



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Annex F Stage 3 Section 42 Consultee Response Summaries

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

May 2020

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



Contents

Annex F – Stage 3 Summary Responses	1
1 Summary of Responses Prescribed Consultees, Local Authorities and Town and Parish Councils	1
1.2 Accountable Officer for Ipswich and East and West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group	1
1.3 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council	1
1.4 Bawdsey Parish Council	2
1.5 Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council.....	3
1.6 Blaxhall Parish Council	3
1.7 Blythburgh Parish Council	3
1.8 Brandeston Parish Council	4
1.9 Bredfield Parish Council	4
1.10 Brightwell, Foxhall and Purdis Farm Parish Council	5
1.11 Bromswell Parish Council	5
1.12 Bruisyard Parish Council	5
1.13 Butley Wantisden and Capel St. Andrew Parish Council	6
1.14 Cadent Gas Ltd	6
1.15 Campsea Ashe Parish Council	6
1.16 Charlesfield Parish Council.....	7
1.17 Chillsford Parish Council.....	7
1.18 Coal Authority	8
1.19 Darsham Parish Council	8
1.20 Dennington Parish Council	9
1.21 Dunwich Parish Meeting.....	9
1.22 East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust.....	10
1.23 East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board.....	10
1.24 SZC Co. Nuclear Generation Limited	11
1.25 Environment Agency.....	11
1.26 Essex County Council.....	12
1.27 Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew Parish Council	13
1.28 Felixstowe Town Council	14

1.29	Friston Parish Council.....	15
1.30	Great Bealings Parish Council.....	15
1.31	Hacheston Parish Council	16
1.32	Halesworth Town Council	17
1.33	Historic England	18
1.34	Ipswich Borough Council	19
1.35	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council	20
1.36	Kettleburgh Parish Council	21
1.37	Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council.....	21
1.38	Leiston-cum-SizeWell Town Council	22
1.39	Letheringham Parish Council.....	23
1.40	Little Bealings Parish Council	23
1.41	Little Glemham Parish Council	24
1.42	Marine Management Organisation	25
1.43	Marlesford Parish Council.....	25
1.44	Martlesham Parish Council.....	26
1.45	Melton Parish Council.....	27
1.46	Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council	28
1.47	Nacton Parish Council	28
1.48	National Grid.....	29
1.49	National Grid Ventures	29
1.50	Natural England.....	29
1.51	Network Rail	30
1.52	Otley Parish Council	31
1.53	Parnham Parish Council	31
1.54	Peasenhall Parish Council.....	32
1.55	Pettistree Parish Council	32
1.56	Playford Parish Council	33
1.57	Public Health England	33
1.58	Rendlesham Parish Council	34
1.59	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	34

1.60	Saxmundham Town Council.....	35
1.61	Scottish Power Renewables	36
1.62	Snape Parish Council	36
1.63	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Partnership	37
1.64	Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council.....	37
1.65	Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services.....	40
1.66	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council	41
1.67	Trimley St. Martin Parish Council	42
1.68	Trimley St. Mary Parish Council	42
1.69	Ubbeston Parish Council	42
1.70	Ufford Parish Council.....	42
1.71	Waldringfield Parish Council.....	43
1.72	Waveney District Council.....	43
1.73	Wenhaston with Mells Parish Council.....	44
1.74	Westerfield Parish Council.....	45
1.75	Westleton Parish Council.....	45
1.76	Wickham Market Parish Council.....	46
1.77	Woodbridge Town Council.....	46
1.78	Yoxford Parish Council	47
2	Summary of Responses from Section 42(1)(d) Consultees by Theme.....	48
2.1	Overall Proposals	48
2.2	Main Development Site.....	59
2.3	Northern Park and Ride at Darsham	63
2.4	Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market.....	63
2.5	Two-Village Bypass	64
2.6	Sizewell Link Road	65
2.7	Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements.....	67
2.8	Freight Management Facility	69
2.9	Rail Improvements.....	69

Annex F – Stage 3 Summary Responses

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

1.2 Accountable Officer for Ipswich and East and West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group

1.2.4. The officer expressed concern that the consultation information did not allow them to fully assess the health needs of the workforce and the resulting impact on local services. They welcomed further discussion with SZC Co. on a number of topics including:

- healthcare needs for Sizewell workers;
- impacts on primary care services at Leiston, Aldeburgh and Saxmundham;
- impacts on the wider population from worker behaviour; and
- options for health promotion.

1.2.5. They urged SZC Co. to support a preventative approach, targeting vulnerable groups and service providers (including sexual health, drug and alcohol services and mental health provision) and also requested controls and mitigation for air and noise pollution.

1.3 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council

1.3.1. The council expressed concern about having a number of energy projects in proximity to their community and commented that SZC Co. were doing the minimum required.

1.3.2. They were concerned about many of the impacts from the main development site, including: its visual impact on the landscape, and designated areas; the impact of the borrow pits on the site of special scientific interest (SSSI); noise, air and light pollution; and how this would affect communities and wildlife habitats.

1.3.3. The Parish Council felt more assessment was needed to be undertaken on the hydrological impacts including how this may be impacted by the proposed causeway across the SSSI. They also expressed concern about the impact of the site on coastal processes, and how moving the sea defence could disrupt these processes.

1.3.4. The Parish Council supported the proposal for a visitor centre and wanted SZC Co. to work closely with them to mitigate any negative impact on tourism in the area. They were concerned that the influx of people into the area would

have negative impacts on local infrastructure, would draw people to working at Sizewell, damage the local economy and supply chains, and that the proposed community fund would be inadequate.

- 1.3.5. The council commented on an overreliance on campus accommodation and suggested an approach with a permanent legacy should be taken, or that smaller ‘groups’ of permanent accommodation could be built to be used, for example, as student or retirement housing.
- 1.3.6. They believed a road-led strategy would be the only viable option following the marine-led strategy being discounted, with bulky materials being delivered by rail. They expressed a number of concerns about the rail-led strategy including;
- the closure of level crossings and footpaths;
 - the inability of existing rail services to cope with predicted use;
 - the effect of rail use at night on residents living near the track;
 - work on the tracks may not offer substantial legacy after the development;
 - temporary closure or new level crossing at Buckleswood Road; and
 - dependency on third parties to deliver the infrastructure to support this option.
- 1.3.7. They noted the short-term and long-term benefits coming from a road-led strategy. They suggested that route W be taken forward rather than the proposed Sizewell link road as they considered the current proposals to be too far north, and suggested a four-village bypass would deliver greater benefits than a two-village bypass.
- 1.3.8. They suggested that all energy companies in the area to work in a more collaborative way to address the major infrastructure issues and deliver the best solutions for all.
- 1.4 **Bawdsey Parish Council**
- 1.4.1. The council commented on the perceived impact from noise, dust, mud on roads and pedestrian safety. This had been experienced in their village in connection with construction for the Scottish Power Renewables windfarms.
- 1.4.2. They also expressed concern about the impact of Sizewell C on coastal erosion. The council commented that it was unclear how the beach landing facility would affect the coast further south and at the mouth of Deben. They also referred to the risk of sea level rise and extreme weather on the proposed development. They suggested that the main development site should be moved 30-50 metres (m) inland to prevent it being affected by collapsing of the coastal cliff.

1.4.3. The Parish Council believed that SZC Co. had not fully taken these issues into consideration in their consultation documentation.

1.5 Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council

1.5.1. The council fully endorsed the views expressed in the Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council's response (below).

1.5.2. They suggested the Friday Street roundabout should be designed to facilitate access from the A12 by ensuring good visibility and appropriate speed and that the northern end of the two-village bypass should be realigned to pass to the east of Foxburrow Wood to prevent adverse effects on Mollett's Farm.

1.5.3. They also considered that the A12/B1121 junction south of Saxmundham should be added to the list of proposed road improvements due to a history of accidents at this junction that would be exacerbated by increased traffic flow. The Parish Council requested that if the Sizewell link road were to be moved to follow route W, further consultation should be undertaken.

1.6 Blaxhall Parish Council

1.6.1. The council challenged SZC Co. for discounting the marine-led strategy with, what they considered, inadequate justification.

1.6.2. They expressed support for the rail-led strategy over road-led but noted concerns about level crossing closures in Blaxhall. They supported the rail-led strategy because it would remove some heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) from the roads, which they felt could ruin the countryside, however they did express concern that there was uncertainty over the rail-led strategy and that Network Rail would need to allocate sufficient priority to the works.

1.6.3. The council considered it essential for robust traffic management methods to be in place, and enhanced mobile coverage may be required if these methods rely on mobile communications.

1.7 Blythburgh Parish Council

1.7.1. The council commented on: the traffic impacts on Blythburgh including traffic density and speed; dangerous bottlenecks and junctions; lack of safe crossing points for pedestrians; discontinuous footpaths; 'rat-running' especially on the A12 and B1125; and the resulting impacts on businesses, tourism and the community.

1.7.2. They suggested the installation of speed cameras, pedestrian crossings and other road improvements to mitigate this impact.

- 1.7.3. They supported the maximum use of sea and rail transport, but were not convinced that this could be achieved. They expressed concern about the use of the B1122 for site access and supported the building of a link road, such as the D2 route, and a two-village bypass.
- 1.7.4. They commented on the belief that the accommodation proposals would have a significant impact on the local communities.
- 1.7.5. They commented that the site access should bridge, rather than separate, the SSSI to avoid habitat fragmentation and that rail legacy development should be included, such as double tracking from Woodbridge to Saxmundham.
- 1.7.6. They commented on the consultation itself, saying the time period was insufficient, the process not transparent and the information provided inadequate.

1.8 Brandeston Parish Council

- 1.8.1. The council suggested that a more aesthetic design would reduce the visual impact of the main development site, for example by using a graduated colour scheme.
- 1.8.2. They expressed concern about increased pressure on social services such as health and schools, the ability for local people to obtain accommodation and the effect on property prices, requesting further information from SZC Co..
- 1.8.3. They suggested that the transport strategy be a combination of rail and road-led, suggesting a preference for a four-village bypass ahead of a two-village bypass, and that further consideration should be given to the marine-led option.
- 1.8.4. They commented on the designated road transport route via the A14/A140/B1078, expressing concern that any road problems from Otley onwards or issues on the Orwell Bridge would create a 'rat-run' through Brandeston. The council suggested the proposed diversion of the A1078 over Glevering Bridge was unsatisfactory due to the poor condition of the road.

1.9 Bredfield Parish Council

- 1.9.1. The council preferred the rail-led transport strategy, commenting that rail upgrades should be complete before construction commences.
- 1.9.2. They considered the A12 and local feeder roads were unlikely to be able to cope with the proposed levels of traffic. The council expressed concern that safe access from Bredfield had not been considered as they considered vehicles may pass through Bredfield to bypass congestion.

1.9.3. The council also believed the rise of ‘fly parking’ may be experienced, as it was during Hinkley Point C construction, and they considered that they had seen no consideration on how SZC Co. planned to address this.

1.10 Brightwell, Foxhall and Purdis Farm Parish Council

1.10.1. The council commented on their concerns about the proposed road-led strategy. They strongly objected to the siting of the freight management facility within the Felixstowe peninsula. They considered both proposed options for the freight management facility to be unsuitable, with delays exacerbated by the potential closure of Orwell Bridge.

1.10.2. They supported the rail-led strategy for the long-term improvements to the East Suffolk line, and to reduce the number of HGVs on the road.

1.10.3. They suggested that the marine-led strategy should be reinstated, to further reduce the number of HGVs.

1.11 Bromswell Parish Council

1.11.1. The council commented that SZC Co. had failed to provide sufficient information in their consultation.

1.11.2. They opposed the closing of several level crossings, and in particular the Bromeswell – Melton/Ufford crossing, as the path is heavily used by pedestrians and there have never been any accidents, making its closure unnecessary. They suggested alternatives such as the use of mini stop lights or an automated crossing.

1.11.3. They considered the addition of pylons and their visual impact and the location of accommodation and park and ride facilities to be unsuitable for the rural locations, and they opposed the ‘either/or’ approach to the transport strategy which they felt should be integrated to balance benefits and impacts more fairly.

1.12 Bruisyard Parish Council

1.12.1. The council expressed concern over the duration of the construction period, the impact of coastal erosion on the site and the effect it would have on the environment and wildlife at Minsmere and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

1.12.2. They suggested further assessment was needed to weigh up the two transport options and that rail should be used as much as possible to avoid congestion on roads. They supported a four-village bypass to help alleviate traffic at Little Glemham but feared that the proposed alterations to the A140/B1078 junction would be insufficient.

1.12.3. They considered that every effort should be made to avoid closures of level crossings, and supported a level crossing at Buckleswood Road. They considered a new rail siding would be more beneficial than using Sizewell Halt and that the freight management facility at Seven Hills would be more appropriate. They considered that the parking at Darsham should remain open for people using Darsham Station.

1.12.4. The council supported the accommodation strategy, but expressed concern that the influx of workers could pose problems. They requested that the local population be prioritised for job opportunities.

1.13 Butley Wantisden and Capel St. Andrew Parish Council

1.13.1. The council opposed the development because of: the proposed cost of the power generated; the short lifetime of the plant; the length of time for decommissioning and subsequent coastal erosion; and the impact on local services from the number of workers.

1.14 Cadent Gas Ltd

1.14.1. Cadent commented on the need for appropriate protection for retained apparatus; and standards compliance for works proposed in close proximity to their apparatus. They highlighted key considerations on safety around pipelines and the requirement for advance notice of any required diversions of apparatus. They also required SZC Co. to obtain the necessary planning permission for diversion works to be carried out and for a minimum C4/Conceptual Design study to establish an appropriate diversion route.

1.15 Campsea Ashe Parish Council

1.15.1. The council commented on the perceived lack of detail in the consultation document, particularly regarding the impact on and lack of transport modelling of Campsea Ashe. They considered that the main development site would intrude on the AONB and heritage coast, which would be likely to affect tourism in the area.

1.15.2. They were sceptical of the proposed employment benefits and considered there would be a negative impact on the local housing market and impact on public services. They considered mitigation for tourism would be needed and requested investment in facilities such as Victory Hall in Campsea Ashe, particularly as there was likely to be a cumulative effect from Sizewell and other developments.

1.15.3. The council expressed support for the accommodation strategy, the freight management facility (but suggested a siting west of Orwell Bridge) and the two-village bypass.

- 1.15.4. They were disappointed about the discarding of the marine-led strategy, and concerned about the ability to deliver the rail-led strategy. However, they favoured this strategy to reduce the number of HGVs on the roads. They suggested:
- the passing loop should be double tracked from Saxmundham to Woodbridge;
 - mitigation should be proposed to reduce noise and vibration impacts on residents living adjacent to the rail track;
 - mitigating the impact on key pinch points in the village; and
 - the Orchard level crossing should remain open and a reduction in the proposed speed of freight trains would allow this.
- 1.15.5. They suggested the location of the southern park and ride site may cause problems on the A12, suggesting Woodbridge or Martelsham as more suitable locations. They considered that the mitigation measures would not tackle concern about the visual blight on the landscape, light, air and noise pollution.
- 1.15.6. They suggested improving capacity on slip roads and the B1078/B1116 roundabout, lowering the speed limit to 30mph on the roundabout and removing vegetation from around the B1078 bridge to give better visibility.

1.16 Charlesfield Parish Council

- 1.16.1. The council supported the rail-led strategy as they considered it to be lower impact, safer, and to have long-term benefits. They suggested it could be used by the workforce.
- 1.16.2. They commented on the perceived increase in traffic on the B1078 through Charlsfield and recommended that light goods vehicles (LGVs) be directed via the HGV route through Debach, with strict monitoring processes.
- 1.16.3. They suggested the existing A12 and A14 dual carriageways should be the preferred route to access the Wickham Market park and ride. The council expressed concern about how villagers may access Wickham Market, where their essential amenities are, because of increased traffic.

1.17 Chillsford Parish Council

- 1.17.1. The council supported the rail-led strategy despite concerns about its reliance on Network Rail but questioned why the marine-led strategy had been discounted. Due to the increase in traffic from workers as well as movement of materials, they supported a freight management facility regardless of which transport strategy was chosen, and that all transport improvements should be completed before construction.

- 1.17.2. They considered the proposed design to be unsuitable as it would lie in an AONB, so should be styled in a way more suitable to the landscape, as well as running power cables underground rather than using pylons.
- 1.17.3. They commented the benefits presented would not outweigh the disadvantages, including: adversely impacting the local economy if workers were lured away from jobs with smaller businesses; the negative impact on tourism from traffic; and reduced accommodation availability. They questioned whether workers from Hinkley Point C would be used, further reducing benefits to the area.
- 1.17.4. They were concerned about the lack of detail on environmental issues, as well as the impact on health, emergency service and local schools.

1.18 Coal Authority

- 1.18.1. The authority commented that the proposed development is sited outside of the defined coalfield, and had no comments or observations to make. They stated that it would not be necessary for them to be contacted in future consultation stages.

1.19 Darsham Parish Council

- 1.19.1. The council did not believe the development would have benefits for the area in general. They suggested SZC Co. to work with Network Rail to ensure the rail-led strategy was taken further, as they considered that traffic modelling underestimated traffic flows and how they would impact public transport.
- 1.19.2. They expressed concern about the lack of pedestrian access from the park and ride facility at Darsham and the station, as well as the lack of any legacy from the proposals. They also considered that the park and ride facility would negatively impact Darsham's dark skies designation.
- 1.19.3. The council considered that SZC Co. should: consider the alternative route W, as they believed that would provide better benefits than the Sizewell link road; and examine the closure of Orwell Bridge which may create serious congestion.
- 1.19.4. They expressed concern that the impact of climate change, sea-level rise and surface water could cause flooding over the lifespan of the Sizewell C Project, as well as fear over the visual impact from the spoil heaps and the pylons.
- 1.19.5. They commented on how the influx of workers into Leiston would put pressure on local services as well as housing prices. The council expressed concern that it would be difficult for local people to find tradespeople if they were employed by the plant.

1.20 Dennington Parish Council

1.20.1. The council considered that the traffic modelling had underestimated the impact of additional traffic on villages along the A1120. They agreed with SZC Co.'s analysis that local traffic would reroute away from HGV traffic on the A12 to use the A1120, but also commented that the workforce from the west would use the A1120 towards Yoxford/Darsham instead of the B1078 towards Wickham Market. They also requested assurance that access to community funds would be available to communities along traffic corridors, and not constrained by a fixed radius around the development site, to enable communities to install traffic-calming measures.

1.21 Dunwich Parish Meeting

1.21.1. The Parish commented on the perceived cumulative effect of various ongoing projects, as well as general concerns about nuclear power. They also considered the site would be too small for the proposed reactors and sought assurance that this would not have any negative safety implications.

1.21.2. Further they considered that the environmental impacts could not be sufficiently assessed with the information that had been provided, in particular about how it would impact on the AONB, wildlife preserves and its impact on hydrology.

1.21.3. They opposed 24-hour working because of the impact of noise and light pollution and its impact on community and wildlife. The Parish expressed concern over the visual impact and suggested the turbine halls should be lower, and that cables should be put underground rather than on pylons.

1.21.4. They understood the removal of the marine strategy but still supported the use of the beach landing facility wherever possible, to reduce the number of HGVs on the road which was considered high under all scenarios. They supported the rail proposals but expressed concern over the severing of villages by the Theberton bypass, as well as the economic damage it could do to local farms. They opposed the Sizewell link road and supported route W as an alternative.

1.21.5. They supported the two-village bypass but expressed concern over its proximity to woodland including Foxburrow Wood.

1.21.6. The Parish commented that employment benefits appeared to have diminished because of proposals to employ workers and use the supply chain from Hinkley Point C.

1.21.7. They considered the proposed tourism fund would not be able to mitigate the adverse effects of construction on visitor attractiveness. The Parish

commented that tourism would be seriously diminished, with subsequent effects on the local economy.

1.21.8. They noted the potential effects on the local rental market and further damage to tourism if tourist accommodation was used by workers.

1.21.9. The Parish commented on the lack of assessment of the impact on local services.

1.22 East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust

1.22.1. The Trust suggested that combined Sizewell B and C outage car parks should be considered, and that it would be imperative that designated land is available at all times whilst the helipad is being relocated. They also requested constant access to land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) because of the danger of storing bulk materials next to residential areas and caravan pitches.

1.22.2. They expressed concern about medical needs of construction workers, commenting that identification of a clinical skills base for onsite medical mitigation would be vital and highlighted the increased pressure on ambulance services for workers to access sufficient secondary care.

1.22.3. They commented that the rise in residency to the area and increase in motor vehicles would worsen an already challenging local road network, increasing response times. The Trust supported the use of rail and water transport to reduce the impacts on local road network. They requested that any movements of abnormal loads are communicated to them well in advance.

1.22.4. They expressed a preference for the new rail siding because of the associated health risks with an overhead conveyer system, and for installing a new level crossing at Buckleswood Road instead of closing the road.

1.23 East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board

1.23.1. The Board highlighted a number of issues, including the proposed watercourse diversion of two Sizewell drains and considered there was insufficient information presented regarding this realignment.

1.23.2. They raised further concerns about issues they considered had not been addressed regarding surface water discharge and the resultant impact on the SSSI, fluvial flood risk and the capacity of Minsmere sluice. They commented that groundwater numerical modelling and assessment, as well as the impact of flows from surface water to ground water within Sizewell Marshes SSSI, should have been undertaken at an earlier stage. They further requested that any impact on Minsmere sluice and changes to coastal processes be

considered in more detail when assessing the impact of the development on surface water drainage.

- 1.23.3. They made additional comments about land drainage consent which they considered planning permission may be dependent on, and the involvement of other stakeholders in ensuring the proposals are acceptable.

1.24 SZC Co. Nuclear Generation Limited

- 1.24.1. SZC Co. Nuclear Generation Limited commented that they would continue to monitor any potential impacts on Sizewell B as the scheme develops towards the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission.

1.25 Environment Agency

- 1.25.1. The Environment Agency suggested that it may not be appropriate to replicate approaches used at Hinkley Point C due to environmental differences between the two locations. They commented on the need for an updated Habitat Regulation Assessment and a Water Framework Directive Assessment following new infrastructure changes, as well as further input into risk assessments for areas of flood risk and contamination of groundwater.
- 1.25.2. They considered that they had not been provided with appropriate modelling assessments, requested a sustainable waste management strategy and requested that SZC Co. use the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Code of Practice to determine whether excavated material is waste.
- 1.25.3. The Environment Agency required a surface water drainage strategy to avoid pollution to the water environment. They sought for all key drainage infrastructure, appropriate mitigation, and treatment systems to be in place before any discharge. They asked for special and specific consideration of matters surrounding designated habitats and sites, in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016, and in consultation with Suffolk County Council, and local water companies.
- 1.25.4. The Environment Agency also commented that assessment of alternatives to direct cooling had not occurred, nor had coastal flooding/ecology impacts been assessed, which should identify an appropriate strategy for Sizewell Bay and along the Minsmere frontage. They commented impacts on protected aquatic species from construction and operation processes were unknown, as was mitigation for the aquatic environment so it was not possible to assess the appropriateness of the mitigation measures.
- 1.25.5. At the main development site, they considered a flood risk assessment for Zones 2 and 3 was needed and impacts of groundwater and surface water on

protected species/habitats should be assessed, and a strategy established. The source of freshwater supply was unknown.

- 1.25.6. They commented that further compensation for loss of habitat would be required in addition to the habitat creation scheme, and that impacts on protected species and habitats had not been adequately assessed for additional developments.
- 1.25.7. They suggested flood risk assessments for all developments in Zones 2 and 3, and commented that impacts of river crossings were unknown for several additional developments.
- 1.25.8. They suggested that the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) Regulations 2015 should be considered, and requested consultation if proposals for COMAH establishments change the likelihood of major accidents or their consequences. They also requested collaborative working to ensure appropriate technology requirements are selected to mitigate impacts on air quality, referencing the Medium Combustion Plant Directive and Best Available Technique reference documents (BREF).
- 1.25.9. The Environment Agency listed specific sites that raised concerns including Sizewell Marshes SSSI and Minsmere and Walberswick Heath and Marshes SSSI, Leiston Drain, Outer Thames Special Protection Area (SPA), Southern North Sea Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and North Norfolk SAC, Sizewell Bay and outlined further assessments needed.
- 1.25.10. They highlighted concerns about associated developments: including loss of habitat for otters and water voles; impact on the River Alde from the two-village bypass; impact on habitats from the Yoxford roundabout; ecological impacts from other rail improvements; and species impacts, including the European Eel, of the Theberton bypass.

1.26 Essex County Council

- 1.26.1. The council supported Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council's response to the consultation and noted that a number of issues needed to be resolved between Stage 3 and the submission of the application for development consent, arguing that the proposals were lacking in detailed information. They commented that the combination of projects in the region should have been considered earlier in the DCO process as it would put additional pressure on availability of materials and labour.
- 1.26.2. The lead local flood authority did not object to the development on flood risk grounds, but stated that the amount of minerals required, and associated infrastructure, had not been specifically qualified with an individual mineral planning authority area.

- 1.26.3. They recognised the economic benefits of the proposed development, although as the impacts would mostly be felt in the locality, suggested local communities should be compensated.
 - 1.26.4. They welcomed SZC Co.'s commitments to education, training and employment and urged investment into skills and education for young people.
 - 1.26.5. They highlighted several coefficients that had not been factored into workforce estimations, that may impact SZC Co.'s ability to meet local growth aspirations. They suggested that the economic benefits may be less than anticipated. They proposed additional mapping that would help the council understand the potential workforce pull from North Essex and what mitigation measures will be in place to meet other local growth aspirations. They suggested that the Gravity Model should take account of how many workers would move to the area from outside a 90-minute commute.
 - 1.26.6. The council commented on the potential effect on the local housing market, in terms of housing for sale or rent and suggest the caravan site would be unable to accommodate 400 pitches, further increasing demand on holiday parks.
 - 1.26.7. They commented that there was a need for a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment to include impacts on the health services in Essex. They requested SZC Co. provide a more detailed tourism mitigation strategy as the negative impact on Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Minsmere Nature Reserve, country walks and beach and coastal paths could damage the tourism industry.
 - 1.26.8. The council considered the dismissal of the marine-led strategy had not been adequately explained and that the rail-led strategy did not address the time or cost needed for changes to the local rail network. They commented that the road-led strategy would be unsuitable because of the number of Hed that the transport routes for materials coming through Essex had not been identified, and impacts not considered.
 - 1.26.9. The council highlighted the impact on: air quality, environmental protection and health, noise, vibration, light pollution, contaminated land and water quality resulting from the main development site and transport infrastructure. They expressed concern that it would be sited on the Suffolk Heritage Coast, in an AONB and cross a SSSI. In particular, they highlighted the addition of pylons on the AONB and questioned how protected species would be impacted by the disturbance.
- 1.27 **Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew Parish Council**
- 1.27.1. The Council considered the decision to discount the marine-led strategy had not been justified and supported the rail-led strategy as they considered it would

be better at reducing congestion and limiting environmental impacts, but were sceptical of SZC Co.'s commitment to it.

1.27.2. They supported the two-village bypass but commented that specific suggestions for routing the bypass made at Stage 2 were not adopted or even acknowledged. They believed insufficient detail had been provided at this stage, and did not feel that the opportunity to comment on the final application satisfied SZC Co.'s obligations to consult and allow pre-application scrutiny by affected parties. Subsequently, they believed a further stage of consultation would be required.

1.27.3. They suggested the following alterations to the two-village bypass:

- the Stratford St. Andrew roundabout should be moved further west to include Tinder Brook and Chapel Lane;
- the routing should run east of Foxburrow Wood;
- the speed limit should be maximum 50mph on the new bypass;
- they expected substantial noise, dust, emission and light pollution mitigation;
- they opposed the raised sections of the proposed bypass 2m above ground level near property;
- they suggested that cuttings be provided, highlighting the benefits of this;
- they suggested footpaths and rights of way be maintained, improved or diverted and that additional provisions be made for vulnerable groups;
- it must be designed to minimise light spill and preserve 'dark skies'; and
- many of these issues equally apply to the suggested four-village bypass, and they requested inclusion in primary discussions concerning the possibility of this.

1.27.4. They also expressed concern that The Friday Street Farm Shop and Café would be negatively affected.

1.28 Felixstowe Town Council

1.28.1. The Council expressed a preference for a rail-led strategy for environmental and traffic advantages but were concerned about the dependency on Network Rail. They commented on severe limitations with freight capacity in the eastern region of Network Rail, and suggested that it would be essential for SZC Co. to provide evidence that:

- the five new paths required could be made available on appropriate timescales without prejudice to wider strategic needs for rail capacity in the region; and
- that SZC Co. had investigated Sizewell C acquiring two existing paths allocated to the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority.

1.28.2. They favoured the freight management facility at Seven Hills Junction if no other appropriate location could be found, but suggested that it would require improvements to the Seven Hills Junction, including additional lanes and full intelligent traffic light signalling.

1.29 Friston Parish Council

1.29.1. The council expressed concern over the use of the United Kingdom European Pressurised Reactor (UK EPR™) reactor, and the current inadequacy of ambulance response times. Further they felt there would be negative impacts on air quality and dust from construction work, nitrous oxide particles and noise levels from machinery.

1.29.2. They believed a four-village bypass would be necessary due to the A12 being a main artery for residents and new buildings exacerbating this need. They expected maximum use of rail transport and welcomed a dual track between Woodbridge and Saxmundham, providing a rail service to Leiston. They requested that SZC Co. supplement the highways budget to allow for damage to roads.

1.29.3. They highlighted the importance of the A12 as a main artery for residents and expected the present traffic situation to be exacerbated further by planned residential developments. They believed a four-village bypass would be necessary for this reason, together with improvements to junctions and carriageways from south of Martlesham to north of Woodbridge. They expected maximum use of rail transport and welcomed a dual track between Woodbridge and Saxmundham, providing a rail service to Leiston.

1.29.4. The council opposed the worker campus in Eastbridge due to visual, social and environmental impact and the lack of legacy benefits. They suggested splitting the campus to provide long-term housing. They also raised concern about the source of supply of potable water required for the campus, commenting that any resulting water rationing would be unacceptable.

1.29.5. The council believed the influx of workers would negatively impact local services and urged SZC Co. to provide details of how it intends to mitigate this as well as ensuring long-term employment opportunities and apprenticeships are provided.

1.30 Great Bealings Parish Council

1.30.1. The council considered the consultation process to have failed to sufficiently contend with the strategic needs of the area, which could render any approval of the development invalid.

- 1.30.2. The council expressed concern about the use of an EPR™ reactor and believed that the benefits presented would not outweigh the risks and costs, especially with regards to the economic value of the Suffolk countryside and impact on tourism. They suggested a cost/benefit analysis on an appropriate net present value based on a 2, 3 or 5-year delay.
- 1.30.3. They believed the development had not been adequately justified due to long-term impact on the wider environment including Minsmere, Lowestoft Marshes and the Alde and Deben valleys.
- 1.30.4. They noted that local plans or a possible Ipswich Northern Relief Road had not been mentioned, resulting in a lack of joined-up approach.
- 1.30.5. The council questioned SZC Co.'s commuting assumptions and workforce and accommodation capacity estimations and considered that they had been underestimated. They believed this could seriously distort the local rental market and impact traffic.
- 1.30.6. The council challenged the assessment of the two transport strategies and believed the economic case for rail-led had been unfairly penalised. They requested that assessment should include short and long term environmental impacts of both strategies. They commented that the removal of the marine-led strategy had not been convincingly justified, as they did not believe it would cause more damage than the road-led strategy.
- 1.30.7. The council commented that the two-village bypass proposal was short-sighted and took no account of wider regional traffic problems. They also expressed concern about the impact on minor roads being used as 'rat-runs', as many are too narrow in places for HGVs to pass each other.

1.31 Hacheston Parish Council

- 1.31.1. The council did not support the Sizewell C Project due to the lack of information on Hacheston residents' concerns and believed more long-term benefits to residents should be seen, as mitigation measures offered would be inadequate with no compensation being offered currently.
- 1.31.2. They strongly opposed the location of the southern park and ride due to impact on landscape, agricultural land, two special landscape areas (SLAs), noise and air pollution and congestion on the B1078 in Wickham Market. They suggested that a more southerly site would be more effective in reducing vehicle movement on the A12.
- 1.31.3. For the southern park and ride site, the council requested 20ft bunds on the north, south and west and tree and shrub planting. They commented on the lack of detail for vehicle movements and raised concerns about: light and air

pollution; additional LGV movements; impact on heritage sites; listed buildings and SLAs; and that the postal consolidation facility would be used for additional purposes. They requested that the site be returned to its original state after its use.

- 1.31.4. The council believed both proposed Wickham Market mitigation measures were inadequate, for example with regards to the Fiveways roundabout. They considered that Option 1 would require locating alternative car parking for residents, which had not been done. They opposed Option 2 because of the diversion over Glevering Bridge, negative landscape impacts, increased danger at Valley Farm and for its use as a road to the B1116, increasing congestion at the southern roundabout.
- 1.31.5. They commented on the addition of pylons and the perceived detrimental impact to the AONB.
- 1.31.6. The council believed the rejection of the marine-led strategy had not been robustly evidenced and strongly supported the rail-led strategy. They welcomed the proposed road improvements and the two-village bypass but would prefer a four-village bypass, and supported the accommodation strategy. They requested low-cost permanent housing as a legacy benefit for residents.
- 1.31.7. The council supported Option 1, reconfiguring an overhead conveyer system at Sizewell Halt, as they believed this option would reduce HGV traffic in Leiston and benefit direct rail services in their decommissioning of Sizewell A and B. They supported a freight management facility in principle but not as part of a road-led strategy. They suggested it should be used as a park and ride within the rail-led strategy.
- 1.31.8. The council supported upgrades to the Saxmundham to Leiston branch level crossings and, despite noise and air pollution impacts, believed they would leave lasting passenger service benefits. They commented on the benefits of the proposed passing loop but stated that they did not comment on individual upgrades or closures because of too much information for the period given.
- 1.31.9. The council commented on the belief that the format of the Joint Local Authorities Group forum with parish councillor meetings was unsatisfactory.

1.32 Halesworth Town Council

1.32.1. The main points made by the council are as follows:

- traffic projections must consider the planned home developments in Halesworth over the next six years and HGVs should not use the A144 through Halesworth;

- they favoured the rail-led strategy, and asked SZC Co. to consider having additional trains to reduce disruption to people and the environment;
- a roundabout at the A144/A12 junction south of Bramfield would be preferable to the current proposed road improvement, which could potentially make the junction more dangerous; and
- concern about the impact of an HGV breakdown or accident on emergency services.

1.32.2. The council noted the prevalence of HGVs under the road-led strategy, commenting on potential ‘trains’ of continuous HGVs on local roads and the A12. They quoted that the average predicted level of traffic equates to a HGV passing a single point every 1.5-2 minutes. They considered a reduction of 50 HGVs per train per day as part of the rail-led strategy would have a significantly smaller effect on road infrastructure.

1.33 Historic England

1.33.1. Historic England challenged the unconfirmed scheme elements prior to a full **Environmental Statement (ES)** (Doc Ref. Book 6) and requested reassurance of confirmation with sufficient time to secure mitigation strategies before the full **ES** submission. They outlined elements to be included and requested further details of specific mitigation strategies for each heritage element.

1.33.2. They believed the duration of construction would result in a high degree of harm to Leiston Abbey 1st and 2nd sites, which derive great significance from their surroundings, due to the following:

- significant landscape, train movement, noise and light impacts from the green rail route south of Leiston Abbey 2nd site (and Fisher’s Farm House). They commented that the proposed mitigation would be inadequate;
- impacts of increased traffic on the access road which leads to Leiston Abbey 2nd site. They requested further information to identify whether changes would be needed to visitor access when turning from Abbey Road;
- potential visibility of the main structures, such as turbine halls, on Leiston 1st site, and they suggested further consultation with regards to design proposals;
- visual impact of the campus and ancillary buildings, the new roundabout and site entrance and construction noise and lighting on Abbey Road; and
- cumulative impacts from other energy projects.

1.33.3. They requested further assessment and details of mitigation for remaining construction in the marine zone, including the beach landing facility.

- 1.33.4. Historic England stated that they did not object to the Sizewell link road but were concerned about the impact on the landscape, isolated rural buildings and Theberton House, which they believed would need further assessment and landscaping mitigation. They also noted the benefits of the Theberton bypass but expressed concern about the potential impact on the agricultural landscape and the character of the land. They requested further assessment to identify the significance and impact on heritage assets including Theberton Hall.
- 1.33.5. They expressed concern about the demolition of a Grade II listed building in Farnham for the two-village bypass, and impact on Glemham Hall, the Church of St. Andrew and the Church of St. Mary. They requested the expansion of the identified heritage asset list to include Glemham Hall and ancillary buildings and suggested that landscaping mitigation be considered.
- 1.33.6. Historic England preferred Option 2 for the freight management facility to avoid Seven Hills Barrow group of scheduled monuments but commented that Option 1 also had a high potential for prehistoric archaeology.
- 1.33.7. In reference to the Yoxford roundabout they commented on the substantial infrastructure in the location of Cockfield Hall and The Rookery, the inadequacy of the analysis and that impact on the conservation area, listed buildings and historic landscapes needs to be fully assessed and further mitigation considered.
- 1.34 Ipswich Borough Council
- 1.34.1. The council supported the rail-led transport strategy for sustainability but commented that the marine-led strategy should be more fully explored. They expressed concern about noise and vibration impacts of freight trains and believed the Felixstowe line should be considered in the assessment.
- 1.34.2. They expressed concern that Ipswich's potential had not been recognised regarding: higher skilled staff from the University of Suffolk; and residential and tourism accommodation. They urged use of the marketplace website and for contract opportunities for local businesses.
- 1.34.3. They requested that SZC Co. have regard to the Ipswich Garden Suburb development of 3,500 dwellings, particularly to: noise and disturbance; the need for level crossing improvements at Westerfield Station; and installation of a footbridge rather than a permanent diversion to retain Public Rights of Way (PRoW).
- 1.34.4. They asked that the Ipswich housing market be included in the accommodation strategy, in terms of the impact on the Ipswich rental market and the need for workers living in Ipswich.

- 1.34.5. The council requested full consideration of impacts on Ipswich’s road network air quality in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and **ES** (Doc Ref. Book 6) and necessary mitigation such as low emission bus transfers for staff from Ipswich and Westerfield Railway Stations.
- 1.34.6. The Council sought further information on the diversion strategy for HGVs and LGVs in case of closure of the Orwell Bridge. They suggested that a freight management facility also be provided to the west of Orwell Bridge. They urged that no HGVs should be diverted through Ipswich.
- 1.35 **Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council**
- 1.35.1. The council expressed concern about changes made to the transport strategy since Stage 2 and insisted that key transport infrastructure should be in place prior to the main development site construction. They expressed concern about the approach to choosing a transport strategy and commented that cost should not be a deciding factor.
- 1.35.2. The council opposed the road-led strategy due to its reliance on HGV traffic and disruption to residents, air and visual pollution, and impact on ecology and cumulative impact on the A12 during the same timeframe as other projects. They did not express full support for the rail-led strategy because of the demands on the A12, the impact of air pollution and the safety and wellbeing of residents, and suggested there should be improvements to the East Suffolk line and a more ambitious rail strategy. They sought clarification on the role of rail transport under normal operation, outages and maintenance, specifically relating to removal of hazardous waste.
- 1.35.3. The council opposed the proposal for the Sizewell link road because of inadequacies in congestion mitigation on the A12, unnecessary routing of traffic north of the site, negative ecological impacts and lack of consideration of noise impacts and detail explaining the justification of the route selection. They expressed concern about the Theberton bypass proposals (including earthworks, surface water and rights of way) and made suggestions about lighting, and requested further impact assessment.
- 1.35.4. The council questioned the estimates made about HGV/LGV movements, commenting on modelling inadequacies. They sought assurance that the minor road network would be controlled, for further consideration of the A12/B1119 Saxmundham junction for improvements and requested details of agreed diversion routes.
- 1.35.5. They believed the station design and proposed pylons would cause visible impact and expressed concern about habitat land-take, drainage and sewage, waste disposal, lack of lighting information or firm estimates for material

quantities. They felt the material increases from Stage 2 meant a further stage of consultation would be required.

- 1.35.6. The council sought further details on the Sizewell Halt or new rail siding proposals, including impact on surrounding areas e.g. Lover's Lane and welcomed the freight management facility but questioned its inclusion in the road-led strategy only. They expressed concern about petrol or noxious liquid spills, congestion on the A14 and impacts on air quality. For Option 1, Seven Hills, they made requests about access and egress to the crematorium.
- 1.35.7. They questioned assumptions made about park and ride schemes, requested bus service information and for land to be returned to greenfield after use. They suggested additions to the park and ride scheme and opposed plans for parking at the main site.
- 1.35.8. The council felt SZC Co. had underestimated the impacts of the workforce coming into the area, including the impact on tourism, and that the employment opportunities would be low skilled and reduce local trade resources. They also made suggestions about safeguarding members of the workforce. They expressed concern about school capacity, social and emergency services and made requests and suggestions about the Health Impact Assessment, the Community Fund and Code of Conduct, arguing that impact on some recreational amenities was not considered. The council commented on the perceived impact on rental opportunities especially for younger people and on tourist accommodation during peak seasons.
- 1.35.9. They commented on the difficulty in accessing printed consultation materials and disappointment that no public exhibitions were held in their parish. They believed a further round of consultation would be needed, due to the difference in Stage 3 proposals compared to previous stages.

1.36 Kettleburgh Parish Council

- 1.36.1. The council expressed concern about the southern park and ride proposals and considered traffic from the A14 may use the A1120 to an unclassified road through Kettleburgh to get to Wickham Market. They requested assurance that this route would not be used for park and ride access or by HGV traffic to access the main development site, as it would be unsuitable.

1.37 Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council

- 1.37.1. The council's main concerns related to the Innocence Farm Option 2 for the proposed freight management facility. They outlined alternative sites, including Orwell Crossing/Ransomes site, the 'Land at Clickett Hill Road and South of Railway Line' and brownfield sites near the A14.

- 1.37.2. They commented that flood risk, archaeology, minerals and ecological impacts under the Habitats Regulation Assessment legislation for Innocence Farm were unknown. They expressed the belief that there was a lack of evidence addressing noise, light, chemical and particulate pollution impacts, which could harm the health and wellbeing of people and wildlife through cancer risk, heart disease, dementia, coughing, sleep deprivation and impact on child health. They requested evidence and assessment of the causes from pollutants, commenting on a Defra report (*“Draft plans to improve air quality in the UK, tackling nitrogen dioxide in our towns and cities, UK overview document”*, Defra, September 2015).
- 1.37.3. The council commented that traffic can only turn left to and from Innocence Farm, meaning traffic would ‘trombone’ from junctions 58 and 60 onto the right carriageway. They believed other sites had better access to the A14 and would be more isolated from schools and residences.
- 1.37.4. Finally, they commented on the high archaeological value of the site and believed proposed groundworks, building foundations and thick roadways would destroy this.

1.38 Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council

- 1.38.1. The council opposed the proposals, with primary concerns regarding impacts on the town centre and additional traffic especially during the construction phase. They highlighted areas to include mitigation and compensatory measures in future proposals and commented on the lack of detail in the consultation documentation, particularly for Leiston centre.
- 1.38.2. They expressed concern about the size and location of the main development site and associated infrastructure including: Sizewell B relocated facilities; the helipad; pylons; landscape impacts on the AONB, SSSI, Ramsar site and heritage assets such as Leiston Abbey; and noise, vibration, air pollution, flood risk, groundwater, coastal path and coastal process impacts. They also believed the development would impact recreation space, PRoW and beach access, and cause a cumulative effect due to other simultaneous construction projects.
- 1.38.3. The council commented on the potential impact from: pressure on emergency services; negative impacts on tourism; local employers; and to the local economy following the peak of construction, distortions to the local housing market and infrastructure impacts from absorbing the workforce. They supported the positive local employment opportunities, education and training opportunities and increased visitor numbers to the town, but requested that the visitor centre be sited in the town centre.

- 1.38.4. They supported the accommodation campus and made suggestions for the proposed sports facilities.
- 1.38.5. The council suggested greater use of the beach landing facility and further exploration of the sea option. They supported the rail-led strategy over road-led, including the green rail route and the new railhead. They supported Option 2 for Buckleswood Road. They expressed concern about the impact of the LEEIE site access on traffic, and made requests for the timing of train movements and for automatic barriers to be installed on the route from Saxmundham. They requested mitigation for Waterloo Avenue, King George's Avenue, the eastern end of Valley Road, Abbey Lane, Lover's Lane, to double the rail track between Saxmundham and Woodbridge and for a roundabout at Crown Farm Corner. They expressed concern about worker fly-parking, congestion, noise and air pollution from HGVs and suggested spreading workforce shift patterns to mitigate the impact of worker bus movements.
- 1.38.6. They supported all junction improvements, Yoxford roundabout and the Sizewell link road, which they considered necessary for the rail-led strategy as well, and requested completion before the start of Sizewell C Project construction. They believed the traffic assessment through Leiston and Knodishall had not been adequate, and requested control measures, signage and enforcement to ensure correct routes are used.
- 1.38.7. They highlighted issues with traffic related to the southern park and ride and suggested legacy benefits for the northern park and ride. They expressed support for the two-village bypass but urged that a four-village bypass be taken forward instead.

1.39 Letheringham Parish Council

- 1.39.1. The council expressed opposition to the Wickham Market park and ride proposals. They highlighted potential problems at this location for villages along the B1078, commenting that these would be exacerbated by the inclusion of additional parking at a location between Potsford Bridge and Wickham Market. They suggested that alternative sites be made available along the A14 after Orwell Bridge or the expansion of the existing park and ride site on the A12.

1.40 Little Bealings Parish Council

- 1.40.1. The council commented that although they supported the principle of a rail-led strategy, this should not be at the expense of closures of PRow. They specifically objected to the closures of footpaths linking Bealings and Playford as this is an important local recreational route along the Fynn Valley.

1.41 Little Glemham Parish Council

- 1.41.1. The council accepted the need for the development but believed there was a lack of detail in the proposals. Their main concern was that current problems in their village on A12 would become worse, including noise, vibration, air pollution, and difficulties crossing the road. They considered the consultation documentation underestimated the impact of HGVs on the roads.
- 1.41.2. The council believed the accommodation campus would help to mitigate the effects of traffic. They had concerns about the influx of workers including: pressure on local services; impact on the housing market; and loss of on-street parking. They suggested mitigation measures, such as: onsite medical facilities; incentives for workers to commute; and to only allow use of tourist accommodation out of season. They further suggested funding for promoting tourism. They welcomed SZC Co.'s skills, education and employment strategy and the policy to recruit home-based workers where possible.
- 1.41.3. The council supported sea and rail transport to reduce traffic on an inadequate road network. They expressed concern about the reliance on Network Rail for the rail-led strategy. They outlined the reasons that workers would not use the East Suffolk line, and suggested that SZC Co. could potentially run extra or longer trains.
- 1.41.4. The council supported the park and rides, but requested that they be compulsory. They identified negative impacts which included: congestion on the A12 to B1078 slip road, the B1078/B1116 roundabout as well as safety issues from poor visibility and noise, vibration and air pollution. They suggested mitigation measures, including lengthening the slip road, removing vegetation and using buses that comply with environmental standards. They highlighted the importance of access from Little Glemham to Wickham Market and requested that whichever mitigation scheme is chosen, delays and congestion must be minimised to prevent 'rat-running' over unsuitable narrow roads.
- 1.41.5. They suggested that Option 1 of the Wickham Market mitigation measures would be unacceptable as faster traffic would create noise, vibration and danger to residents. They preferred Option 2, the diversion route, but expressed concern about the use of Glevering Bridge and the flood plain. They believed sub-contractors may use this route for the movement of HGVs even though the road is very narrow and unsuited to large vehicles, and suggested a link road to bypass the problematic parts.
- 1.41.6. The council highlighted the benefits of the two-village bypass in reducing traffic queues and associated pollution but expressed concern about a loss of

trade for local businesses, a decrease in property values, the location of the southern roundabout and the increased traffic through Little Glemham.

1.41.7. They suggested several mitigation measures to overcome these impacts, including signage, remodelling or relocating junctions and compensation.

1.41.8. The council supported the proposed A140/B1078 junction improvements, but suggested road improvements should be made in Coddendam as well.

1.42 Marine Management Organisation

1.42.1. The Marine Management Organisation commented that several marine elements still required in-depth consideration and requested a clear summary and indication of marine and terrestrial infrastructure. They outlined specific relevant planning regulations and what may be required for development activities within the UK Marine Area.

1.42.2. The organisation requested further explanation about the discounting of the marine-led strategy.

1.42.3. They suggested that the East Marine Plans, Marine Policy Statement and The Marine Works Regulations 2007 be referred to as a requirement. They requested further information about: the impact on commercial fisheries; the construction methodology and final footprint of the beach landing facility; environmental impacts of repeated beaching; marine-based traffic modelling and impacts; details of the coastal defence features; cooling water infrastructure; and about previously proposed marine ecology mitigation.

1.42.4. They believed the ‘marine works and associated infrastructure’ section of the consultation documentation was lacking in detail and outlined what should have been included, as well as suggesting further specific areas to be included in impact assessments. They requested further detail about beach closures, noise and vibration impacts, chlorination and water quality impacts, and wished to understand what SZC Co. had included in their assessments.

1.42.5. Finally, they suggested further consideration of dredging and disposal operations, highlighting the Water Framework Directive, volumes, contaminant concentrations and characterisation and mobilisation of sediment.

1.43 Marlesford Parish Council

1.43.1. The southern park and ride proposals were a key concern to Marlesford Parish Council, including: its proximity to Marlesford and subsequent noise and light pollution; the need for further mitigation such as bunding; screening and surface water run-off controls; and the need for commitment to return the site to agricultural land post-construction.

- 1.43.2. They expressed disappointment that the marine-led strategy had been discounted and believed the rail-led strategy was in question.
- 1.43.3. They commented on the perceived traffic impacts on minor roads such as the B1078 and the A12, which would contribute to severance of local communities. They urged that a four-village bypass would be required instead of the proposed two-village bypass.
- 1.43.4. They commented on the negative impact on tourism and the environment, particularly RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve. They considered SZC Co. had not recognised or compensated for the highly adverse impacts to be suffered by East Suffolk residents, especially considering the cumulative impacts from other developments.
- 1.43.5. They believed the consultation documentation was lacking in detail in a number of areas, including the Gravity Model assumptions and where it referred to ‘ongoing assessment’ and ‘further planned work’.

1.44 Martlesham Parish Council

- 1.44.1. The council considered that there was insufficient information to support the development proposals; questioned the necessity for a nuclear power station; made recommendations for the consultation documentation; and requested greater assessment of costs versus benefits and coordination with other development proposals in the area.
- 1.44.2. They expressed concern about the potential for: impact on the AONB and landscape, SSSI, SPA and Suffolk Heritage Coast and coastal path; the effects of water-cooling intake; the inadequacy of environmental mitigation proposals; increased flood risk; visual and health impacts of stockpile and borrow pits; visual impact of pylons; dangers of spent fuel and waste; and the impact of the beach landing facility. They made several recommendations about environmental mitigation.
- 1.44.3. They did not consider significant local economic and employment opportunities would occur due to: the lack of skilled jobs; impact on tourism; inability of Small and Medium Enterprises to compete; lack of information about corporate and investment structures; and distortion to the local housing market. They opposed the height and location of the accommodation and challenge the assertions made in the strategy. They made suggestions about the campus and caravan proposals, including the provision of permanent ‘affordable’ housing for legacy benefits.
- 1.44.4. The council supported the rail-led strategy, but favoured marine-led. A12 traffic was a major concern and they identified plans for housing developments, which would add to existing issues. They commented on

issues on the A12 and A14 caused by the frequent closure of Orwell Bridge. They opposed the closure of the level crossing in Martlesham but supported plans for the riverside footpath from Post Office Lane and requested information regarding rail night timetables and passenger transport. They supported a freight management facility but expressed concern about both options, and recommended traffic lights on the A12/A14 roundabout and for the timing of construction to reduce any impact on Martlesham. They highlighted several unexplained issues regarding the southern park and ride and made mitigation suggestions. They commented that proposals for the two-village bypass and proposed road improvements did not address the issues at Martlesham and Martlesham Heath.

1.45 Melton Parish Council

- 1.45.1. The council questioned whether the benefits of Sizewell C would outweigh the disadvantages and requested greater coordination with other developments. They made suggestions about the consultation process and urged SZC Co. to share more detail and information.
- 1.45.2. They opposed pylons because of the impact on the AONB and requested assurance that ecology, sea defence and coastal process mitigation are developed to a satisfactory quality.
- 1.45.3. The council challenged the economic benefit assumptions and expressed concern about the adequacy of the proposed tourism, housing and community funds. They believed more needed to be done to ensure the proposed benefits would be realised and that SZC Co. should contribute to community costs, such as policing.
- 1.45.4. The council supported a marine-led strategy and requested further justification of its dismissal, followed by rail-led to reduce the burden on the road network. They requested coordination between SZC Co., Network Rail and themselves to mitigate significant impacts given Melton's level crossing cuts, and suggested improvements to the Melton Station level crossing and straightening of the dog-leg configuration. They made other suggestions regarding air pollution monitoring; rail timetable and upgrade works and double tracking to Saxmundham. They also requested assurances regarding HGV traffic through Melton, Snape and Woodbridge.
- 1.45.5. They urged that the Melton/Bromeswell crossing should not be closed, or a footbridge should be installed. They suggested that a freight management facility be provided under both transport strategies, and made suggestions for the southern park and ride. They support a four-village bypass as beneficial legacy.

1.46 Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council

- 1.46.1. The council opposed the development and believed mitigation of the negative impacts would not be possible. They commented on the size and required infrastructure for the main development site, and its perceived impact on the AONB landscape, Sizewell Marshes SSSI, RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve, wildlife habitats and the dark skies designation.
- 1.46.2. The council supported the provision of education and training, but questioned the significance of the employment benefits, partly due to a lack of information about worker location estimates. They expressed concern about potential tourism impacts through damage to the area's attractiveness, social impact on local communities from the influx of workers and the lack of resources to police anti-social behaviour.
- 1.46.3. The council suggested investigating less impactful construction models for the jetty to pursue a marine-led strategy or for more adequate justification of its dismissal. Otherwise, they supported the rail-led strategy and requested greater use than five trains per day. They made several requests about passenger services and for inclusion of a "Crossing Farm" spur.
- 1.46.4. They opposed the use of the B1122, Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass routes and resultant noise and vibration impacts. They commented for consideration of alternatives and stated that any route should be completed before site work commences. They commented on the perceived inconsistencies and inadequacies in the traffic modelling, the lack of results provided and questioned what methodology was used.
- 1.46.5. The council had strong concerns about the perceived inadequacy of the consultation process, including what had been consulted on, lack of feedback and inadequacy of the consultation documentation.

1.47 Nacton Parish Council

- 1.47.1. The council supported the rail-led strategy and understood the reasons behind discounting the marine-led strategy for environmental reasons. Their reasons for this support are:
 - fewer HGV movements along the A12/A14, resulting in less air pollution;
 - minimising impact on the environment;
 - would not require a freight management facility, for which Option 1 at Seven Hills would cause traffic problems. The use of this site would also require improvements to the T-junction on Felixstowe Road and to the crematorium; and

- problems due to Orwell Bridge closure, which currently often results in gridlock. They noted that this would occur even under the rail-led strategy.

1.47.2. The council also requested that another stage of consultation should be held owing to the significant changes made since Stage 2.

1.48 National Grid

1.48.1. National Grid discussed their electricity transmission infrastructure near the order boundary, including overhead lines, underground cables and substations. They made several points about requirements, statutory clearances and safety that should be taken into consideration as part of the development, and provided documentation for guidance. They requested that National Grid's assets are considered in subsequent reports, including the **ES** (Doc Ref. Book 6) and discuss the involvement of National Grid Electricity Transmission in the development.

1.49 National Grid Ventures

1.49.1. National Grid Ventures commented on their two interconnector projects, 'Nautilus' and 'Eurolink' and how they should be considered together with the wider energy projects on the Suffolk Coast. They commented on their intent to make a relevant representation and register as an interested party once the application for development consent has been submitted.

1.49.2. National Grid Ventures commented that they were currently assessing different options for delivery and planned to undertake public consultation in the future. They commented that they could not provide SZC Co. with a detailed response at that early stage of their development, but would continue to engage with SZC Co. to provide the proposed route and environmental information to be considered cumulatively with Sizewell C.

1.50 Natural England

1.50.1. Natural England advised that the impacts of the Sizewell C Project on ecology and landscape are closely interrelated and potentially significant. They stated that protection and mitigation should be provided for sites such as Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths and Marshes, Sizewell Marshes and Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, and listed all the designated sites that the Sizewell C Project could potentially impact.

1.50.2. They welcomed the consideration of environmental constraints in the discounting of the marine-led strategy but requested that the decision-making process be clearly outlined in the application for development consent.

- 1.50.3. They expressed disappointment that their advice on options at Stage 2 had not been taken forward and commented that significant gaps and uncertainties remained in the proposals. They suggested that ecological and landscape impacts be assessed cumulatively and ‘in combination’ and that the Sizewell C Project must demonstrate adherence with the avoidance-mitigation-compensation hierarchy. They also made suggestions for the Habitat Regulations Assessment, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
- 1.50.4. They raised concerns and made suggestions about the following perceived issues: parts of the development proposal including worker accommodation; spoil management proposals; coastal defence features; beach landing facility; combined drainage outfall and main power station platform proposals with associated infrastructure; training building; emergency equipment store and backup generator; new electrical substation; water management zones; site entrance hub; contractor compounds; shared facilities areas; relocation of Sizewell B facilities; helipad; two-village bypass; Yoxford roundabout; use of Sizewell Halt or new rail siding; park and ride sites; highways improvements; the Sizewell link road; freight management facility; upgrades to the train lines including level crossings; the ‘green rail route’ and the Theberton bypass. Other issues raised are;
- public access including the England Coast Path;
 - habitat loss and fragmentation and spread of invasive species;
 - hydrological, ecology, landscape impacts;
 - noise and light disturbance;
 - air quality; and
 - landscape impacts.

1.51 Network Rail

- 1.51.1. Network Rail commented on the environmental and legacy benefits of a rail-led strategy. They commented on the early findings of their development work, looking at high-level rail scheme feasibility for both strategies, and on a Transport and Works Act Order to address the level crossing closures and upgrades, to be submitted outside of the application for development consent.
- 1.51.2. They commented on current works to update capacity from Felixstowe, stating that the increase in port traffic would largely consume capacity previously assumed for Sizewell. They therefore recommended a full capacity and timetable study within the next stage of work would be required, which if undertaken by SZC Co., would be progressed by Network Rail as a priority. Until then, detailed development work would be based on set assumptions until greater certainty is provided.

1.51.3. They suggested there were several (unspecified) risks to the rail-led strategy which could impact the submission date for the application for development consent, and recognised that this could affect the decision about which strategy to undertake.

1.51.4. Finally, they highlighted protective provisions to potentially be included in the DCO, including legal and commercial agreements and potential impacts on and usage of level crossings.

1.52 Otley Parish Council

1.52.1. The council supported the proposed improvements to the B1078/B1079 east of Eastern and Otley College due to accidents in this area. They expressed concern about the amount of HGVs and worker transport using the A12 and A14. They suggested the following measures to improve safety for those using the B1078 and B1079:

- reduce the speed limit at Otley Bottom to 30mph, from the ‘Upyonda’ property until the current 30mph starting point in the main village;
- widen the junction at Otley Bottom with appropriate kerbing; and
- reduce the speed limit on the B1078, particularly at the cross roads with the Swiland road.

1.53 Parnham Parish Council

1.53.1. The council objected to the proposed southern park and ride location for the following reasons:

- congestion of A12 around Woodbridge, where a site south of Woodbridge would reduce this e.g. an existing park and ride at Martlesham;
- there was no evidence of having assessed alternative locations between Stages 2 and 3;
- negative landscape, light, air and noise pollution impacts. They suggested planting around the bunds and down-lights and commented that SZC Co. had not taken additional traffic impacts into account in their noise impact assessment;
- Option 1 of the proposed mitigation would remove on-street parking but SZC Co. had not identified alternative sites and had provided insufficient detail; and
- Option 2 would be unsuitable and traffic levels had been underestimated. Glevering Bridge would be unable to cope and was in a Category 3 flood zone.

1.53.2. Other key concerns included the perceived impact of additional traffic on minor roads, particularly the B1116 through Framlingham, the need for a four-village

bypass and further improvements to the A12. They commented that the marine-led strategy should be revisited or more determined efforts to deliver a rail-led strategy should be made.

1.54 Peasenhall Parish Council

1.54.1. The council suggested that road improvements should be completed before construction starts. They requested monitoring measures for LGVs and questioned the assumptions and lack of Peasenhall traffic modelling. They requested a maximum speed limit of 50mph for the entire A1120 and made comments about each of the proposed road improvements, including the inadequacy of A140/B1078 junction improvements.

1.54.2. The council suggested that: the freight management facility should be located to the west of Ipswich; or for a northern relief road to be built to bypass Orwell Bridge; for the Sizewell link road to be routed from Friday Street to Leiston; for a four-village rather than two-village bypass; for consideration of the impacts on the A12 and A14 from the increase in roll-on/roll-off traffic through Felixstowe port; planned housing developments; and a shopping centre extension at Martlesham. They also expressed concern about exiting the A1120 onto the A12 at Yoxford.

1.54.3. The council: supported the green rail route but suggested that all upgrading works take place on the weekends; suggested that the Saxmundham to Westerfield line be upgraded; suggested that road improvements should also be carried out under the rail-led strategy; and expressed concern about the perceived visual impact of the Sizewell Halt overhead conveyer system and of pylon proposals.

1.54.4. The council requested greater consideration for water and sewage systems and more information about local emergency services and schools. They commented on the 'Gravity Model', pressure on housing near the site, and traffic on the A1120 and through Peasenhall in the early morning and late at night. They suggested traffic management, such as speed cameras.

1.55 Pettistree Parish Council

1.55.1. The council was concerned about the perceived proximity of a nuclear development to villages, the abandonment of the marine-led strategy and subsequent increases in traffic during construction, and that the two-village bypass would be inadequate.

1.55.2. Their principal concerns about the southern park and ride included the following:

- traffic from the A12 and B1078 would use Pettistree for 'rat-running';

- Option 2 mitigation for the southern park and ride would be unworkable due to narrow lanes and Glevering Bridge. Option 1 would not be sufficient either;
- A12 traffic would exacerbate the congestion at Woodbridge; and
- noise and light pollution, for which landscaping and planting should be used.

1.55.3. The council supported a longer diversion starting at Potsford Farm area of the B1078, joining Easton Road beyond Glevering Mill. They also opposed the use of pylons due to visual impact.

1.56 Playford Parish Council

1.56.1. The council supported the rail-led strategy to keep heavy goods vehicles off the A12 and surrounding roads but strongly objected to the closure of two footpath level crossings in Playford Parish. They believed these footpaths would continue to be used extensively for leisure, and the intended diversion by Butts Road would be dangerous and would not include a footpath.

1.56.2. The council proposed that the stile on the diversion replacing two footpath level crossings should be replaced with gates and commented that the cost of this would be miniscule compared to the total cost of the Sizewell C Project.

1.57 Public Health England

1.57.1. Public Health England stated that they were generally satisfied with the proposed methodology, and would expect that the detailed quantitative and cumulative assessments proposed are undertaken and provided in the final **ES** (Doc Ref. Book 6).

1.57.2. Public Health England welcomed the intention to address health issues and opportunities through a Health Impact Assessment and associated Health Action Plan in consultation with key health stakeholders. They welcomed the recognition of the potential need for social services and mental wellbeing services for construction workers and their families. They requested the inclusion of the draft **Construction Worker Travel Plan** (Doc Ref. 8.8) in the **ES** (Doc Ref. Book 6). This was to ensure the PRow, footpaths and cycle routes that would be affected have appropriate mitigation measures in place. This would minimise any perceived barriers to use and to ensure on-site infrastructure, buildings and facilities are designed to promote active travel and physical activity, following the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guidelines.

1.57.3. They suggested that the possible health impacts of Electric Magnetic Fields (EMF) should be included in the **ES** (Doc Ref. Book 6) and made suggestions for the radiological impact assessment.

1.57.4. They suggested details of the accommodation strategy and campus design should be included in the **ES** (Doc Ref. Book 6) to assess the influence of design features on mental and physical health and wellbeing outcomes. They highlighted the need for suitable cooking facilities for healthy meals, and onsite outlets with healthy food options and for measures to ensure tourist or private rented sector accommodation is fit for human habitation.

1.58 Rendlesham Parish Council

1.58.1. The council supported the intentions of the park and ride scheme. They had concerns about rule enforcement especially regarding: 'informal parking' around the A12; taking spaces intended for tourists; and resulting in inappropriate parking in areas such as Rendlesham Eyke Snape.

1.58.2. They were concerned about potential impact from LGVs and did not believe the local supply chain of white van users would be used or successfully managed, and requested further elaboration from EDF about the postal consolidation facility.

1.58.3. The council believed the proposed two-village bypass was short-sighted, and requested assurance that this construction would not become two smaller projects. They suggested that Highways England 'buy-in' to bring forward the four-village bypass, and for this to be completed before the Sizewell C main construction phase.

1.58.4. They suggested: engagement with the local community in Rendlesham for employment opportunities; to work with local schools to identify career opportunities for young people; to support infrastructure development in Rendlesham; and to mitigate impacts of demand on local medical and educational services by Sizewell C workers.

1.59 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

1.59.1. RSPB did not feel that there was enough evidence to show that the chosen main development site is the least damaging to the environment compared to the other available sites. They suggested the use of other proposed nuclear sites where projects have so far failed to progress as they feel these will be less damaging to designated nature conservation sites.

1.59.2. They commented that information about the design of the coastal defences and other coastal structures, and their potential impacts, was still incomplete. RSPB could not be confident that the beach landing facility and the hard-coastal defence feature would not have adverse effects on the integrity of the Minsmere-Walberswick designated sites.

- 1.59.3. RSPB did not consider there to be sufficient evidence presented to give confidence in the assessment of the effects on RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve and Sizewell Marshes SSSI, or to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of the Minsmere-Walberswick designated sites. They considered that it was not clear whether the proposed mitigation would be effective.
- 1.59.4. They believed there had been limited consideration of effects on waterbirds of the Minsmere South Levels. RSPB would like further work to demonstrate that the marsh harrier mitigation area would be sufficient so that adverse effects on the integrity of the Minsmere-Walberswick designated sites could be avoided.
- 1.59.5. RSPB stated that the justification for SSSI loss required by the NPS-EN1 had not been provided, and they were concerned that the amount of SSSI loss had increased without explanation. They considered further work would be required to ensure compensatory habitats are provided.
- 1.59.6. They commented on areas where potential impacts are still unclear (e.g. air quality, protected species), and believed further work would be needed to identify the impacts on visitors to RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve.
- 1.59.7. They disagreed with the assessment that: there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of Minsmere to Walberswick SPA; and Minsmere/Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site; or that no significant damage would occur to Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SSSI and Sizewell Marshes SSSI.
- 1.60 **Saxmundham Town Council**
- 1.60.1. The council criticised SZC Co. for: their response to consultations; for failing to understand the significance of the impacts of their proposals; and for the lack of strategic planning involving other projects and agendas. They requested that construction complies with the overarching principles of sustainable development; that land be restored to its previous use after construction and to potentially scale back the size of the development. They expressed concern about the impact on biodiversity; Sizewell Marshes SSSI (including the proposed access road causeway); coastal erosion; coastal processes and inland flooding; as well as associated economic impacts caused by environmental damage.
- 1.60.2. The council expressed concern about the additional demand for local amenities; retail services and public services from the influx of workers and questioned the assumption of economic benefits. They were also concerned about employment opportunities being limited and criticised the education and training proposals. They highlighted several issues in the town that need addressing.

- 1.60.3. The council did not support the accommodation strategy due to impact on the sensitive area around Eastbridge and pressure on Leiston and Saxmundham services. They commented for a new village with proper facilities that would provide legacy housing, or that the accommodation should be more dispersed across East Suffolk.
- 1.60.4. They commented on the misleading and confusing nature of the transport questions in the consultation documentation. They commented on the inadequacy of East Suffolk's transport infrastructure and current congestion problems. They commented that road, rail and sea transport would be required, and challenged the decision to discount the marine-led strategy. They suggested greater rail investment including double track between Ipswich and Lowestoft, and expressed concern about the timing and noise of freight traffic rail movements. They supported a footbridge in the south of Saxmundham as a new track crossover, but believed the proposed road improvements were inadequate, considering plans for the Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood. They expressed concern about congestion and 'rat-running' through the town, and supported the proposed Sizewell link road, the idea of a four-village bypass and proposed park and rides, although they highlighted congestion issues in Wickham Market.

1.61 Scottish Power Renewables

- 1.61.1. Scottish Power Renewables stated that, with constructive cooperation, the delivery of Sizewell C should not affect any of their projects and that their offshore infrastructure would be sufficiently far from Sizewell's cooling water infrastructure.
- 1.61.2. They stated that engagement would be needed to understand cumulative and in-combination effects, particularly related to transport, and on land south of Sizewell Gap which is subject to an option agreement in favour of Sizewell C. They would continue to liaise with SZC Co. and the landowner about this agreement. They stated that further information would be required to establish project interactions along Sizewell Gap and interactions in wider areas subject to highways improvements.

1.62 Snape Parish Council

- 1.62.1. The council commented that their concerns from Stage 2 remained. They were concerned about: the lack of cumulative assessment of impacts from Sizewell C and Scottish Power Renewables' proposals and believed the consultation had been neither adequate nor fair. They requested a further stage of consultation.
- 1.62.2. They expressed concern about the visual, noise, air quality and environmental effects on the AONB and impacts of construction traffic on the A12 and in Snape, commenting that impacts had not been fully assessed or addressed.

They supported the proposed A1094/B1069 roundabout but urged that any works should be fully analysed in terms of traffic delay, air and noise pollution. They expressed concern about fly-parking, inadequacies of traffic modelling, lack of recognition for traffic flow increase through Snape from the southern park and ride and at the potential non-feasibility of the rail-led strategy.

- 1.62.3. They expressed concern about the possible long-term risk to the tourism and farming industries and the lack of direct reference to Snape, given the popularity of Snape Maltings as a tourist destination. They also believed public services would be impacted by the influx of people, and the lack of information about mitigation for the extra demand.

1.63 Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Partnership

- 1.63.1. The main concerns of the partnership were:

- the consultation documents did not pay proper regard to the purposes of the AONB or demonstrate the impacts of the development on the AONB;
- the development would cause significant harm to the AONB, and adequate mitigation proposals had not been demonstrated; and
- insufficient regard had been paid to the combination of impacts with other development projects in the area.

- 1.63.2. They highlighted several sections of NPS EN-6, NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-5 that they believed had not been followed. They commented on: the impact on the AONB characteristics and setting by construction, pylons, transport infrastructure, design, training centre and car park; accommodation campus, stacks and chimneys; and impacts on AONB access, value, biodiversity habitat, long views, water management zones and heritage coast. They also raised concerns about the subsequent impact on tourism and gave detailed expert advice from AONB's consultants.

1.64 Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council

- 1.64.1. The councils submitted a joint response and expressed concern about the impacts of the proposed pylons, helipad, spoil heaps and accommodation campus on designated sites such as European Sites, SSSIs and the AONB. They urged EDF to minimise any visual impact on the AONB.

- 1.64.2. They also had other environmental concerns such as;

- the effects of the abstraction and release of sea water for cooling on water quality and the fish/shellfish populations
- the impact of the Sizewell C Project on European Protected Species (EPS);

- the direct impact on below-ground archaeological remains and the visual impact on above-ground heritage assets, especially from the green rail route, Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass.
- 1.64.3. They commented that environmental impacts had not been fully assessed. They outlined what assessments they expected to have been carried out by the next stage of public consultation, including air quality, noise and hydrology. They also requested that details of mitigation measures were provided for all impacts. The councils expressed concern about building design, locating Sizewell B facilities within the AONB, the need for further detail about the impacts and feasibility of the beach landing facility and impact on coastal processes, requesting mitigation such as minimising closure of the beach. They requested explanation of the SSSI access route choice and an overview of the worst-case scenario for materials proposals, suggesting a reduction in the volume of stockpiled material and clarification of the operating hours, depths of pits, pollution and groundwater movements from SZC Co..
- The councils also commented with on the use of LEEIE, requesting evidence that appropriate surface water drainage can be provided for it, that the environmental health impacts on local residents can be mitigated and the overdevelopment of the caravan site avoided.
- 1.64.4. The councils commented that discussions about the proposed tourism, housing or community funds had not begun. They commented on the perceived lack of clarity surrounding forecasts for homebased roles and SZC Co.'s ambitions for employing local residents, labour market pressures from other projects, Brexit's impact and the lack of information on wages and job duration. They requested access to the Gravity Model and the assumptions used to feed it.
- 1.64.5. The councils made recommendations including investment in the training and development of the local workforce, commitment to using local supply chains and workers; to support local businesses and attract inward investors; and to develop early mitigation to increase local economic benefits and reduce negative effects. They highlighted the significant detrimental effect on the £2.03bn tourism sector and requested involvement with the Tourism Fund and for details on tourism impacts.
- 1.64.6. The councils' concerns about the proposed accommodation included the perceived impact on rental and tourism accommodation; the insufficient size of the proposed caravan site, visual impacts of the campus, impacts on public services, health and wellbeing and the recycling centre and impacts of anti-social behaviour. They suggested further community implications assessment, for mitigation plan agreement with Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council and consideration of a campus location in a more urban area or Leiston Airfield.

- 1.64.7. The councils suggested further determination of transport impacts and mitigation and holistic consideration with other development projects. They supported the marine-led strategy and questioned its removal, and aspects of the rail-led strategy including proposed upgrades but questioned the availability of the necessary capacity. They urged assurance of a rail-led strategy from the early years onwards and expected a full travel plan in the EIA, outlining what it should contain.
- 1.64.8. They opposed the road-led strategy due to HGV numbers and expressed concern about congestion and safety impacts on the A12, requesting further information about A12 junction impacts. They queried the proposals for mitigation for only either the road-led or rail-led strategies and believed rail-led may require additional road mitigation such as a freight management facility.
- 1.64.9. They suggested: further air quality, noise and vibration mitigation for impacted transport routes; a contribution towards highways maintenance; a better sustainable transport and cycling strategy and mitigation for footpath and Bridleway 19 closure.
- 1.64.10. The councils commented on the rail-led strategy, including perceived noise impacts on residents, impact on the setting of Leiston Abbey, lack of provision for surface water and flood management; unsolved issues for the Theberton bypass (although in principle it was supported) and the amount of level crossing closures proposed.
- 1.64.11. Their concerns about the road-led strategy included the proposed locations for the freight management facility due to Orwell Bridge closure, although Option 2 would be preferable from an archaeological perspective, that the proposed route for the Sizewell link road would not be justified by traffic modelling, environmental and community impacts and lack of legacy benefit as it would run parallel to the existing road. They requested that the southern route W be reconsidered, outlining several of its benefits.
- 1.64.12. The councils expressed additional suggestions about the transport proposals including the consideration of a four-village bypass and the possibility of changing the route of the two-village bypass to minimise impact on Foxburrow Wood and heritage.
- 1.64.13. They also noted the following concerns about transport;
- for the northern park and ride proposals, they expressed doubts about the ability of the new roundabout junction to cater for all traffic, the sufficiency of car parking space, light pollution, ecology and drainage impacts;

- the southern park and ride issues should be addressed including conservation areas, water and flooding, and the inadequacies of both Wickham Market mitigation proposals;
- further assessment would be required for Yoxford roundabout regarding traffic flow, flood and water design and the historic environment; and
- additional road junctions require improvement.

1.65 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services

- 1.65.1. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services considered that there remained several areas to discuss and were unable to support all specific proposals put forward.
- 1.65.2. They considered that a combined outage car park for Sizewell B and C would lessen the impact on the surrounding area. Further flood modelling across the SSSI, flood risk monitoring across borrow pits and maintenance of an identified temporary landing area for helicopters to permit rapid emergency intervention was also recommended.
- 1.65.3. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services commented that the effect on East Suffolk communities would require risk modelling. They were required to ensure occupant and resident safety and asked SZC Co. to work with local authorities to reduce the impact of an influx of workers. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services expressed concern about road safety issues due to traffic levels and LGVs and advocated for delivery of multi-service safety interventions based on education. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services believed fire risk assessments should be conducted for the temporary campus and caravan site.
- 1.65.4. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services considered the that rail-led strategy in principle could reduce road risk and congestion and supported the rail siding option as opposed to Sizewell Halt. They encouraged further discussion with SZC Co. about transport decisions including level crossings and non-regulated vehicles on park and rides,. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services considered there was a need for further information on consideration of a freight management facility off Levington Road and Innocence Farm, and consideration of a freight management facility for the rail-led strategy. Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service supported a level crossing for Buckleswood Road and supported the road improvements. They recommended further consideration of modelling and traffic for the Sizewell link road, Yoxford, Coddendam, East of Easton & Otley College, Saxmundham, South of Knoddishall, Friday Street north-east of Farnham, and south of Bramfield.
- 1.65.5. They identified what they considered to be additional significant and foreseeable issues which would be directly attributable to Sizewell C such as:

- the significant emergency and risk management planning and workload generated by Sizewell C;
- the need for specialist protection staff from the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services with knowledge of building techniques and fire engineered solutions to be based at Sizewell C; and
- the need for appropriate drainage to ensure flood risk is not increased.

1.66 Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council

- 1.66.1. The council expressed disappointment at the lack of assessment and studies undertaken at this stage of the consultation. They commented that little information on environmental impacts had been provided and that cumulative impacts with other developments had not been evaluated. They expressed concern about the inadequacy of the proposed site and issues regarding pylons, incomplete hard coastal defence plans and an operational platform of only 32 hectares.
- 1.66.2. They commented against the removal of the marine-led strategy. They questioned the suitability of the road and rail infrastructure to support construction, arguing that a relief road similar to the D2 route should be included under both strategies. They strongly opposed the proposed routes of the Theberton bypass and Sizewell link road due to the impact on residents, farmers, heritage assets, businesses, interruptions to PRow and inadequate legacy benefits. They requested that relief road construction should begin in advance of site construction to reduce impact on the B1122 in the ‘early years’.
- 1.66.3. They expressed concern about the impact of the proposals on the AONB, heritage coast, Minsmere Nature Reserve, and Sizewell Marshes SSSI from borrow pits, spoil heaps, noise, light and air pollution, also harm to the tourist industry.
- 1.66.4. They expressed grave concern about the impact of the proposed accommodation campus on Eastbridge. They supported the economic benefits but challenged SZC Co.’s definition of ‘home-based workers’ and believed the development will create difficulties for local businesses.
- 1.66.5. They commented that SZC Co.’s proposals did not demonstrate that the impact on communities and the environment would be outweighed by the benefits, with limited mitigation and compensation proposals. They believed SZC Co. had not satisfied their Statement of Community Consultation so needed to undertake a further stage of consultation.

1.67 Trimley St. Martin Parish Council

1.67.1. The council expressed concern about traffic impacts on the A12 and A14, particularly regarding the impact of the closure of Orwell Bridge. They urged that rail transport would be more environmentally friendly, and would obviate the need for a freight management facility and its use of agricultural land.

1.67.2. For the freight management facility proposals, they believed both sites would be inappropriate, commenting on the A12/A14 interchange and Felixstowe Road being prone to congestion. They believed Innocence Farm would be more problematic, particularly in entering and exiting the site.

1.68 Trimley St. Mary Parish Council

1.68.1. The council's concerns primarily related to the freight management facility proposals. They considered Option 2 Innocence Farm to be unreasonable because:

- A14/Croft Lane junction is the site of several accidents, which may increase;
- the A14 is at or near full capacity, so to propose no changes to this junction was unsound;
- it would require additional road miles for vehicles to U-turn to their respective destinations;
- no evidence of a rigorous cost analysis to justify the expenditure for such a low amount of traffic; and
- significant noise impact on a rural area with environmental consequences.

1.40 The council supported a rail-led approach to obviate the need for a freight management facility.

1.69 Ubbeston Parish Council

1.69.1. The council's concerns included perceived impact from congestion on minor roads, the A14, A140 and A12 especially where it is single carriageway, the large scale of the Sizewell C Project and resulting impact on tourism and the AONB, impact on rail services and 24-hour light pollution.

1.70 Ufford Parish Council

1.70.1. The council strongly objected to the closure of the level crossing that connects Ufford 12 and Bromeswell 5A. They commented on the heavy usage and importance of this crossing and its safety and clear visibility. They had several questions about Network Rail safety scores in relation to their objection, and questioned whether 'mini stop lights' or an 'automated crossing' could be installed instead of closure. They requested details of whether crossing details were obtained and outlined why they believed each of the five suggested diversions would be unworkable.

1.71 Waldringfield Parish Council

- 1.71.1. The council objected to the proposed development because of its size and location in the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB (they believed this had not been given sufficient regard) and due to long-term disruption to local communities and the environment. They also commented on the perceived impact on two SSSIs; Minsmere Nature Reserve, Minsmere Levels and Sizewell Marshes; and subsequent landscape, noise, light and air pollution impacts due to: the accommodation campus, access road, spoil heaps, construction and nuclear waste storage. They commented that a full EIA should be published before planning consent is applied for.
- 1.71.2. The council commented on the belief about impacts on the tourism industry and the lack of legacy benefit of the accommodation campus. They supported the maximum use of rail and marine transport to reduce the number of HGVs and support a four-village bypass to include Marlesford and Little Glemham. They criticised the consultation questionnaire and documentation and commented that SZC Co. had not listened to local peoples' concerns.

1.72 Waveney District Council

- 1.72.1. The council commented on the belief that this consultation was lacking in sufficient detail for the final stage, limiting their ability to evaluate the proposals. They highlighted the economic opportunities but required clarity on the proportion of business rates to be retained in Suffolk. They expressed concern about the perceived impact on: residents, particularly in Eastbridge, Theberton, Leiston, Wickham Market and Darsham; road users of the A12, B1122, B1078, A1120, A145; smaller rural roads; as well as environmental impacts on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and the SSSI. They believed greater environmental mitigation and compensation would be needed. They also sought greater detail regarding the SSSI crossing, spoil management, the beach landing facility, sea defences, hydrology, groundwater, potable water supplies. They were concerned about coastal processes and the marine environment.
- 1.72.2. They made several comments and suggestions about SZC Co.'s work with local supply chains, commitment to education and training and ways to mitigate and minimise adverse economic impact, including the effect on tourism. They commented on their belief that there was insufficient evidence to determine a lasting positive legacy for residents and requested further mitigation for impact on public services. They commented on the potential for a 'community benefit package' as part of government commitment.
- 1.72.3. The impact of the influx of workers on the private and tourist rental sectors was a concern of the council, in which the Housing Fund may not be enough to address.

- 1.72.4. The council requested further information about the direction of travel for HGV movements to establish potential impact on road networks, and expected consideration and assessment of impacts of traffic through Waveney District. They suggested consideration of Lowestoft Port for usage and for potential links from the port to rail.
- 1.73 **Wenhaston with Mellis Parish Council**
- 1.73.1. The council strongly considered the mitigation proposals for the development would be inadequate and that SZC Co. were too focused on construction costs rather than long term impacts.
- 1.73.2. They commented on the perceived impacts from: the pressure on road and rail networks; the number of HGVs predicted to use the roads; access to the A12 from Hazel Lane; the cumulative impacts from other energy developments; and about the northern park and ride; including its size, lack of pedestrian access and legacy benefit and enforcement of its use. They supported a four-village bypass and route W relief road to mitigate impacts on the A12 and B1122, as well as the green rail route and the maximum use of rail transport.
- 1.73.3. The council commented that the campus would: exacerbate environmental impacts including noise, light and traffic effects; place burden on Eastbridge and Theberton from anti-social behaviour; place a strain on emergency services and infrastructure; and impact the local rental market. They commented that ‘split’ accommodation with greater legacy potential at a different location should be considered.
- 1.73.4. The council commented on the perceived impact on designated SPA, SAC and SSSI locations and their fragile habitats from the accommodation site, spoil heaps, quarries and causeway crossing, and believed it is weak to suggest best practice “will be taken into account”. They commented that Aldhurst Farm habitat creation would not be sufficient compensation and urged SZC Co. to publish the full EIA before submitting the application for development consent.
- 1.73.5. The council expressed concern about: the perceived impacts on the environment, during construction and operation, including impact on Sizewell Marshes hydrology, coastal processes and marine ecology; risk to local population from radioactive waste and lack of emergency planning; and lack of timetable for restoration of sites to greenfield land. They believed pollution and impact on RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve would damage the tourist industry in Suffolk, possibly permanently. They also commented that the employment benefits would be reduced by use of the Hinkley Point C supply chain.

1.74 Westerfield Parish Council

- 1.74.1. The council understood the reasoning for the siting of the development but believed several issues had not been addressed, including the effect on the local environment, traffic in south east Suffolk and assuring economic benefits would be sustainable in the long-term.
- 1.74.2. The council commented that Footpath 18 should be maintained where it crosses the East Suffolk line, partly due to the development of the Ipswich Garden Suburb. If an interim solution should be required, they commented that Option 2 would be the only acceptable diversion route.
- 1.74.3. In reference to the freight management facility, they expressed concern about traffic on the A12/A14 Seven Hills Junction. They preferred Option 1 due to closer proximity to the junction and less of an impact on local roads.
- 1.74.4. They also supported Option 2 for the new rail siding and the two-village bypass but believe there should be discussion about a potential four-village bypass.

1.75 Westleton Parish Council

- 1.75.1. The Parish Council believed Sizewell C will have a negative impact on the local area and the AONB on the Suffolk Coast. The council said that SZC Co. had ignored their opposition and they were strongly believed that the impacts of the proposal to local area would not be justified by the benefits.
- 1.75.2. The council expressed concern about the potential for significant noise, light, and air pollution, and environmental disruption. They considered increased traffic movement and damage to the AONB to greatly affect the tourism industry. The council considered that visual impacts would be substantial, in part due to spoil heaps and borrow pits, and the decision to include pylons. Mitigation features offered by SZC Co. on this dark sky discovery site were additionally felt to be unsuitable.
- 1.75.3. The council stated that the potential of 10-12 years of increased road traffic affecting quality of life is a serious concern of residents, with belief that the B1125 would be used as a 'rat-run'. The council considered traffic modelling by SZC Co. to be understated, not accounting for summer month increases. They strongly disagreed with the justification that the D2 would not be a viable route for the link road.
- 1.75.4. The Council suggested that accommodation should be dispersed to more urban areas and built for legacy usage for councils to reduce visual, environmental, and social impact for Eastbridge Hamlet. They considered the influx of workers to be negative to local services, and the council stated that

SZC Co. needed to provide more detail on how to mitigate the strain on these services during construction.

1.76 Wickham Market Parish Council

- 1.76.1. The council did not object to the principle of the Sizewell C Project but did not support it due to lack of suitable diversion for the southern park and ride. They considered that there was sentiment that the marine-led strategy had been discarded without adequate justification.
- 1.76.2. They suggested that Sizewell C would damage the tourist industry as fewer holiday lets would be available, pushing up house prices as well, and that traffic would increase. They supported the accommodation proposal for the workforce onsite is, however they asked that greater account is taken of the accommodation landscape impacts in the final design.
- 1.76.3. The council strongly favoured the rail-led strategy in the absence of a sealed option. They expressed concern about traffic modelling for not considering the frequent closure of Orwell and for inconsistencies with their own traffic flow measurements. They supported a freight management facility with no preference between the options, and suggested a few smaller park and rides on the southern side instead to reduce the impact in Wickham Market. They suggested more mitigation of visual impacts from the southern park and ride and around the Marlesford Conservation Area. The council supported the two-village bypass as the most beneficial option from Phase 2 but considered strongly that a dualled four-village bypass would be preferable. With regards to road improvements the council considered that there should be provision for cyclists.
- 1.76.4. The council considered that mitigation Option 1 to remove roadside parking on the B1078 is flawed, and not workable. The council considered mitigation Option 2 not to be viable, however the council was receptive to the idea of a bypass along a different route.

1.77 Woodbridge Town Council

- 1.77.1. The council believed there was no true justification for dropping the marine-led strategy. They considered that offshore wind options could have been a better option than nuclear power. The council deemed the economic value and jobs added to the site to be inaccurate. They commented that the A12 would not be able to accommodate additional road traffic due to development. The council considered the environmental impact and the negative impact on tourism of the A12, upon Woodbridge and surrounding areas to be too great.

1.78 Yoxford Parish Council

- 1.78.1. The council considered the site to be unsuitable for a project the size of Sizewell C, particularly as it borders the AONB, SSSI, Minsmere and general environmental landscape. They considered a smaller power station should be considered and objected to the addition of pylons and overhead cabling at the site.
- 1.78.2. They welcomed the addition of a relief road, and expressed support for its construction regardless of whether the road-led or rail-led strategy were chosen. They suggested either the D2 relief road or option W should be selected to provide a positive legacy. They stated there was a lack of clarity about how and why the marine-led strategy had been abandoned, and considered that in its absence the minimum expectation would be to go ahead with the full rail-led strategy. Whilst they supported the improvements to the Yoxford roundabout, subject to further information on the design, they would like the buses operating out of the park and ride sites to be electronic rather than diesel. They expressed scepticism about the traffic modelling.
- 1.78.3. They considered the accommodation campus to be too close to an AONB, and that a split approach with sites closer to urban centres would be more suitable. They considered there would be a significant impact on social cohesion and integration, as well as significant pressure on services that had not been fully accounted and mitigated for. They queried whether there was sufficient scope for any gaps to be filled by the private rented sector, with tourist accommodation potentially taken by Sizewell workers damaging the tourist industry further as they suggest tourism would be negatively impacted by the construction. They commented the main local benefit would be the uplift in local skills, something they suggested may not be realised if jobs go to workers based further afield.
- 1.78.4. They considered the consultation continued to only give the minimum required detail and wanted to discuss with SZC Co. ways that they could provide reassurance for the local community and build a trustworthy and constructive relationship with them.

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

2.1 Overall Proposals

General

- 2.1.1. Some section 42(1)(d) consultees (referred to throughout this report as persons with an interest in land or PILs) supported the Sizewell C development. They were positive about nuclear power as they felt it is clean and efficient and would be a stable energy source enabling the United Kingdom to secure its future energy needs. Others believed that Sizewell C would contribute to the economic growth of Suffolk.
- 2.1.2. Other PILs opposed the Sizewell C Project as they felt the location was unsuitable since the main development site is inside an AONB and situated on an eroding coastline. Other reasons for opposition included:
- perceived damage to the local tourist trade;
 - the belief that SZC Co. had chosen the cheapest options throughout the planning process;
 - perceived environmental pollution; and
 - the potential impact on ground water levels.
- 2.1.3. Some PILs commented on the timescale of energy production from Sizewell C as they felt it would not repay its energy debt and carbon footprint before the reactor needed to be decommissioned. Other comments on nuclear power included:
- The technology proposed for this reactor is unproven and similar single reactor projects are not functioning;
 - The economic case for nuclear power is questionable; and
 - Nuclear technology has been superseded by other technology.
- 2.1.4. Some PILs suggested that renewable energy should be used instead of nuclear energy as the government has invested recently in renewable energy projects and the PILs considered that it would be less expensive to generate than nuclear energy. Others suggested renewable energy would cause less disruption and involve less reliance on foreign investment.
- 2.1.5. Some PILs believed that the funding of Sizewell C was uncertain and criticised the government's proposal to indemnify SZC Co. against risk and guarantee a profit. Others expressed concern at the reduction in the total costs of the Sizewell C Project as they felt this had been achieved by abandoning promises made in the initial stages of consultation that were intended to reduce the impact on the local area. Some PILs also reported that Hinkley

Point C was over budget and raised concerns this would also be the case at Sizewell C.

- 2.1.6. Some PILs commented on the long timescale for the construction phase of the Sizewell C Project and suggested that it would over-run as have other EDF EPR™ projects in Finland and France.
- 2.1.7. Some PILs suggested that protecting the environment and providing restored habitats were important criteria in judging whether the Sizewell C Project was viable.
- 2.1.8. Some PILs challenged the planning process for Sizewell C as they felt it required greater government oversight of the Sizewell C Project. Others also suggested that the proposals did not meet with national planning policy requirements and that SZC Co. had not responded to environmental concerns appropriately.
- 2.1.9. Some PILs commented on the cumulative impact of the Sizewell C Project alongside other energy projects on the Suffolk Coast and felt that this should have been addressed fully in the consultation documents and through a joint strategy with Scottish Power Renewables and National Grid Ventures. They believed that the impact on local infrastructure and on the heritage coast of several projects operating at once would alter the character of the area beyond recognition and prove detrimental to local residents.
- 2.1.10. Some PILs requested that SZC Co. introduce a smaller reactor design with a shorter construction time and reduced footprint or only one reactor instead of two to mitigate the impact on local communities. Others asked that the location of the reactor be moved to a more industrialised area such as Tilbury or to another nuclear site such as Wylfa on Anglesey.

Safety

- 2.1.11. Some PILs commented on the general safety of nuclear power and the perceived risk of having two reactors in close proximity. They requested guarantees from SZC Co. that no contamination of the air, water or land would occur. Others expressed concerns about the ease of evacuation in the event of an incident at Sizewell C as they felt the local roads would be unable to cope and asked for details of SZC Co.'s emergency plans.
- 2.1.12. Some PILs suggested that the high cost of decommissioning Sizewell C should be factored into the economic calculations and safety considerations.

- 2.1.13. Some PILs requested that SZC Co. detail its plans for long-term management of spent waste as it was felt that no existing strategy was in place. Others expressed concerns about the long-term presence of nuclear waste in Suffolk.
- 2.1.14. Some PILs felt that China General Nuclear is not a reliable partner as they suggested there are security and political concerns regarding their involvement in the Sizewell C Project.
- 2.1.15. Some PILs believed that the proposed pressure water reactor type was outdated, and that better technology is available.

Socio-economics

- 2.1.16. Some PILs supported the people and economy proposals without going into detail as to why. Others suggested that Sizewell B had had a positive effect on the local economy as it had provided jobs, helped upskill the local workforce and supported educational improvements.
- 2.1.17. Some PILs requested that SZC Co. employ as much local labour as possible and make local supply chain opportunities available. They also asked that SZC Co. introduce a programme upskilling the local workforce to improve future job prospects.
- 2.1.18. Some PILs challenged the idea that SZC Co. would employ local workers as they believed that the majority of the workers, particularly the skilled workers, would be sourced from the Hinkley Point C project. They asked for details of how the use of the Hinkley Point C supply chain would affect the promised economic benefits for local people. Other concerns included:
 - whether there would be employment opportunities for locals who are not young men;
 - the source of local workers given the high employment rate of the area; and
 - the loss of jobs in tourism.
- 2.1.19. Some PILs challenged the assumptions made by SZC Co. about benefits for the local economy as they believed the plans did not provide a long-term positive socio-economic benefit. Others felt that any potential benefits for the local community and economy presented by Sizewell C were outweighed by the impacts of the Sizewell C Project.
- 2.1.20. Some PILs felt the economic benefits were of a short-term nature and they suggested that once the construction was finished the jobs would disappear and the holiday accommodation used by workers would no longer be in demand.

- 2.1.21. Some PILs commented on the long-term impact on tourism as they believed the tourism industry would be destroyed for nearly two decades and that it would be difficult to rebuild it once construction was over. Some PILs felt that the congested roads, the closure of beaches and footpaths, the visual impact of construction as well as increased noise and pollution would discourage tourists from visiting the area. They suggested this would cause economic damage to the tourist industry and noted that it is one of Suffolk’s major industries.
- 2.1.22. Some PILs felt that the accommodation campus would be detrimental to the local area as it would lead to antisocial behaviour. They questioned whether there would be adequate policing to deal with antisocial behaviour. Others commented that the influx of workers, particularly into Leiston, would make locals feel over-run and that the infrastructure could not cope.
- 2.1.23. They believed that Sizewell C would have a very negative impact on the local community due to the environmental and social impacts of the construction. Others feared that the Sizewell C Project would result in the destruction of communities such as Eastbridge.
- 2.1.24. Some PILs raised concerns that pollution from traffic emissions, dust and noise and vibration would pose a significant threat to the health of communities in the area. Others felt the Sizewell C Project would lead to mental health issues and worsen the quality of life of local residents.
- 2.1.25. Some PILs commented on perceived devaluation of their properties and damage to their businesses, especially farming and tourism businesses, as a result of Sizewell C.
- 2.1.26. Some PILs felt that the local road infrastructure, especially the A12, would be unable to cope with the additional traffic generated by the construction of Sizewell C. Others suggested that as Suffolk is one of the driest counties, sourcing water for the increased population of workers would exacerbate this issue.
- 2.1.27. Some PILs also commented on the increase in demand on local services that would result from the increased workers, highlighting the impact on health services, the police, the fire service, education, public transport and local amenities.
- 2.1.28. Concern was expressed about the loss of recreational areas within the AONB and the Sandlings SPA used for walking, cycling, running and other activities. Some PILs felt that this would be very damaging to the quality of life of local residents and visitors.

- 2.1.29. Some PILs requested further assessment on the impact of the proposals on tourism and health and community. Others wanted information about various topics including traffic, management of speed limits, vibration damage to properties along the B1122, emergency services access as well as noise and air pollution.
- 2.1.30. Some PILs believed that not enough had been done by SZC Co. to address the concerns of impacted communities and asked SZC Co. to provide mitigation for the local economy and the tourism industry. Others challenged existing mitigation proposals such as the ‘Housing Fund’ as they felt that this would result in further development of the area and remove more agricultural land.
- 2.1.31. Some PILs requested that SZC Co. provide compensation for the owners of older properties which would suffer severe vibration damage. Others provided specific mitigation and compensation proposals, including:
- staggering shift changeovers to reduce the impact of workers on Leiston;
 - community policing;
 - solar panel installation and home insulation for local properties; and
 - a compensation policy for all affected.

Accommodation strategy

- 2.1.32. Some PILs opposed the accommodation strategy as they felt it would ruin the countryside and prove a waste of money. They objected to the accommodation campus in particular which they felt was chosen as it would be the cheapest option.
- 2.1.33. Some PILs requested that permanent housing be built for workers closer to urban centres instead so that these could provide a legacy value in the form of affordable housing. Others suggested that tourist accommodation should be used to provide accommodation instead of the proposed strategy. Some PILs also asked that the accommodation buildings constructed by SZC Co. be designed to be as energy efficient as possible.
- 2.1.34. Some PILs believed that the accommodation campus should be close to the main development site and supported the proposed campus location for this reason.
- 2.1.35. Some PILs felt that the accommodation campus and caravan site would lead to a rise in antisocial behaviour and disrupt the peaceful communities nearby. They requested that a management plan be put into place as they felt the offer of recreation facilities on site would be insufficient in reducing antisocial behaviour.

- 2.1.36. Some PILs commented on the anticipated rise in home rental costs in the area around Sizewell C, noting reports that rent rose by an average of 18% around Hinkley Point C and that affordable housing in the Sizewell area was already limited by the tourism industry. Others felt that accommodation currently used by tourists would instead be rented by Sizewell workers and that this would lower the profit for the property owners and other local businesses due to the different spending patterns of tourists and workers.
- 2.1.37. They requested guarantees from SZC Co. that the land used for the accommodation strategy would be restored to its original state and not become brownfield land. Other PILs expressed doubts that the sites would be restored as they noted that facilities for Sizewell A were intended to be temporary but remain in place.
- 2.1.38. Some PILs commented on the lack of amenity and recreation proposed for the accommodation campus as they noted that Leiston has limited leisure facilities. Some supported the planned sports facility in Leiston although others felt that it should be situated at the accommodation campus as placing it in Leiston increases the impact on local residents.
- 2.1.39. Some PILs commented that the accommodation campus was too close to the RSPB Minsmere Reserve, the Sizewell B reactor, the towns of Leiston and Theberton and the hamlet of Eastbridge. Other comments made about the accommodation campus included:
- it would generate air, light and noise pollution;
 - it would lead to increased traffic;
 - it would have a detrimental visual impact due to its height; and
 - it would be built on a greenfield site.
- 2.1.40. Some PILs requested that the accommodation campus should be built on a brownfield site on the edge of a town to reduce local traffic and encourage workers to boost the local economy.
- 2.1.41. Some PILs supported the accommodation campus as they felt that changes to its design reduced the visual impact and that it was acceptable since it would already be in the SZC Co. estate and would be returned to greenfield land at the end of the construction phase. Others believed that some form of accommodation campus was necessary given the problems local residents experienced during the construction of Sizewell B and that it would reduce the use of tourist accommodation. They also suggested that it would ease congestion caused by workers travelling to and from the main development site.

- 2.1.42. Some PILs suggested that the approach taken at Hinkley Point C of building split campuses located in areas with existing infrastructure should be used for Sizewell C.
- 2.1.43. They felt the proposed caravan site would be too far from the accommodation campus and the main development site which would increase traffic and felt that the entrances are dangerously positioned. Other PILs commented that the caravan site would have no legacy value and that it would have a detrimental visual impact on the AONB. They suggested that the caravan site should be moved to an alternative area or removed as a proposal.

Transport

- 2.1.44. Some PILs commented on the ‘Early Years’ and their concern about the movement of up to six hundred HGVs a day on the B1122 before the construction of the Sizewell link road or the park and ride sites. Others commented on the use of Lovers’ Lane/Sizewell Gap road during these years, suggesting it is already congested and provides the sole access to sites such as Sizewell A and B. They feared that use of this road would lead to safety issues and requested that a new road entrance to the main development site be built before construction of Sizewell C begins.
- 2.1.45. Some PILs believed that the movement of HGVs to and from the main development site would impact on the speed with which ambulances could reach major hospitals.
- 2.1.46. Some PILs suggested that cut-through driving and fly-parking would increase in villages, creating congestion for local residents, and noted that these issues have occurred at Hinkley Point C. They requested that vehicles used by workers should have windscreen stickers so that those who are cut-through driving are easier to identify.
- 2.1.47. Some PILs requested figures for predicted traffic movements at the site entrance roundabout. Others asked for an assessment of the impacts of the green rail route on woodland, as well as on bat roosts. Others asked for further assessments about the impact of the Yoxford roundabout on bats and great crested newts.
- 2.1.48. Some PILs commented that the use of the helipad could spook horses on the diverted Bridleway 19. Others suggested the proposed site for the helipad had been set aside for reptile mitigation land and that it could have an adverse effect on a range of ecological receptors. They requested that details of the level of proposed use should be made available and that if a helipad is necessary, it should be placed on the site of Sizewell A.

- 2.1.49. Some PILs suggested that mitigation should be provided for the southbound A12 and A14 and that this should account for the closure of the Orwell Bridge.
- 2.1.50. Some PILs proposed that the marine strategy should be used for the movement of freight as they believed that this would be less disruptive for local communities, the environment and the local economy. They criticised the removal of this option from the transport strategy after two stages of consultation and suggested it was due to cost not the environmental impact as stated. Other PILs suggested that SZC Co. consider alternative plans for a sea jetty that would be less environmentally damaging such as augured piles.
- 2.1.51. Some PILs challenged the transport strategy as they felt there were no proposals for increasing the capacity of the road network and that SZC Co. had always intended to use the road strategy and had dismissed the other options for inadequate reasons without providing any convincing evidence.
- 2.1.52. Some PILs opposed both the rail and road strategies as they believed both were inappropriate and would lead to too much congestion and too great an impact on those living locally. Others requested that a combination of rail and marine strategies should be used to transport freight.
- 2.1.53. Some PILs asked for further assessment of existing traffic data for roads proposed to be used in the transport strategy, a review of marine and rail routes and an assessment of alternative routes to the Theberton bypass. Others asked for information about the following topics:
- the sourcing of aggregates;
 - noise mitigation measures;
 - type of HGV; and
 - assessment of air, light and noise pollution.
- 2.1.54. Some PILs challenged various assumptions in the consultation documents about the Sizewell link road. This included the traffic modelling, the landscape and visual assessments, the ecological assessments, the archaeological evaluation and the surface and flood water assessments. They suggested further assessments should be made.
- 2.1.55. Some PILs opposed the road strategy as they believed the local road infrastructure is not equipped to handle the increased HGV movements. They felt as there are no motorways and roads such as the A12 and B1122 are already congested they would struggle to cope with the increased traffic. They commented that the congestion would result in noise and vibration throughout the day for those living close to the affected roads. Other concerns expressed about the road strategy included:

- it would impact the local tourist industry;
 - it would damage the road surface, underground cabling, gas and water routes;
 - it might involve 24 hour a day HGV movements; and
 - the difficulty of thousands of HGVs travelling on small country roads.
- 2.1.56. Some PILs believed that the road-led strategy would be environmentally damaging as the material set down areas would destroy parts of the countryside; the lighting and HGV movements would impact ecology and wildlife; and the increased traffic would lead to more carbon emissions.
- 2.1.57. Some PILs suggested a new exit for North Green Lane should be incorporated into the proposed roundabout on the A12 as this is prone to accidents.
- 2.1.58. Other PILs supported the road-led strategy as they felt it would minimise the impact on local residents. Others commented that the road improvements on the B1122 would benefit those who live on the road.
- 2.1.59. Some PILs supported the rail-led strategy because they believed it would reduce the number of HGV movements which would decrease air pollution, noise and vibration and congestion compared to the road-led strategy. Others supported the rail-led strategy but disagreed with the exclusion of certain road improvements as part of the rail-led strategy.
- 2.1.60. Some PILs challenged the rail-led strategy as they noted that the majority of freight would still be transported by road since it requires the movement of up to 900 HGVs a day on the B1122 as well as park and ride buses. Others suggested that the rail-led strategy was unlikely to be chosen due to funding concerns and SZC Co.'s assertion that the strategy is uncertain. Some PILs requested a rail line to be constructed directly to the main development site.
- 2.1.61. Other PILs felt the rail-led strategy relies too heavily on the B1122.
- 2.1.62. Some PILs supported the park and ride sites because they believed that use of the park and rides by workers would reduce the number of vehicles travelling to the Sizewell site.
- 2.1.63. Some PILs requested that the siting and operation of the park and ride sites should be sensitive to the local environment and the concerns of local residents and that postal consolidation facilities should be in place to reduce the number of LGVs on the road.
- 2.1.64. Others opposed the use of the A12 for the park and ride buses as they felt it was unsuitable.

Construction Materials

- 2.1.65. Some PILs raised concerns about potential pollution of ground sites as a result of construction work and asked SZC Co. to provide a solution for this potential problem.
- 2.1.66. Some PILs requested details of the building plans such as their size and positioning. Others asked for further assessments of the impacts of filling borrow pits with the materials proposed and whether there is a need for any additional mitigation measures for potential impacts.
- 2.1.67. Some PILs commented on the potential for contamination during excavation of the quarry pits and the risk that when refilled, pollutants from the quarry pits could leach into the water table and impact the hydrology of the Minsmere Levels, the Sizewell Marshes and the Minsmere sluice. They felt that SZC Co. recognised this issue but was not proposing measures to stop it. Others commented that the borrow pits are close to land set aside for marsh harrier mitigation and that they would have an adverse impact on marsh harriers and other species.
- 2.1.68. Some PILs expressed concerns that spoil heaps would lead to significant dust pollution in nearby designated areas, affect human health and be visually intrusive due to their height. They requested further information about mitigation for the spoil management proposals and criticised both the spoil heaps and the borrow pits as these were not included in previous stages of consultation.

Consultation Process

- 2.1.69. Some PILs believed that the phrase ‘rail-led strategy’ was misleading as it uses HGV movements on roads for the majority of freight transport. Other PILs considered that the following information in the consultation document was misleading:
- Farnham Hall was identified as the only building affected by the proposed bypass;
 - Leiston Abbey was said not to be affected by the Theberton bypass; and
 - the ecological impacts of the Sizewell C Project were not adequately reflected.
- 2.1.70. Some PILs felt the information provided in the consultation document was unclear, particularly maps as the details were too small and hard to decipher. Others suggested the information in the consultation document was not detailed enough. Some also suggested that the maps were outdated while newer maps were available. Other topics PILs felt were especially lacking in detail included:
- the reasons the rail-led and marine-led strategies were not favoured;

- embankments, cuttings and speed limits on roads;
 - the overall transport strategy; and
 - access for Farnham Hall.
- 2.1.71. Some PILs urged SZC Co. to publish a full Environmental Impact Assessment as they felt that the preliminary environmental information provided was inadequate and that this was unacceptable given the scale and location of the proposed construction site.
- 2.1.72. Other information perceived to be inaccurate included:
- the figure for tons of materials to be brought into the site;
 - the properties affected by the two-village bypass, its route and the existing features on the proposed route;
 - figures in the transport tables; and
 - the suggestion that the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB is a ‘local designation’.
- 2.1.73. Some PILs believed that Stage 3 of consultation included fundamental changes to the proposals compared to Stages 1 and 2. Others noted their preference for proposals made in previous stages such as the Farnham bypass. Some PILs also suggested that their concerns and those of local authorities from previous stages of consultation had not been addressed and criticised SZC Co.’s behaviour towards affected landowners.
- 2.1.74. Some PILs believed that a fourth stage of consultation was necessary because of the significant changes to the proposals at Stage 3 and the lack of information provided. They felt that this undermined the consultation process, along with the lack of information, failure to provide adequate comparisons and the failure to consult more widely in the East Anglia region.
- 2.1.75. Some PILs suggested that the consultation period was too brief as they had only six weeks to decide whether to give SZC Co. access and believed their land could be compulsorily purchased if they did not. Others felt that the consultation had coincided with another on offshore windfarm substations that affects a similar area and felt it was stressful to have to respond to both at the same time.
- 2.1.76. Some PILs commented that they felt the public meetings did not deal with all their concerns as staff refused to engage with difficult questions and needed to be better informed. Other concerns included:
- the model presented at exhibitions did not show the construction phase;
 - the events were held in a small area around the main development site even though the impact will be wider; and

- the legends for the drawings were placed at the bottom of the drawings so it was hard to see them at the events because of crowds.
- 2.1.77. In contrast some PILs praised the events, saying that the consultation was professionally presented and the staff were knowledgeable and polite.
- 2.1.78. Others suggested that more assessment was needed with regard to the traffic modelling, environmental impacts and the cumulative impacts of Sizewell C and other energy projects. Some PILs also requested a Health Impact Assessment.

Some PILs asked for more detailed information about the Sizewell C proposals to be supplied by SZC Co.. Others requested that SZC Co. engage with them directly about their properties.

2.2 Main Development Site

General

- 2.2.1. Some PILs offered general support for the proposed main development site without providing an explanation as to why.

Site Suitability

- 2.2.2. Some PILs believed that the thirty-two hectare site was too small for the proposed twin nuclear reactors as government guidelines state that a single nuclear power station should occupy at least thirty hectares. Others commented that the land take for the site had increased since Stage 2 of consultation.
- 2.2.3. Other PILs felt that the location chosen for the main development site was unsuitable because it is too close to the sea, within the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB and is difficult to access by sea, road or rail.
- 2.2.4. Some PILs did not support the removal of Coronation Wood and the use of Pillbox Field to re-locate the Sizewell B facilities. They suggested that these facilities should instead be moved to Sizewell A or to an off-site brownfield site.
- 2.2.5. Some PILs felt the site entrance hub would have a detrimental impact on local properties and claimed that these impacts were not considered in the consultation document. They also commented on the plan to build the initial site access route from the B1122/Lovers Lane and felt that this would lead to increased traffic and difficulty for homeowners exiting their properties onto the B1122.

Environment – General

- 2.2.6. Some PILs believed that the Sizewell C development would lead to lasting damage to the local environment which could not be repaired and would destroy the peace and tranquillity of the area.
- 2.2.7. Some PILs felt that the HGV movements required to import and export materials would be particularly damaging for the environment.
- 2.2.8. They also requested further environmental information and assessments on the following topics:
- ecology and biodiversity;
 - hydrology and flooding;
 - designated areas; and
 - PRoW.
- 2.2.9. Some PILs suggested the information provided about the environmental mitigation proposed was inadequate. They also had concerns about the following aspects:
- areas previously selected for mitigation were proposed at Stage 3 to be used as part of the development;
 - noise, light pollution and visual impact mitigation measures such as tree planting would take decades to be effective;
 - unclear how creation of Suffolk Sandlings habitat would compensate for loss of shingle beach vegetation; and
 - no amount of mitigation could replace what has taken millennia to develop.
- 2.2.10. Some PILs provided suggestions for mitigation such as the creation of green corridors and new woodlands. Other suggestions included:
- the creation of bee friendly meadows and bird nesting boxes;
 - the introduction of a mound with fencing and hedging at the southern perimeter of the site entrance hub;
 - the design of buildings should blend into the surrounding AONB through the use of cladding; and
 - the main access road should be unlit and subject to speed restrictions.
- 2.2.11. Some PILs welcomed the proposals for the AONB mitigation land as they provide habitat for wildlife and improve the quality of life of local people. They also requested that SZC Co. engage with PILs about the assessment of ecological impacts.

- 2.2.12. Some PILs felt that the SSSI crossing would impede the drainage of the Sizewell Marsh SSSI habitat and that the choice of a causeway with a culvert should be explained
- 2.2.13. Some PILs believed that the increased transmission of electricity via overhead pylons would impact on the environment and people's health.

Noise and Vibration

- 2.2.14. Some PILs commented on the potential for noise pollution caused by the movement of HGVs to and from the main development site, the use of construction machinery and the two-village bypass. Others commented on the impact of noise and vibration on wildlife, particularly bats and birds.

Air Quality

- 2.2.15. Some PILs believed that air quality would worsen due to the air pollution caused by the release of emissions from regular HGV movements and heavy plant machinery on the main development site. They also commented on the potential dust pollution caused by construction machinery.

Landscape and Visual

- 2.2.16. Some PILs felt that the main development site for Sizewell C, especially the pylons, would have a negative visual impact on the surrounding AONB and ruin the rural skyline.
- 2.2.17. Other PILs felt that the pylons should be installed underground to limit their visual impact.
- 2.2.18. Some PILs felt that an increase in light pollution due to proposals such as the building of new roundabouts on the Sizewell link road would have a huge impact on local residents and wildlife. Others focused on the potential loss of dark skies as a result of light pollution.

Ecology

- 2.2.19. Some PILs commented on the impact of the Sizewell C proposals on designated areas such as the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, the Sizewell Marshes SSS and the Sandlings SPA. They commented that the designated areas contained precious biodiverse habitats that cannot be easily replaced such as lowland heath. They suggested that harm to the designated areas would seem to contradict the requirements of national planning policy.
- 2.2.20. Some PILs suggested the construction of Sizewell C would have an impact on wildlife, particularly the rare birds found in the RSPB Minsmere Reserve.

Others noted specific proposals such as the SSSI crossing which they believed would impact connectivity of species travelling through the SSSI or certain species such as the natterjack toad which could become locally extinct through the introduction of the water management zones.

Amenity and Recreation

- 2.2.21. Some PILs commented on the closure of PRoW, such as parts of the Sandlings Walk and the Farnham Circular Walk. They felt that the nature and attraction of these walks would be altered by the diversions provided. Others believed that horse riding would be impacted by proposed new roads which would necessitate the closure of bridleways.
- 2.2.22. They also commented on how the beach landing facility would prevent the use of the Suffolk Coast Path and the proposed England Coast Path.

Groundwater and Surface Water

- 2.2.23. Some PILs believed that the construction laydown areas, accommodation site, spoil heaps, quarries and the SSSI crossing would damage the fragile hydrology of the Minsmere Levels and the Sizewell Marshes as well as affecting the Minsmere sluice. Other PILs were concerned about flooding since the removal of the jetty from proposals.

Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water

- 2.2.24. Some PILs suggested that the proposed rock armour defence of the Sizewell C platform and the beach landing facility was inadequate as it would stop above the low water line when it should go below it. They suggested the sea would undermine it once the sacrificial dune had eroded.
- 2.2.25. Some PILs expressed concerns about the eroding coastline and requested reassurance from SZC Co. that the erosion would not jeopardise the nuclear reactors. Others thought that the development would have a massive impact on coastal processes and asked for an assessment of the effect on the Suffolk Shingle Beaches County Wildlife Site.

Climate Change

- 2.2.26. Some PILs requested that SZC Co. include proposals to reduce the carbon emissions generated by its vehicles such as use of electric cars or incentivisation of car sharing. Other PILs commented on the emissions generated by the emergency diesel generator plant and their impact on ecological receptors and argued that more information was needed about these impacts.

2.3 Northern Park and Ride at Darsham

General

- 2.3.1. Some PILs expressed opposition to the northern park and ride proposals because of the perceived increase in congestion at the roundabout and level crossing, especially during shift changeovers. They also expressed concern about impacts from noise, dust and disruption to nearby residences, as well as the adverse impact on Darsham’s dark skies from light pollution. Some PILs felt that a lack of noise and light mitigation for properties had been proposed, particularly for the roundabout at the entrance to Willow Marsh Lane. They believed that the proposals would be likely to negatively affect property prices and tourism in the area. Others expressed concern about the effect on animals, for example a nearby herd of alpacas, and requested information about works timetables in order to relocate the animals.
- 2.3.2. Some PILs also suggested that the 40mph speed limit on the A144 be increased to enable residents to join the A12 smoothly. They questioned what would happen to the park and ride facility once Sizewell C construction is complete, some suggesting that a section of the car park should be used as parking for Darsham railway station. Others suggested that the park and ride should be made compulsory for workers.
- 2.3.3. Some PILs were supportive of the northern park and ride proposals without specifying their reasons. Others specifically expressed support for the relocation of the access road to Marsh Lane.

2.4 Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market

General

- 2.4.1. Some PILs claimed that SZC Co. had not visited the proposed location of the southern park and ride and that this meant the problems with the proposals could not be understood.
- 2.4.2. Others were supportive of the proposed location for the southern park and ride. Some based their support on the stipulation that the area is returned to greenfield land following the construction period.
- 2.4.3. Some PILs suggested routing traffic along the B1079 to join the A12 at Woodbridge as an alternative to the proposed mitigation measures.
- 2.4.4. For the proposed mitigation options, some PILs expressed support for Option 1 as they felt it represented the least invasive solution. They expressed concern about Option 2 because of the perceived impact on buildings along Valley and Easton Roads and Glevering Bridge. Some also commented that

bottlenecks on Glevering Bridge would inhibit traffic flow and made several suggestions in the event that Option 2 is taken forward, including widening the road and security measures.

2.5 Two-Village Bypass

General

- 2.5.1. Some PILs expressed support for the two-village bypass as necessary for reducing the impact of Sizewell C traffic on the villages of Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew. This included congestion, damage to a Grade I listed church and the dangers associated with the Farnham bend. Some commented that the two-village bypass would be required even without the Sizewell C development. Others were supportive of the proposed 50mph speed limit on the bypass.
- 2.5.2. Other PILs commented on the potential impacts of the proposed two-village bypass. They felt that the road would negatively impact approximately 19 homes and families living at Farnham Hall, something they believed SZC Co. had not adequately considered. Some PILs claimed that the road would be as close as 75m to some homes, not 500m as stated in the consultation documentation. The perceived impacts included noise and light pollution from traffic, air pollution from dust and increases in nitrous oxide, reduction in property values, impacts on Grade II listed buildings and threat to their quality of lives. They also commented that Foxborrow Wood is a popular amenity for residents and visitors and the road would cut through a trackway, inhibiting the use of a lane by residents and visitors for recreational activities. They further suggested the proximity to the road would cause safety issues for residents with learning disabilities. Additionally, some PILs commented that the route would cause a loss of productive farmland by sub-dividing existing parcels. They believed the severing of irrigation facilities would also cause financial hardship to farms, as well as the loss of tourist business.
- 2.5.3. Some PILs commented on the perceived impact of the two-village bypass on Foxborrow Wood itself, commenting that several 500-year-old oak trees would be felled, impacting the historic landscape character. They also commented that a wildlife crossing from Tunstall Forest to Pond Wood would be disrupted, affecting many species. Other environmental impacts included potential for increased flood risk caused by bridging watercourses and crossing drainage ditches.
- 2.5.4. Some PILs felt that deciduous hedgerows would not mitigate the impacts of noise, light and visual pollution as they would be bare for six months of the year. They requested more details about the proposed mitigation measures,

including measures to provide legal support and compensation to affected residents.

- 2.5.5. They also commented that further environmental studies should be completed before the route decision was made and they questioned the assertions made in the preliminary environmental information report that there would be “no residual effects” on species such as great crested newts and bats.
- 2.5.6. Some PILs suggested that the route would be better placed further east, on the other side of Foxborrow Wood. Other suggestions included that:
- the road be placed in a cutting to lessen the impact;
 - all footpaths be reinstated;
 - bollards and islands should be positioned at the centre of the road to assist pedestrians in safely crossing it, with appropriate signage; and
 - the road should be resisted further south to incorporate Tinkerbrook Lane.

Site Suitability

- 2.5.7. Some PILs suggested that a four-village bypass should be built to include the villages of Marlesford and Little Glemham, as an alternative to the two-village bypass. Others expressed concern about the possibility of a four-village bypass in the future. Some PILs suggested positioning the two-village bypass on the other side of the A12.

Historic Environment

- 2.5.8. Some PILs commented that the two-village bypass would sever Farnham Hall from Foxborrow Wood which was part of the grounds of the Hall for hundreds of years until the mid-twentieth century.

2.6 Sizewell Link Road

General

- 2.6.1. Some PILs expressed opposition to the Sizewell link road because of the proximity to residences and disruption caused by high volumes of traffic near homes for a long period of time. Some commented that the proposals were almost as flawed as using the B1122 itself, given the disruption to communities such as Middleton and Theberton.
- 2.6.2. Others commented on the need for the link road without qualifying their support.
- 2.6.3. Some PILs commented on the perceived lack of assessment including traffic modelling, detailed road design, landscape and visual assessments,

ecological assessments, archaeology evaluation and surface and flood water assessments.

- 2.6.4. Some PILs suggested the only sustainable response would be to require SZC Co. to remove the road after the end of its use as a haul route and restore the land to its former condition and use.

Site Suitability

- 2.6.5. Some PILs queried the route choice for the proposed Sizewell link road. They commented that the proposals had not evolved over a period of consultation with the community. Some believed SZC Co. chose this option because it was the cheapest, not for the reasons given in the consultation document.
- 2.6.6. Some PILs commented that the route would bring most construction vehicles north of the construction site (because SZC Co. stated that 85% of the traffic will come from the south) to then travel south, increasing journey times and overall pollution.
- 2.6.7. Some PILs expressed support for an alternative route, namely the previously proposed 'D2' route, located further south along the A12. They highlighted the benefits of this route over the proposed route, such as:
- being a more direct route to Sizewell C;
 - would serve multiple energy projects, such as the Scottish Power Renewables project;
 - greater legacy benefit for Leiston and Saxmundham;
 - would avoid adverse impacts to biodiverse wildlife habitats;
 - would avoid disruption to lives and prevent cut-through driving on rural roads;
 - less invasive, affecting fewer residential properties; and
 - less impact on designated heritage assets.
- 2.6.8. Some PILs also commented that the D2 route is supported by several local action groups.

Environment – General

- 2.6.9. Some PILs commented on the potential impact of the Sizewell link road on wildlife, including red deer and bats, from the destruction of habitats and noise, dirt and light pollution. They suggested that it would encroach on the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and believed consideration had not been given to whether the land within the proposed route provides any habitat for species for which the SPA is designated. Others commented that cutting across drainage

systems would increase the probability of flooding and believed the road would cause permanent changes to the landscape of the area.

- 2.6.10. Some PILs questioned the statement in the preliminary environmental information assessment for the Sizewell link road that mitigation proposals will reduce the impact on great crested newts and bats to ‘not significant’. They commented that further surveys and assessment of habitats and species along the route would be needed to be confident in this assumption.

Community Impacts

- 2.6.11. Some PILs commented on the perceived impact of the route on communities resulting from the proximity to homes and listed buildings. They believed it would sever communities with road and footpath closures, cutting homes off from their village centres.
- 2.6.12. Some PILs felt that the proposed route would be of no benefit to the community after the construction of Sizewell C, as it runs parallel to the existing B1122. They also felt it would be a drain on local resources as the council would have to pay to maintain and operate it.
- 2.6.13. Regarding traffic, some PILs commented that the A12 is already under pressure at peak times and did not believe the proposals would provide a satisfactory access solution to the main development site. They believed the number of vehicles that would use this road including LGVs and worker transport would lead to cut-through driving on minor roads in an attempt to avoid congestion during peak periods. Others commented that congestion would increase the response time of emergency vehicles.
- 2.6.14. Some PILs stated that the Sizewell link road would run as close as 150m to properties, affecting them with noise, vibration, air pollution, and light pollution. Some commented that for many, their homes would be affected by traffic running both in front and behind and their quality of life would be severely impacted.
- 2.6.1. Finally, some PILs suggested the proposed route would have a detrimental impact on agricultural land. They commented that farms would be split by the new route, creating unusable plots and making them economically unviable. Some commented that the road would pass within 100m of farm houses and buildings, devaluing their property.

2.7 Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements

General

- 2.7.1. Some PILs that commented on the road improvements proposals in general stated that they rejected the need for any new roads and road works as they believed rail and sea transport should be used alternatively. Others were supportive of all proposed road improvements to help manage increased traffic levels.
- 2.7.2. Some PILs commented on the potential impact of light pollution of the proposed roundabout at the A12/A1094 Friday Street. They suggested that lighting should be designed to minimise the effect of this. Others suggested relocating the proposed roundabout further south.
- 2.7.3. Some PILs suggested that the A12/A144 junction at Bramfield should instead be a roundabout to improve the flow of traffic here.
- 2.7.4. Regarding the A12/B1122 Yoxford roundabout, some PILs suggested that the design would favour those entering the B1122, and those trying to egress the B1122 would be penalised. Others believed that even with the proposed roundabout, Yoxford would become a ‘blackspot’ for congestion and pollution due to the number of vehicles traversing the area. They also felt the roundabout would ‘industrialise’ the village and would not be required if the D2 alternative was adopted. Some PILs suggested that a flyover be considered instead, or that Suffolk Highways Agency should be responsible for the cost and construction of the roundabout instead of SZC Co.. Others expressed support for the proposed Yoxford roundabout.
- 2.7.5. Many comments about the proposed Theberton bypass were similar to those concerning the Sizewell link road. Some PILs felt that the proposed bypass would still result in congestion, noise, vibration damage, air pollution and risk of accidents on residents and visitors. Some commented that it would cause damage to the landscape, cut off access to Pretty Road and that the combination of these impacts would deter visitors, affecting the viability of local businesses. Additionally, some PILs expressed concern about the impact of the bypass on heritage assets, including Theberton Hall.
- 2.7.6. Others commented on the perceived impact of the route on habitat for species including marsh harriers and ponds under management for great crested newts, commenting that it would be very difficult to mitigate these impacts.
- 2.7.7. Some PILs felt that if the rail-led strategy were taken forward, the Theberton bypass would provide no relief for the impacts of traffic on Yoxford. Others felt that the bypass should not be retained following the construction period for Sizewell C as it would provide no legacy benefit, and should be removed.

2.8 Freight Management Facility

- 2.8.1. Some PILs expressed opposition to Option 1, for a freight management facility to be located at Seven Hills junction, because they believed traffic with the facility combined with traffic from events at Trinity Park could combine to cause congestion issues. They also commented that this option would cause problems for traffic approaching and leaving the junction in general at peak hours.
- 2.8.1. Some PILs expressed support for Option 2 at Innocence Farm because they believed less congestion would be caused by locating the facility here than it would at Seven Hills Junction. Some commented that the site entrance for this option would require a long slip road to allow safe access and egress.

2.9 Rail Improvements

General

- 2.9.1. Some PILs expressed opposition to the closure of any level crossings and PRow, which were proposed as part of the rail-led strategy. They commented that these closures would cut-off access routes, affect locals' rights to walk the Suffolk countryside and impact tourism. Some questioned whether mitigation would be provided for these closures. Others expressed support for these closures given that they would be required for the rail-led strategy to be taken forward.
- 2.9.2. Some PILs expressed support for the upgrades to level crossings required as part of the rail-led and road-led strategies to maximise efficiency and because the improvements would be beneficial in general. Some PILs requested confirmation that the manual control at Lime Kiln Quay level crossing would have no impact on the users of the crossing, as well as information about the timing of upgrade works and compensation for residents where required.
- 2.9.3. Some PILs commented that the proposals to use the railhead at the LEEIE would still require the use of HGVs to transport materials for the remainder of the journey to the main development site. Some felt that lighting for the proposals should be sensitively managed to reduce the impacts of light pollution on the dark skies.
- 2.9.4. Some PILs commented on the potential for the green rail route proposals to cause significant adverse impacts on great crested newts and bats, even after the inclusion of embedded mitigation.

Site Suitability

- 2.9.5. Concerning the options for offloading materials from the rail line, some PILs opposed Option 1 (the overhead conveyer) because they felt it would be inappropriate due to the visual intrusion, noise from aggregates travelling across the road and potential danger from falling spoil. They supported Option 2 (a new rail siding) because it would remove works from residential areas at King George’s Road and Heath View. They commented that it would also mitigate the need for lorries to cross King George’s Avenue.
- 2.9.6. For the proposals for Buckleswood Road, some PILs opposed Option 1 (temporary closure with a new footbridge) because they felt the footbridge would not be accessible for those with pushchairs or on wheelchairs or mobility scooters. They also commented that it would create traffic issues on Abbey Lane, which already experiences congestion, and impede access for drivers to the A12. Some PILs were more supportive of Option 2 (a new level crossing) because it would avoid the restriction of access for vehicles, especially to local businesses.