more freight from the road network. Further details are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 6 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Mitigation	Comments that the strengthening of the Bramford Road and Norwich Road bridges are unnecessary due to the already underway Felixstowe line capacity improvements.	<p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, Appendix 8.4A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.’s programme for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades (or closures) on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> <p>Any works to these bridges would fall under Network Rail’s responsibilities for maintenance of existing rail</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		infrastructure, to be carried out under their statutory undertakings. They do not form part of the DCO submission.	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED