



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Annex G Stage 4 Issues Tables

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

May 2020

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



Annex G – Stage 4 Issues Tables

Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Table G.1: Summary of Section 42 Responses and Consideration by Topic | 1 |
| a. Overall Proposals | 1 |
| • Theme: Need Case | 1 |
| • Theme: Site Suitability | 10 |
| • Theme: Safety..... | 14 |
| • Theme: Socio-economics..... | 17 |
| • Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | 37 |
| • Theme: Environment – General | 75 |
| • Theme: Consultation Process | 86 |
| b. Main Development Site..... | 97 |
| • Theme: Site Suitability | 97 |
| • Theme: Environment – General | 106 |
| • Theme: Noise and Vibration..... | 110 |
| • Theme: Air Quality | 111 |
| • Theme: Landscape and Visual..... | 114 |
| • Theme: Ecology | 115 |
| • Theme: Amenity and Recreation..... | 116 |
| • Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water | 118 |
| • Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water | 119 |
| c. Pylon options | 122 |
| • Theme: Need Case | 122 |
| • Theme: Site Suitability | 122 |
| • Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | 127 |
| d. Northern park & ride | 129 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| • | Theme: Site Suitability | 129 |
| • | Theme: Environment – General | 131 |
| e. | Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market..... | 133 |
| • | Theme: Site Suitability | 133 |
| • | Theme: Environmental – General | 140 |
| f. | Sizewell Link Road / Theberton Bypass | 143 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 143 |
| • | Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | 153 |
| • | Theme: Environment – General | 155 |
| g. | Two Village Bypass | 159 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 159 |
| • | Theme: Site Suitability | 161 |
| • | Theme: Environment – General | 170 |
| | Yoxford Roundabout..... | 180 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 180 |
| i. | A140/B1078 west of Coddendam..... | 184 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 184 |
| j. | A12/A144 south of Bramfield | 185 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 185 |
| k. | A12/B119 at Saxmundham | 185 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 185 |
| l. | A1094/B1069 south of Knodishall | 186 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 186 |
| m. | Freight Management Facility | 187 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 187 |
| • | Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | 192 |
| n. | Rail Improvements..... | 194 |
| • | Theme: Need Case..... | 194 |



- o. Sizewell Halt 204**
 - Theme: Site Suitability 204
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment 209
- Table G.2: Summary of Section 47 Responses and Consideration by Topic 212**
- a. Overall Proposals 212**
 - Theme: Site Suitability 212
 - Theme: Safety..... 212
 - Theme: Socio-economics..... 213
 - Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) 215
 - Theme: Consultation Process 221
- b. Pylon Options 223**
 - Theme: Site Suitability 223
 - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment 225
- c. Northern Park and Ride..... 227**
 - Theme: Site Suitability 227
- d. Southern Park and Ride 229**
 - Theme: Site Suitability 229

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

a. Overall Proposals

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Principle of Nuclear Energy | <p>Support for the proposals due to the necessity of generating power. Positive comments about the benefits of nuclear energy as a clean source of power, reducing carbon emissions. Positive comments suggesting the proposals offer a secure and reliable source of energy.</p> | <p>Support welcomed. The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK's energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK's binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government's Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> | N |

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



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites.</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Principle of Nuclear Energy | Concern about how to handle nuclear waste, that some nuclear waste will remain on-site and that not enough detail had been provided regarding | <p>The safety of nuclear power plants is assured by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the process of Generic Design Assessment covers safety analysis. This can be found on Her Majesty’s Government website. The Generic Design Assessment was approved on 13 December 2012.</p> <p>The design proposals have due regard to the Generic Design Assessment. Further information can be found within</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | storage. | the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11). | |
| Timescale | Concern that the construction will not run on time due to SZC Co.'s track record of delays such as those experienced with Hinkley Point and other developments. | <p>Construction of the Sizewell C nuclear power station is estimated to take 9–12 years. This has been informed by experience in delivering projects of this type and scale across the world. The Evolutionary Power Reactor design is now successfully operating at Taishan 1 and 2 in China. By the time a decision is taken on the Sizewell C Development Consent Order (DCO) application, Flamanville and Olkiluoto nuclear power stations in France and Finland (respectively) will also be operating. Civil construction at Hinkley Point C will be 80% complete.</p> <p>The French and Finnish projects experienced delays as a result of an incomplete design. In the case of Olkiluoto, this was not agreed with the regulator until well after construction started. Both projects also faced quality issues arising from restarting new nuclear build after a long gap. Flamanville has had a delay in order to ensure the recommendations of the French regulator are met to the letter.</p> <p>Sizewell C has a stable design and will have an experienced workforce and supply chain and a well-tested schedule. We have a very good understanding of project risks and how to</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>mitigate them. SZC Co. has been able to learn from these experiences and this has informed the construction assumptions set out in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> <p>Further details on the anticipated construction timescales for Sizewell C nuclear power station are provided in Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Principle of Nuclear Energy | Suggestions that renewable energy offers an increasingly cheaper, more Efficient, less risky and environmentally damaging alternative to nuclear power. | <p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK's energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK's binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government's Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Funding | Concern that the construction is too expensive, the financial modelling does not add up and it is poor value for money for the | <p>For new nuclear power stations to be built, the government has been clear that costs must come down.</p> <p>New nuclear costs are driven by construction and financing and both can be cheaper by replicating the design of Hinkley Point C.</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>taxpayer. Often includes comments in response to government consulting on the Regulated Asset Base model, suggesting this makes the funding for this project less likely.</p> | <p>Evidence shows repetition brings costs down in nuclear development, just like other technology. Many of the design and qualification costs for Sizewell C have been paid for already at Hinkley Point – as well as the costs of setting up the supply chain and training workers. With the right timing, we can directly transfer the skills from Hinkley Point C to Sizewell C.</p> <p>Further information regarding the funding of the Sizewell C Project is contained in the Funding Statement (Doc Ref. 4.2).</p> | |
| Ownership | <p>Concern over foreign ownership and involvement in the construction of Sizewell C, in particular the involvement of China Nuclear General.</p> | <p>Foreign investment has been used to enable infrastructure development throughout the UK. SZC Co. and Chinese General Nuclear have funded the re-development phase of Sizewell C.</p> <p>However, the funding of Sizewell C may change once the DCO, if granted, has come into force. External finance (equity and debt), is expected to be required to fund the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. has been engaging with a variety of third party investors with a view to attracting the investment required. The ownership of SZC Co. for the construction period is</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | currently expected to be made up of third party investors (some of whom may be foreign). | |
| Process | Challenge that the estimates about the benefits and impacts of the proposals are unrealistic, that they underestimate the sensitivity of the environment and are unclear about its eventual capacity. | <p>The Sizewell C Project will result in positive economic effects in terms of employment, but also supply chain, spending, and sustainable investment in skills and training pathways from education to in-work upskilling.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) assesses the environmental effects on resources (such as the water environment) and receptors (such as human beings) arising as a result of a proposed development.</p> <p>EIA Scoping forms one of the early stages of the EIA process, which sets out the potential environmental aspects that may be significantly impacted by the proposed development and which, therefore, would need to be assessed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>SZC Co. submitted an EIA Scoping Report to the Planning Inspectorate in April 2014 and an updated EIA Scoping Report in 2019 – provided in Volume 1, Appendix 6A of the ES – alongside a written request for a scoping opinion in accordance with the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>The methodology has applied standard and good practice across the identified environmental topics to provide consistency and</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>allow comparison between the predicted results of each of the topic assessments. The approach to the assessment considers the sensitivity, importance or value of an affected resource or receptor and the predicted change to the environment (i.e. the 'magnitude' or severity of an effect) as a result of the proposed development. The duration and geographic scale of the effects have also been considered, which vary depending on the environmental topic and specific receptors under consideration for that topic. The resulting effect is then determined and can be considered to be either adverse, beneficial or neutral, and the effect is assessed to be significant or not significant.</p> <p>The concept of 'significance' is central to the EIA process; it aids the identification of the principal effects of the proposed development and, accordingly, where mitigation is required. As a general rule, major and moderate effects are considered to be 'significant', whilst minor and negligible effects are considered to be 'not significant'. It is the significant adverse effects which require mitigation.</p> <p>Following the consideration of the proposed mitigation, the anticipated effects that remain are known as residual effects and these can either be significant or not significant.</p> <p>The results of the EIA are then reported in Volumes 1 to 10 the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2 to 6.11).</p> | |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Full details of the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9). | |
| Process | Challenge that the planning process omits overarching objectives on how SZC Co. expects the development to work in practice and other relevant Information and evidence. Further concern it does not reflect the latest policies which encourage a greater focus on renewable energy and SZC Co. are pursuing for the cheapest option. | <p>The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK has been established by the Government.</p> <p>The 2008 White Paper on Nuclear Power made clear that new nuclear power stations should have a role in the UK's energy mix, alongside other low-carbon sources. Nuclear power can contribute to meeting the UK's binding targets for emissions reductions, whilst contributing to diversity and security of supply.</p> <p>The Government's Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>alternative sites</p> <p>The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Site Suitability | Suggestions that Sizewell is not a suitable location and new power stations should be constructed | The principle of new nuclear power generation, site suitability and the need for Sizewell C are established through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | elsewhere in an area less environmentally sensitive such as Hartlepool or in Scotland. | of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | |
| Other projects | Concern over the cumulative impact on Sizewell and the wider region due to a lack of coordination with other energy projects in the region such as Bradwell B, Scottish Power Renewables and National Grid projects as well as planned housing developments. | <p>The EIA Regulations require that the ES includes consideration of cumulative effects. Schedule 4 of the Infrastructure Planning EIA Regulations and Schedule 3 of the Marine Works EIA Regulations state that the ES should provide a description of:</p> <p><i>“the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved projects, taking into account any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected or the use of natural resources”.</i></p> <p>Accordingly, the ES considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Inter-relationships’ that occur when the individual environmental effects of the proposed development combine together with one another and lead to significant effects on a single receptor (e.g. air quality and noise impacts occurring on the same receptor). • ‘Project-wide effects’ that occur when impacts of the main development site and associated developments combine. • ‘Cumulative effects with other projects’ that arise as a result of the proposed development in combination with other projects and/or development plans within the Zone of | |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Influence (Zol) of the proposed development. It is assumed that the potentially cumulative schemes will take place as per the descriptions made publicly available at the time of writing this ES, unless otherwise specified in the technical chapter.</p> <p>A staged process has been followed to assess cumulative impacts with other projects, plans and programmes which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1: establishing a Zone of Influence (Zol) and 'long list' of non-Sizewell C projects, plans and programmes. • Stage 2: selecting a short list of projects, plans and programmes for the assessment. • Stage 3: information gathering. • Stage 4: assessment. <p>Volume 10 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.11) sets out the cumulative and transboundary effects associated with the proposed development.</p> | |
| Other projects | Concern over how construction of Sizewell will directly disrupt over projects area. | <p>SZC Co. recognises that the scale of Sizewell C has led to concern regarding its impact on people and the environment.</p> <p>Sizewell C is a major development and comprises a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The principle of the need for nuclear power generation in the UK</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

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

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>through NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. Therefore, these matters do not fall to be debated in the consideration of an application for development consent. National planning policy recognises the urgency of need for the development of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell and the significant national and regional benefits that such a development would bring. Further information can be found within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Sizewell C Project have been fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures are proposed. Please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | |

| Theme: Safety | | | |
|---------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Safety | <p>Concern about the risks from radiation and possibility of a nuclear disaster similar to Chernobyl or Fukushima. Comments that rising sea levels and Suffolk's unstable coast increase the</p> | <p>The safety of nuclear power plants is assured by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the process of Generic Design Assessment covers safety analysis. This can be found on Her Majesty's Government website. The Generic Design Assessment was approved on 13 December 2012.</p> <p>The design proposals have due regard to the Generic</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Safety | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>risk of a nuclear disaster. Concern over safety of the proposals due to potentially faulty materials, lack of major incident planning and questioning Energy's track record for safety.</p> | <p>Design Assessment. Further information can be found within the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> | |
| Decommissioning | <p>Concern about the cost and logistics of decommissioning as well as the lack of detail about this in the proposal.</p> | <p>As part of the development of any new build nuclear power station, it is necessary to develop plans to demonstrate that the facility can be decommissioned in a safe and environmentally acceptable way. It is expected that the Sizewell C power station will have a lifetime of 60 years, following which it will be decommissioned.</p> <p>Before decommissioning can take place, there is a requirement for the operator to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and prepare an ES under the relevant EIA Regulations, such as Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) Regulations 1999 and the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007. For the Sizewell C UK European Pressurised Water Reactor (UK EPR™) units the</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Safety | | | |
|---------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>preparation and submission of the EIA will take place in the years leading up to End of Generation. The EIA performed at that time would take full account of the environmental impacts of decommissioning. This is a statutory process and the time for the assessment will reflect that. The length of the decommissioning itself will be in accordance with planning permission and ES to ensure that it is decommissioned in a safe and environmentally acceptable way.</p> <p>Operation and decommissioning of the Sizewell C power station would result in the unavoidable generation of quantities of radioactive waste and spent fuel. Whilst the regulatory requirements minimizes environmental impacts, this is a known and justifiable consequence of nuclear power generation and the UK regulatory permissions regime for nuclear power stations defines precise regulatory requirements and expectations for the management of this waste.</p> | |
| Reactor type | Concern that the construction involves untested technology, that SZC Co. have had engineering issues with the | The safety of nuclear power plants is assured by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the process of Generic Design Assessment covers safety analysis. This can be found on our website. The Generic Design Assessment was approved on 13 December 2012. | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Safety | | | |
|---------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | EPR™ reactor previously, and that by the time it is operational it will be outdated. | The design proposals have due regard to the Generic Design Assessment. Further information can be found within the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11). | |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| People and economy | Positive comments suggesting that the proposals will provide lasting community benefits such as jobs, training, education and boost the local economy. | <p>SZC Co. welcomes the recognition that the Sizewell C Project will provide lasting community benefits in terms of employment, skills, training, education and supply chain benefits.</p> <p>SZC Co. has worked closely with stakeholders to ensure that the economic benefits can be enhanced in-line with the aspirations for sustainable sectoral growth across the Energy Coast – plans to implement these enhancements are set out in Appendix A, the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy; and Appendix B, the Supply Chain Strategy appended to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9), which quantifies the overall economic benefits.</p> | N |
| Economic benefits | Suggestions that benefits such as increased | SZC Co. is required to mitigate all significant adverse effects related to the Sizewell C Project. In order to understand the extent of the effects, an Environmental Impact Assessment | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>employment do not outweigh the impacts on economy, communities and the environment.</p> | <p>has been undertaken and physical mitigation and implementation measures, as well as financial mitigation identified.</p> <p>In addition, SZC Co. has set out a number of strategies to enhance the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project – set out in Appendix A, the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy; and Appendix B, the Supply Chain Strategy appended to the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>A range of mitigation measures have been developed, summarised in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3), to avoid or reduce significant effects – this includes a Housing Fund, a Public Services Contingency Fund and implementation strategies like an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local</p> | |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected. Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3). | |
| Workforce / supply chain | Concern that the Hinkley Point supply chains will be favoured over local supply chains, as such jobs will not be created for local people, and any employment will be low skilled. | <p>Sizewell C’s construction phase will support around 2,600 jobs for local residents at the peak of activity in a range of different skills, roles and in both construction and non-construction sectors that would not otherwise arise (without the Sizewell C Project).</p> <p>Replication of some parts of the supply chain developed for the first of a kind new fleet of UK nuclear new builds (at Hinkley Point C) is important to enable efficiencies – but there will be substantial opportunities for Suffolk-based firms to benefit from contracts over the lifetime of the Sizewell C Project, as has been identified in the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and within the Supply Chain Strategy, provided in Appendix B of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>Work has been underway in advance of the DCO submission to provide information and support to local companies with an interest in bidding for contracts on the Sizewell C Project through the Supply Chain Portal (run by the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, funded by SZC Co.).</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Anti-social behaviour | Concern about anti-social behaviour and crime caused by the increase in population from the Sizewell workforce. Suggestion that lessons had not been learnt from problems associated with construction of Sizewell B. | <p>SZC Co. is aware of the concern from local residents about the behaviour of workers, particularly those who remember incidents that arose during the construction of Sizewell B.</p> <p>As a result, SZC Co. has been working closely with Suffolk Constabulary and other emergency services to develop a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) supported by financial mitigation to ensure resourcing is in place to apply measures needed to reduce the risk of anti-social behaviour and crime. This includes a service to ensure that local residents' complaints are heard and prioritized by SZC Co..</p> <p>In addition, SZC Co. will be implementing a Worker Code of Conduct which sets out the Sizewell C Project's expectations of worker behaviour both on-site and in local communities, and disciplinary action will be taken should it be needed.</p> | N |
| Local Community | Concern over disregard for communities such as Leiston and nearby villages whose dynamic will change | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken a ward-level assessment of the likely demographic and population change as a result of the temporary, non-home-based construction workforce, and the knock-on implications for housing and public services, and community cohesion as a result. This is included within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | and will suffer from disruption. Suggestion that a long-term community fund be provided. | <p>Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>As a result of this assessment, a range of mitigation measures have been developed, summarized in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics), to avoid or reduce significant effects – this includes a Housing Fund, a Public Services Fund and implementation strategies like an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected.</p> | |
| Health and wellbeing | Concern over health and wellbeing of local people due to the increased risk of disease associated with pollution, the importance of the | <p>SZC Co. considers the mental and physical health and wellbeing of local communities and the workforce to be paramount.</p> <p>A full assessment of the potential effects of the Sizewell C Project on residual healthcare service demand and the potential for effects of environmental change to the area on</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) to wellbeing was stressed as well as the mental health of communities. | health indicators and perceptions of wellbeing is included in Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). | |
| Local community | Concern over the general impact on the area of a large influx of workers, without specifying what impacts they will bring. | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken a ward-level assessment of the likely demographic and population change as a result of the temporary, non-home-based construction workforce, and the knock-on implications for housing and public services, and community cohesion as a result. This is included within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>As a result of this assessment, a range of mitigation measures have been developed, summarized in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3), to avoid or reduce significant effects – this includes a Housing Fund, a Public Services Fund and implementation strategies like an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in</p> | N |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected. | |
| Local property | Concern over impact on housing and historic buildings of vibrations from heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements. Further concern the construction would decrease the value of properties and damage farms. | <p>SZC Co. have worked to minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls, including those set out in the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11). The predicted impacts on heritage assets from the proposed development are then set out within the historic environment chapters of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6). No significant vibration impacts on heritage assets are predicted.</p> <p>SZC Co. and their agents continue to engage with landowners concerning accommodation works in order to minimise impact on holdings as far as possible.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the 'Compensation Code', based on legislation, case law and best practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned 'Compensation Code'. SZC Co. has and continues to work</p> | Y |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for the Sizewell C DCO has been accepted for examination.</p> <p>SZC Co. have committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p> | |
| Local economy | Concerns about the detrimental impact | SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of the likely significant effects on the tourist economy and on the | Y |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | the development will have on businesses such as those in tourism and farming. | <p>agricultural economy. This is included within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>SZC Co. will provide compensation to any agricultural land holdings that are displaced or substantially changed, as set out in Volume 2, Chapter 17 of the ES (Soils and Agriculture) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>SZC Co. and Ipsos MORI, working with local tourism stakeholders, have developed a Tourism Survey to understand the perceived sensitivities to change in visitor behaviour, identifying a perceived risk that some visitors state that they are less likely to visit. As a result, SZC Co. has developed proposals for a Tourism Fund that will provide promotional, marketing and other measures to seek to avoid perceived effects materializing. This is detailed in the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Local infrastructure / services | Concerns over the impact on local infrastructure and services such as pressure on schools, | The Sizewell C Project will require a temporary non-home-based workforce who may seek to access public services. Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) and Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) set out an assessment of the potential net additional | N |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>general practitioner (GP) services, sewage disposal, roads, water supply and parking.</p> | <p>demand from the workforce for these services, and identify that there is unlikely to be a substantial demand that would not otherwise be accounted for by general taxation.</p> <p>However, in recognition of the potential demand for some services as a result of workers bringing dependents, the lag time between taxation and central government funding, or related to the specific demographic profile of the workforce, SZC Co. will provide a public services contingency fund and a residual healthcare demand fund that can be applied where potential additional demand may arise.</p> | |
| Mitigation | <p>Comments calling for more details regarding the Community Fund and concerns it was not adequate mitigation for the impacts.</p> | <p>A range of mitigation measures have been developed, summarized in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3) to avoid or reduce significant effects – this includes a Housing Fund, a Public Services Contingency Fund and implementation strategies like an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local</p> | N |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected. Further information can be found in the Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13).</p> <p>The Community Fund is of a scale and will be applied to locations where there is anticipated to be more substantial changes to local populations and infrastructure as a result of the Sizewell C Project.</p> | |
| Local amenities | Concern over impact on local amenity and the loss or alteration of the countryside and beaches. | <p>Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of potential amenity and recreation effects of the proposed main development site. Onshore, a network of linear and area access resources (referred to as ‘recreational resources’) exist within the study area, which are used for a range of recreational activities including walking, dog walking, cycling, horse riding, fishing and watching wildlife.</p> <p>Proposals for the main development site have been developed to minimise effects on linear recreational routes from physical diversions and temporary or permanent closures of existing routes, where possible. For example, the long distance walking routes along the coast (the Suffolk Coast Path, Sandlings Walk, and the future route of the England Coast Path) would remain open during construction and operation of Sizewell C, but may need to be closed for short periods to ensure public safety during the construction</p> | |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>of the sea defences and the operation of the Beach Landing Facility. An inland diversion would be provided for periods of temporary closure to ensure that people can continue to walk the Suffolk Coast Path, Sandlings Walk and the England Coast Path at all times, albeit along a longer inland route. The period of these closures and diversions would be minimised as far as possible.</p> <p>In addition, approximately 1.4km of the Sustrans Regional Cycle Route 42/Suffolk Coastal Cycle Route on the B1122 and Eastbridge Road would be permanently diverted in order to ensure that the route stays open and that a safe route is provided whilst the new roundabout on the B1122 is being constructed. Temporary diversions would also be provided for sections of Sandlings Walk and Bridleway 19 (E-363/019/0). All temporary and permanent diversions of public rights of way are set out within the Rights of Way and Access Strategy provided in Volume 2, Appendix 15I of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Local housing | Concern house prices and rents will increase due to increased demand from workers, | SZC Co. is keenly aware of the potential for workers to access rented accommodation in the local area that is an important resource for local residents with housing need or vulnerability. As a result of the assessment of these potential effects set out in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio- | Y |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | exacerbating current shortages. Concern about a negative impact on house prices. | <p>economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3), SZC Co. has developed an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a Housing Fund to avoid potential adverse effects on the housing market.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for the Sizewell C DCO has been accepted for examination.</p> <p>SZC Co. have committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p> | |
| Tourism | Concern that the tourist trade will be damaged because visitors will be put off by the visual impact of the development and traffic impacts | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of the likely significant effects on the tourist economy. This is included within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>SZC Co. and Ipsos MORI, working with local tourism stakeholders, have developed a Tourism Survey to</p> | Y |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | from the construction. | <p>understand the perceived sensitivities to change in visitor behaviour, identifying a perceived risk that some visitors state that they are less likely to visit.</p> <p>As a result, SZC Co. has developed proposals for a Tourism Fund that will provide promotional, marketing and other measures to seek to avoid perceived effects materializing. This is detailed in the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Further assessments | Calls for further assessments or more information to be provided regarding Health and Community, tourism, economic, social and environmental impacts. | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken a ward-level assessment of the likely demographic and population change as a result of the temporary, non-home-based construction workforce, and the knock-on implications for housing and public services, and community cohesion as a result. This is included within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>As a result of this assessment, a range of mitigation measures have been developed, summarized in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3), to avoid or reduce significant effects – this includes a Housing Fund, a Public Services Fund and implementation strategies like an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected. Further information can be found in the Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13).</p> | |
| Compensation | <p>Suggestion that compensation will need to be provided for those who have had their business been adversely affected.</p> | <p>SZC Co. recognises the potential for the infrastructure and workforce associated with Sizewell C to lead to changes in the local economy in terms of labour supply, economic opportunity within the supply chain, and environmental and land changes to specific businesses and sectors.</p> <p>SZC Co. have developed a range of strategies including an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, provided in Appendix A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9), and a Supply Chain Strategy provided in Appendix B of the Economic Statement to minimize adverse effects and maximise the benefits of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. will be providing a significant investment into</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>transport infrastructure to ensure that accessibility issues related to the Sizewell C Project on local and strategic road networks are minimized wherever possible, in order to minimize the effects on business.</p> <p>Where land is required for the Sizewell C Project, compensation for businesses in those landholdings will be negotiated with those interests.</p> | |
| Mitigation | <p>Suggestions to commit to filling roles with local workers and for local businesses to be given the opportunity to bid for contracts.</p> | <p>Sizewell C’s construction phase will support around 2,600 jobs for local residents at the peak of activity in a range of different skills, roles and in both construction and non-construction sectors that would not otherwise arise (without the Sizewell C Project).</p> <p>Replication of some parts of the supply chain developed for the first in a new fleet of UK nuclear new builds (at Hinkley Point C) is important to enable efficiencies – but there will be substantial opportunities for Suffolk-based firms to benefit from contracts over the lifetime of the Sizewell C Project, as has been identified in the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and within the Supply Chain Strategy, provided in Appendix B of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>Work has been underway in advance of the DCO</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>submission to provide information and support to local companies with an interest in bidding for contracts on the Sizewell C Project through the Supply Chain Portal (run by the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, funded by SZC Co.).</p> <p>The Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, provided in Appendix A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) includes a suite of measures, supported by financial commitments, that will work with local and regional policy aspirations and mechanisms for upskilling and qualification, and with partner organisations such as schools, further education and higher education institutions to support the workforce needed for the Sizewell C Project and the wider Energy Coast, and develop sustainable careers with transferrable skills for local residents.</p> | |
| Mitigation | <p>Suggestions for housing mitigation, for SZC Co. to enhance the environment and leisure facilities, contribute to regenerating Leiston Town, install traffic</p> | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken a detailed assessment of the likely socio-economic effects of the Sizewell C Project in terms of housing and public and emergency services, leisure/sport activity and economic development, and community cohesion. This is included within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>As a result of this assessment, a range of mitigation measures have been developed, summarized in Volume 2,</p> | N |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | management measures and support emergency services infrastructure. | <p>Chapter 9 of the ES (Socio-economics) (Doc Ref. 6.3), to avoid or reduce significant effects – this includes a Housing Fund, a Public Services Fund and implementation strategies like an Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10) and a Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16).</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected.</p> <p>SZC Co. have also undertaken a Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) to identify where the workforce and materials/goods movements for the Sizewell C Project may require mitigation (such as physical improvements and implementation plans e.g. Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7) and Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8) to mitigate potential adverse effects on the highway network.</p> | |
| Mitigation | Suggestion that | SZC Co. welcome the suggestion that its initiatives seek to | Y |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>training opportunities focus on local people to allow them access to employment, and linking up with local institutions such as the University of Suffolk.</p> | <p>develop opportunities for local people to access employment and incorporate and support existing local institutions.</p> <p>The Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, provided in Appendix A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) includes a suite of measures, supported by financial commitments, that will work with local and regional policy aspirations and mechanisms for upskilling and qualification, and with partner organisations such as schools, further education and higher education institutions to support the workforce needed for the Sizewell C Project and the wider Energy Coast, and develop sustainable careers with transferrable skills for local residents.</p> | |
| Accommodation | <p>Concern about the accommodation block being too large for the area, and that SZC Co. have ignored previous consultation responses making this point.</p> | <p>SZC Co. have sought to manage the effects of the workforce on local communities and the highway network, balanced with delivering economic benefits to local communities and ensuring the safety, security and recruitment initiatives to deliver a NSIP effectively.</p> <p>A significant element of this is providing sufficient, well-accessed and attractive accommodation for its workforce at the main construction site.</p> <p>SZC Co.'s design for the accommodation campus has</p> | N |



| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>evolved through the consultation process in order to account for the most efficient use of the site and to minimize disruption to residential properties in communities immediately adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Details of SZC Co.’s consideration of alternatives to the on-site accommodation campus are set out in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). Details of the design of the on-site accommodation campus are set out in Appendix A of the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p> | |
| Accommodation | Suggestions that SZC Co. pursue a split campus model as they did with Hinkley Point C. | <p>SZC Co. has developed its proposals for a single, on-site accommodation campus for Sizewell C and considered alternatives throughout four stages of consultation. A range of factors have led to the finalization of a strategy for project accommodation that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduce the number of journeys on local roads; - balance the economic benefits of workers integrating within housing markets and communities, without overwhelming local communities with new residents; - reduce pressure otherwise placed on tourist and private rented sectors; and - allow flexible working patterns and out of hours | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>working that would be necessary to maintain construction productivity and progress.</p> <p>Details of this process are set out in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), the Planning Statement and the Accommodation Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p> | |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Assessments of traffic | Suggestions that SZC Co.'s traffic assumptions and modelling are incorrect, or inaccurate and that further modelling of traffic impacts should take place. | <p>Extensive pre-application scoping and discussions have been undertaken with Suffolk County Council (SCC) and East Suffolk Council since 2012 on the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), alongside the SZC Co. consultations that have been carried out with the local community and stakeholder interests. The assessment has been based on the information and advice that has been made available through these discussions on the approach, methodology and scope of the study area.</p> <p>SZC Co. has actively sought to obtain views from a wide range of prescribed and non-prescribed consultees on matters including transport.</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>The strategic highway assignment modelling provides an assessment covering the highway network, which has been agreed with SCC and extends to Lowestoft to the north, Ipswich to the south and the A140 to the west, including the A12, A14 and key routes envisaged to be used by Sizewell C traffic.</p> <p>For further details of the modelling assumptions please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> | |
| Criteria | <p>Suggestion to use whichever option, or combination of options, will minimise the use of roads during construction.</p> | <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. These include the green rail route, and the works needed to upgrade the branch line. To increase SZC Co.'s confidence in delivering these works, it is proposed to include all the necessary powers to undertake the works within the DCO. The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the Integrated Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>(by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Environmental impact | Concern that any of the transport proposals will have a detrimental impact on the environment | <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | in general. | in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites. A full ES has been prepared to minimise effects and mitigation is proposed to mitigate significant effects. Further information can be found within the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | |
| Environmental impact | Concern that any of the transport proposals will have adverse impacts on air quality from vehicle emissions. | <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites. Further information can be found within the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |
| Environmental impact | Concern that traffic associated with the construction will increase carbon emissions and contribute to climate | <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | change. | recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites. Further information can be found within the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | |
| Environmental impact | Concern that any of the transport measures will lead to increased noise pollution and vibrations from freight, with particular concern for night movements and residents living close to the railway and the A12. | <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites. Further information can be found within the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |
| Environmental impact | Concern about how the landscape will be adversely impacted by associated transport due to road building, cuttings and embankments. | The design of the proposed roads (and their associated structures such as overbridges, cuttings and embankments) has been carefully considered and has evolved through consultation and environmental assessments. The Site Selection Report , provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), explained the route selection for the two village bypass, Sizewell link road and Yoxford roundabout and other highway | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | improvements. Please also refer to Chapter 3 of Volumes 5, 6 and 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6 to 6.8) for information regarding the design evolution of the road proposals. Chapter 6 of Volumes 5, 6 and 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.6 to 6.8) provide information regarding the expected landscape and visual effects of the proposed roads associated with Sizewell C. As explained within these chapters mitigation is proposed where necessary to help mitigate adverse landscape and visual effects. Such mitigation includes retention of existing vegetation where possible, proposed planting to integrate and screen and the sinking of the routes to mitigate visual effects. | |
| Environmental impact | Concern that transport proposals will negatively impact wildlife such as rare birds, priority habitats and species. Comments also noted that increased speed limits are a danger to animals crossing the road. | <p>Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025.</p> <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites. Further information can be found within the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |
| Community impact | Concern that transport proposals will lead to an | Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>increase in traffic on the local road network, with many comments citing concern about HGVs in particular. Comments raised concerns about the A12, B1122 and smaller county roads and the impact this will have on communities.</p> | <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites. Further information can be found within the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Infrastructure | <p>Concern about HGV traffic using unsuitable roads such as the B1122 in the early years and the suggestion that construction should not commence till the infrastructure is in place.</p> | <p>SZC Co. has taken steps to ensure that construction traffic impacts are mitigated as far as possible. The construction programme has sought to deliver mitigation early on in the process, whilst allowing the Sizewell C Project to be delivered in a timely manner. The construction of the off-site associated developments would be undertaken early in the construction programme. The construction period of each associated development would vary, however each is assumed to take no longer than 24 months.</p> <p>An indicative phasing schedule for the Sizewell C Project as a whole is provided in the Implementation Plan, Appendix 8.4I of</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | |
| Local economy | Concern that the transport options will negatively impact businesses who will not get their deliveries on time and suffer from less demand for tourist services due to the congestion. | <p>SZC Co recognises that changes to road infrastructure has the potential to change the operation of some businesses that rely on passing trade. Where there is a potential effect that can be evidenced, businesses have the right to raise a Part 1 claim for compensation. SZC Co. will work with potentially affected businesses in these cases to determine the effects.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project has been designed sensitively to reduce the potential adverse effects on local economies by providing physical mitigation measures that will improve the strategic road network.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) explains how the proposed highway improvements mitigate the impact of Sizewell C construction traffic. Further information is included in Volume 2 Chapter 10 (Transport) and Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | N |
| Community impact | Concern over cut-through traffic on country lanes around the B1122, A12 and park and rides as well as exacerbating | The Sizewell link road would be a quicker and safer route than the existing B1122 so would be more attractive than the existing road to drivers, encouraging them to use the Sizewell link road rather than other roads. Similarly, the two village bypass will be quicker and safer than the existing A12 through Farnham and Stratford St Andrew. | Y |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | problems on the B1078. | The impact on the B1078 is identified in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and mitigation proposed at the A140 junction and near Easton and Otley College. Impacts on other roads, for example the B1116 near to the southern park and ride site, are small and do not require mitigation measures. | |
| Safety | Concern that the transport plans do not allow for evacuation, will increase road accident risks due to the increase in traffic and exacerbate current problems of poor visibility, dangerous junctions and bottlenecks. | <p>Following comments made at Stage 2 consultation about use of the B1122 as a construction route and during an evacuation, at Stage 3 consultation SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road. This would relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic and be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) considers road accidents and mitigation measures are proposed at the A140/B1078 junction, near Easton and Otley College, A12/A1094 junction, A12/B1119, A1094/B1069 junctions to mitigate the risk of additional accidents. Improvements are proposed at the A12/B1122 and A12/A144 junctions to increase capacity and reduce delays.</p> | Y |
| Mitigation | Concern that the proposed transport mitigation will not | The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) explains how the proposed highway improvements mitigate the impact of Sizewell C construction traffic, as planning policy requires. Further information | Y |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | solve problems, and that Stage 4 of the consultation has not included additional measures. | is included in Volume 2 Chapter 10 (Transport) and Volume 7 of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6). | |
| Further assessments | Calls for further assessments related to the transport plans such as how non-HGV traffic is factored into the proposed transport strategies, further traffic modelling, on-street parking, and modelling the cumulative transport impact of from other projects. | <p>The base year modelling includes all types of traffic currently on the highway network. Traffic from committed developments is then added to the traffic model. Sizewell C traffic, which is made up of heavy goods vehicles, light goods vehicles, buses and cars, is then added into the traffic model so that a comprehensive picture of the cumulative transport impact is presented.</p> <p>The more detailed modelling of the individual junctions presented in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) includes the effects of on-street parking, where appropriate.</p> | Y |
| Mitigation | Suggestions such as upgrading existing infrastructure, monitoring of HGV movements, a | The highway improvements proposed in the DCO largely constitute upgrading or replacing existing infrastructure. For example, the two village bypass moves traffic off the existing A12 onto a new highway scheme – it would not be possible, without significant property demolition, to upgrade the existing A12 through Farnham | Y |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>phasing plan for infrastructure, complaints procedure and provision of pedestrian access to countryside.</p> | <p>and Stratford St Andrew. Similarly, the Sizewell link road effectively replaces the existing B1122, which many consultees felt could not accommodate the additional traffic during Sizewell C construction. Online improvement of the existing B1122 would have been impractical and have a very significant impact on Middleton Moor and Theberton.</p> <p>Throughout all four public consultation stages, SZC Co. confirmed that HGV movements would be monitored to ensure that they followed the fixed routes defined by SZC Co. and used in the transport modelling work. This monitoring would most likely be through GPS technology.</p> <p>An indicative phasing schedule for the Sizewell C Project as a whole is provided in the Implementation Plan, Appendix 8.4I of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>Where appropriate, public rights of way that cross the new highway infrastructure or the main development site (bridleway 19) have been accommodated through temporary or permanent diversions so that pedestrian access to the countryside would be maintained.</p> | |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Mitigation | Suggestions to make safe provisions for cyclists such as surfacing the bridleway diversion, underpasses and safe crossings in all locations affected by new roads. | The bridleway diversion would be surfaced with material suitable for both horses and cyclists. There are a number of safe crossings, suitable for both horses and cyclists, along the length of the bridleway diversion. These are called Pegasus crossings and are clearly shown on the plans submitted with the Sizewell C DCO. | |
| Suggestion | Suggestion that as part of the transport proposals SZC Co. should upgrade the A12 to dual carriageway. | <p>SZC Co.is required to mitigate the impact of Sizewell C construction and operational traffic on the local road network.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES consider these impacts and set out mitigation measures, including the Sizewell link road, two village bypass and numerous junction improvements.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) demonstrates that the impacts do not justify a dual carriageway from Wickham Market to Lowestoft.</p> | N |
| Marine-led strategy | Suggestions that a marine-led transport strategy should be | Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “ <i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Project, where cost-effective</i> ”. The feasibility of a marine led | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>used instead and that dropping this strategy has not been justified and should be reopened.</p> | <p>strategy has therefore been considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the Beach Landing Facility (BLF) is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref.</p> | |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | 8.4). | |
| Beach Landing Facility | Suggestion that the Beach Landing Facility should be upgraded to allow it to take delivery of the majority of the large and heavy materials required for construction. | <p>The Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), sets out that a preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both jetty options would result in severe underwater noise during construction as a result of the nature of the construction works, and the significant amount of time required to construct the jetty. This noise would likely extend to a radius of several kilometres (km). This would cause significant adverse effects on marine ecology and fisheries, which could only be limited, but not removed by extensive seasonal controls on construction activity, which would greatly extend the construction programme and the commencement of operation of the power station. The jetty options would result in greater habitat loss associated with the footprint of the piles. <p>The Beach Landing Facility (BLF) also requires piling, but to a</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>greatly reduced extent, and only in shallow waters which greatly attenuates the radius of underwater noise. The BLF is therefore predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment, shipping and navigation activities compared with either of the jetty options, and would not require removal as it would be retained for use during the operation of the power station.</p> <p>Whilst the wide jetty option would not have caused permanent change to the shoreline alignment, it would likely have caused greater temporary effects, such as a reduced wave height at the shore, and associated short-term changes to the alignment of the shoreline. Measures to reduce these impacts would significantly increase the overall time taken to construct the power station, would not fully address those impacts, and it could delay the overall construction programme.</p> <p>The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase. SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too</p> | |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>large to be delivered by road or rail. The decision was informed by design development and environmental work, and EDF Energy’s experiences from the construction of Hinkley Point C in relation to the type of material and deliveries needed during construction. A BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted. It will allow for the delivery of AILs throughout the construction phase and during the operational phase, to remove heavy and oversized loads from the road network.</p> | |
| Beach Landing Facility | <p>Calls for more information regarding the Beach Landing Facility, any maritime installations and associated marine works to be made available, especially for the Ministry of Defence and local fishing interests.</p> | <p>A permanent BLF is required for the operational phase for delivery of AILs during maintenance, such as the reactor pressure vessel. The landward termination of the BLF would be at up to 6m Ordnance Datum (Newlyn) (ODN) to provide the necessary depth to accommodate the required barges. The BLF would include a temporary deck structure that can be removed when not in use, leaving minimum visible elements. Illustrative details showing how the BLF could look for the majority of the time during operation, when it is dismantled, are shown on Figure 2.10 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2).</p> <p>An application for a Deemed Marine Licence is included within the Draft Order, which includes a number of proposed conditions that would be attached to a licence.</p> <p>Chapter 24, Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2) presents an assessment</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>of the marine navigation effects arising from the construction and operation of the Sizewell C power station at the main development site (referred to throughout this volume as the 'proposed development'). This includes an assessment of potential risks, their significance, the requirements for mitigation and the residual risks.</p> <p>Detailed descriptions of the main development site (referred to throughout this volume as the 'site'), the proposed development and the different phases of development are provided in Chapters 1 to 4 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2).</p> | |
| Beach Landing Facility | <p>Concerns over lack of detail about Beach Landing Facility and disruption to coastal walks, damaging coastal processes and the AONB. Further concern that the rock armour defence is inadequate and that yachts use the power station for navigation.</p> | <p>The Beach Landing Facility (BLF) has deliberately been designed to be a short, open-piled structure to minimise impacts on coastal processes. Our assessments show that the BLF will not have significant impacts.</p> <p>The detailed design of the rock armour coastal defence (hard coastal defence feature (HCDF)) has continued since Stage 3 with the appointment of the construction contractor to ensure that it is adequate and safe for the proposed development.</p> <p>Further information is provided in Chapter 20 (Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) in Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | N |
| Road-led strategy | <p>Concerns over the levels of traffic and</p> | <p>The Integrated Strategy is now proposed in the DCO which allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>the congestion that will result from a road-led strategy, particularly on the A12 and B1122. Further concerns expressed over the suitability of the, B1078 and other local roads to handle traffic in a road-led strategy.</p> | <p>by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the Integrated Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability. Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Road-led strategy | <p>Concern that the road-led strategy will have a negative impact on the air</p> | <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>quality and cause noise pollution and vibrations, with a potential for adverse health impacts.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beach Landing Facility; • green rail route; • two village bypass; and • Sizewell link road. <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project. Doing so will also help reduce potential air quality impacts.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Road-led strategy | Suggestions for assessments of the air | The Integrated Strategy is now proposed in the DCO which allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | quality within Ipswich as a result of the increased traffic related emissions associated with the road strategy. | <p>by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the Integrated Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability. Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the integrated strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Road-led strategy | Suggestion that the B1122 should not be used in any road-led strategy and that if it is the highways | Following comments made at Stage 2 consultation about use of the B1122 as a construction route, at the Stage 3 consultation SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It | Y |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | authority may make representations for further traffic mitigation. | relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows (reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in Volume 6 of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6). | |
| Rail-led strategy | Support for the rail-led strategy as providing legacy benefits for the area through rail-improvements, as well as some of the road improvements proposed under the rail-led strategy such as the two village bypass. | <p>The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. This would in turn affect SZC Co.'s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed in time to meet the urgent need for new Nuclear Power Generation.</p> <p>On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable. Instead, an integrated strategy was developed to seek to secure the best deliverable rail outcome, whilst addressing the concerns expressed in relation to the road-led strategy.</p> <p>Based on the above principles, the Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility; • green rail route; • two village bypass; and • Sizewell link road. <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | Support for the rail-led strategy as having less negative | The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. This | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>environmental impacts, including reducing the construction’s carbon footprint and negative impact on air quality.</p> | <p>would in turn affect SZC Co.’s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed in time to meet the urgent need for new Nuclear Power Generation.</p> <p>On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental information also identified the road-led strategy required extended hours for HGV operation (beyond 7am to 11pm), which would result in a number of significant noise impacts arising from night-time road noise. Further environmental assessment work undertaken as part of Stage 4 therefore concluded that the predicted impacts of the three options are broadly comparable and therefore there was no environmental reason to prefer road based strategy, having regard to the clear policy preference for rail over road where practicable.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the integrated strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference.</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | <p>Support for the rail-led strategy due to it removing vehicles from the roads and thus relieving congestion from the</p> | <p>The Integrated Strategy is now proposed in the DCO which allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the Integrated Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | local area. | <p>strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the integrated strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project. For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | Comments suggesting rail-led strategy will have least impact on the tourist economy. | <p>SZC Co. recognises that tourism is a key strength within Suffolk’s economy, and in particular within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which stretches north and south of Sizewell C.</p> <p>With input from local stakeholders including Local Authorities, and the Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation, SZC Co. developed a Tourism Survey to understand the potential sensitivities of new and returning tourists to the Suffolk Coast. This was undertaken by Ipsos MORI and the results are contained in</p> | Y |



| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>Using feedback from the Tourism Survey, SZC Co. has developed proposals for a Tourism Fund, details of which are set out in Chapter 9 (Socio-Economics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). This will include funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | <p>Concern that the rail-led strategy will be too hard to implement, highlighting comments from SZC Co. suggesting it is uncertain, thus an unrealistic option.</p> | <p>The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. This would in turn affect SZC Co.'s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed in time to meet the urgent need for new nuclear power generation.</p> <p>On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental information also identified the road-led strategy required extended hours for HGV operation (beyond 7am to 11pm), which would result in a number of significant noise impacts arising from night-time road noise. Further environmental assessment work undertaken as part of Stage 4 therefore concluded that the predicted impacts of the three options are broadly comparable and therefore there was no environmental reason to prefer road based strategy, having</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>regard to the clear policy preference for rail over road where practicable.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co, have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference.</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | <p>Concern that the rail-led strategy will cause noise disruption and vibration damage to buildings near the rail lines due to passing freight trains.</p> | <p>The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. This would in turn affect SZC Co.'s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed in time to meet the urgent need for new nuclear power generation.</p> <p>On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental information also identified the road-led strategy required extended hours for HGV operation (beyond 7am to 11pm), which would result in a number of significant noise impacts arising from night-time road noise. Further environmental assessment work undertaken as part of Stage 4 therefore concluded that the predicted impacts of the three options are broadly comparable and therefore there was no environmental reason to prefer road based strategy, having regard to the clear policy preference for rail over road where practicable.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. | |
| Rail-led strategy | Concerns that the rail-led strategy will negatively impact the passenger services in the area, in particular on the East Suffolk line. | <p>The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. This would in turn affect SZC Co's ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed in time to meet the urgent need for new nuclear power generation.</p> <p>On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental information also identified the road-led strategy required extended hours for HGV operation (beyond 7am to 11pm), which would result in a number of significant noise impacts arising from night-time road noise. Further environmental assessment work undertaken as part of Stage 4 therefore concluded that the predicted impacts of the three options are broadly comparable and therefore there was no environmental reason to prefer road based strategy, having regard to the clear policy preference for rail over road where practicable.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference.</p> | N |
| Rail-led | Concern that the rail- | The Integrated Strategy is now proposed in the DCO which allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| strategy | led strategy involves too much road traffic, including HGVs, that will be using the road during construction of Sizewell C. | <p>by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the Integrated Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability. Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | Concern about the traffic and levels of congestion caused by the rail-led strategy, including | <p>The Integrated Strategy is now proposed in the DCO which allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project. Importantly this strategy involves fewer works to the East Suffolk line, including a reduced number of changes to level</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | through Yoxford and Middleton Moor, as well as potentially longer level-crossing closures near Westerfield. | <p>crossings.</p> <p>For further details, please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) for information on the proposed package of highway improvements, and the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) in relation to the selection process used for the proposed development.</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | Suggestion that SZC Co. need to conduct further assessments of the rail-led strategy to determine the impact trains could have on buildings, other services or if the rail-led strategy's impact on the B1122 had been examined properly. Requests for more information including whether freight trains would be moving at peak times, or how long | <p>Further work was undertaken by SZC Co. and Network Rail to understand the extend of works needed to deliver the rail led scheme. This work identified that the works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility; • green rail route; • two village bypass; and • Sizewell link road. <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | work on level crossings will take. | | |
| Rail-led strategy | Suggestions for the rail-led strategy such as a freight management facility along the East Suffolk line, consideration of public rights of way and crossings, continued collaboration with Network Rail and legacy improvements. | <p>The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility; • green rail route; • two village bypass; and • Sizewell link road. <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |
| Integrated strategy | Support for the integrated strategy reducing HGV use of roads. | <p>The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> | Y |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> beach landing facility; green rail route; two village bypass; and Sizewell link road. <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Integrated strategy | Concern that the integrated strategy will have negative consequences for the environment from HGV movements and trains, including concern that overnight train movements will cause significant noise impacts for residents living close to the line. | <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> beach landing facility; green rail route; two village bypass; and Sizewell link road. <p>For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |
| Integrated strategy | Concern that the integrated strategy relies too heavily on HGV movements that | <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> beach landing facility; | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | will significantly increase congestion on the A12 and other country roads. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • green rail route; • two village bypass; and • Sizewell link road. For further details, please refer to the Site Selection Report , provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | |
| Integrated strategy | Calls for further impact assessments of the integrated strategy on areas such as level crossings and pollution effects on ecological receptors such as the Minsmere-Walberswick Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar site. As well as requests for more | The environmental impacts of the Sizewell C Project have been fully assessed and appropriate mitigation measures are proposed. Please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6). | N |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | information on overnight train movements, details of required materials and traffic impacts. | | |
| Integrated strategy | Suggestions to avoid night train movements, upgrade rail infrastructure and for environmental assessments to protect nearby properties. | <p>The works needed to deliver the rail-led option include complex works to an operational rail line which mean that adequate certainty cannot be placed on the programme for when such works would be available. On the basis of these concerns, SZC Co. concluded that the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility; • green rail route; • two village bypass; and • Sizewell link road. <p>Potential effects arising from night time freight movements will be reduced through the implementation of the measures set out within the Noise Mitigation Scheme and the Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy. For further details, please refer to Volume 2 Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |
| Integrated strategy | Support for the integrated strategy on | Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “ <i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the</i> | Y |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>the condition that the marine-led option is shown to be unworkable, and if SZC Co. show there will not be adverse impacts on roads.</p> | <p><i>Project, where cost-effective</i>". The feasibility of a marine led strategy has therefore been considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the BLF is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy is now proposed in the DCO which allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials</p> | |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the Integrated Strategy are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability. Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Park and ride | Support for the park and ride proposals as a way of reducing traffic on the roads. | SZC Co. welcome the support for the park and ride proposals. | N |
| Park and ride | Concern about lack | The final proposed strategy for the transportation of the workforce | Y |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>of cycling infrastructure to and from the park and ride sites.</p> | <p>retains the overarching principles established at the Stage 1 and 2 consultation, including the principle of two park and ride facilities, direct buses and the promotion of walking and cycling.</p> <p>Where highway improvements are proposed within the DCO, walking and cycling improvements have been incorporated within the design where practical to encourage walking and cycling as a mode of transport for the construction workforce.</p> <p>People using the park and rides would benefit from the walking and cycling infrastructure improvements incorporated as part of the highway improvement schemes.</p> <p>Minor alternations to the development site boundary at the southern park and ride at Wickham Market were made following the Stage 3 consultation. The development site boundary now includes the B1078/B1116 roundabout (which was previously excluded from the Stage 3 boundary) to facilitate the provision of walking/cycling improvements within highway land if necessary.</p> <p>Throughout the consultation stages, SZC Co. explained that, for assessment purposes, no construction workers have been assumed to walk or cycle to the main development site or park and ride sites, although measures to encourage cycling and walking</p> | |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | would be explored and encouraged where practicable. This has now been developed and further detail can be found in the Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) (Doc Ref. 8.8). | |
| Park and ride | Concern that the park and rides as presently designed will not leave a suitable legacy for the area. | <p>The park and rides are temporary to assist with the development of the Sizewell C Project. Once the park and rides are no longer necessary for the construction of the main development site, the land at each site would be reinstated to its former use (be it agricultural use or highway land). As such, there is limited potential for a legacy benefit.</p> <p>However, at both park and ride sites, where agreed with the landowner, the screen planting provided around all boundaries of the site during construction and operation would be left <i>in situ</i>.</p> <p>At the southern park and ride at Wickham Market, the A12 highway works to reduce the northbound carriageway to one lane, would be retained. SZC Co. anticipate that Suffolk County Council would retain the B1078 speed limit reduction on the bridge across the A12, if agreed and adopted during the construction and operation phases of the proposed development.</p> <p>Further detail of the proposals for each site can be found in the relevant descriptions of development for the northern park and ride provided in Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4) and the southern</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | park and ride in Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5). | |
| Park and ride | Concern that the park and ride sites will create an increase in traffic on the roads as workers make their way to and from the sites. | <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES set out the expected traffic increases on these roads in the early years and at peak construction.</p> <p>The forecast traffic increases are not expected to result in congestion or affect access to local amenities.</p> | Y |
| Park and ride | Concern that the park and ride sites will lead to increased urbanisation and cause significant adverse visual impact on the surrounding area. | <p>During construction, operation and the removal and reinstatement phase of each park and ride, the landscape character of the area will change. However, the landscaping strategy for each site has been designed to minimise potential impacts on amenity and recreational, and landscape and visual receptors through the provision of landscape bunds, buffer zones and planting.</p> <p>The detailed design for landscaping will follow the Associated Development Design Principles (Doc Ref. 8.3).</p> <p>Once the park and rides are no longer necessary for the construction of the main development site, the land at each site would be reinstated to its former use (be it agricultural use or highway land). Therefore, any potential urbanisation and visual impact would be temporary.</p> | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Environment | <p>Comments outlining general concern about the construction’s impact on the environment, with particular concern over the location’s sensitivity, and the visual impact on the area from all the elements of construction.</p> | <p>The Government’s Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) states that there is an urgent need for new electricity generating stations, including nuclear power. Sizewell is identified in the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) as one of eight potentially suitable sites for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Annex C to NPS EN-6 confirms that the inclusion of Sizewell C in the NPS reflects the in-principle acceptability of its location, and together with Chapter 3.10 (Nuclear Impact: Landscape and Visual Impacts) of NPS EN-6, it recognises the potential acceptability of significant environmental impacts in this regard in view of the national need for nuclear power generation and the scarcity of alternative sites.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Landscape and visual) Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) assesses the landscape and visual impact of the Sizewell C Project during construction, operation and decommissioning in detail. It defines measures which will help mitigate the impacts of the development. Measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carefully screening the boundaries of the site, with bunds and hoarding and also making use of natural | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>topography and vegetation including woodland blocks and mature hedgerows to contain the construction site and screen it as much as possible from external views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the longer-term, the operational masterplan will establish extensive areas of acid grassland, characteristic of the Suffolk Sandlings, using the approaches summarised in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) (Doc Ref. 8.2) across the EDF Energy Estate. • The new coastal sea defences would support vegetation characteristic of coastal dunes and grasslands using seeds and surface sands sourced from these areas cleared during construction. • The finish and colour of the larger buildings will be informed by local planning guidance on the use of colour developed by the AONB partnership, to enable the landscape effects on the AONB to be minimised. <p>The ES acknowledges that there would be some significant adverse effects on landscape character of the AONB arising as a result of the development although the effects have been minimised as far as possible. The Sizewell C Project is therefore considered appropriate in this regard, and in the context of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6.</p> | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Designated areas | Concern about impact on the AONB, SSSIs, Minsmere Special Protection area, Minsmere Reserve, Ramsar site as well as the Heritage Coast. | <p>The impact on the AONB has been minimised as far as possible by setting the construction area as sensitively as possible within the retained landscape, using natural screening of the landform and retained woodland and hedges supplemented by a high quality approach to boundary treatments.</p> <p>In the longer-term the impacts would be minimised by the measures defined in the operational masterplan and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) (Doc Ref. 8.2) which will establish extensive areas of acid grassland, characteristic of the Suffolk Sandlings, across former arable areas of the EDF Energy Estate. The finish and colour of the larger buildings will be informed by local planning guidance on the use of colour developed by the AONB partnership, to enable the landscape effects on the AONB to be minimised.</p> <p>The impacts on the SSSI have been minimised as far as possible through the advanced creation of replacement habitats at Aldhurst Farm, through the off-site creation of fen meadow habitats, by minimising the impacts of the SSSI crossing and well as by protected species translocations, particularly for water voles.</p> | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>The impacts on Minsmere will be limited in part by the distance of the development to most of the reserve, but also by specific measures to address possible impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of surface water levels during construction through use of control structures on the Leiston drain. • The use of a 5m noise barrier along the northern edge of the construction area to minimise noise spill to the north and to screen the construction site from long-range views from Minsmere to the north. • The creation of on-site and off-site habitats for hunting Marsh Harriers, to support the Minsmere population during construction if they forage less over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. • Monitoring of any increase in visitor numbers to the outer part of the Minsmere reserve in response to ‘recreational displacement’ from Sizewell and measures to mitigate possible increased disturbance. <p>When considered overall, the long-term effects of construction on the purposes of the Heritage Coast designation would be medium-scale over a limited extent of the designation, low magnitude and slight (not significant) adverse.</p> | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Night-time effects on the Suffolk Heritage Coast would be broadly similar as described for the coastal sections of the AONB.</p> <p>Overall, with the proposed mitigation measures, the proposals are considered to be appropriate with regard to the impact upon these designated areas. Further details are contained within Chapters 13 (Landscape and visual) and Chapter 14 (Terrestrial ecology and ornithology) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Heritage | <p>Concern about archaeological impact and effect on historic buildings and the suggestion that new areas within the red line boundary are assessed.</p> | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the Sizewell C Project, including on archaeology and designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Where possible, impacts are proposed to be avoided or reduced by design or by embedded mitigation measures such as screening. Where required, additional mitigation will take the form of agreed schemes of archaeological investigation of s106 commitments.</p> <p>Following Stage 4, further archaeological evaluation has been carried out including archaeological geophysical survey and trial trenching. This scope of this was agreed with SCC</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Archaeological Service (SCCAS) who also monitored the fieldwork.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation <i>in situ</i> has been identified to date.</p> <p>Where land access or ecological constraints has precluded fieldwork ahead of application, this will be undertaken as part of the investigation stage out above with an evaluation stage added at the beginning.</p> <p>Please see Chapters 16 and 23 of Volume 2 and Chapter 9 of Volumes 3-9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3 to 6.10) for full details.</p> | |
| Hydrology | Concern that the water table will be contaminated, that flood risk will increase and about | <p>SZC Co. have carried out a number of assessments in relation to groundwater, surface water, drainage and borrow pit infill.</p> <p>We recognise the potential for the main development and</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>the lack of a water drainage strategy. Further concern about the construction’s demand for water in an area known for shortages.</p> | <p>associated development sites to impact on the hydrological and hydrogeological regimes, through the introduction of buildings, hardstanding, drainage infrastructure, materials handling and infill, often within floodplains, in proximity to watercourses and adjacent to sensitive ecological receptor sites. Impacts could include the effects on water quantity, flow, location and quality, and over time.</p> <p>Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) relating to flood risk adaptation and mitigation was consulted on at Stage 3 (see Doc Ref. 5.5, Appendices E.2, E.3 and E.4). Chapter 19 (Groundwater and surface water) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) provides full details on the assessment of effects on groundwater levels, potential contamination of water bodies and flood risk, and demonstrates that the Sizewell C Project is appropriate in this regard.</p> <p>Additional information, including mitigation, is presented in the Outline Drainage Strategy provided in Volume 2, Appendix 2A of the ES, the Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 5.2) and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> | |
| Land take | <p>Concern over increasing land take</p> | <p>SZC Co. has continually refined the schemes which has led to variations in land take. However, since Stage 4, there has</p> | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | mentioned in each stage of the consultation. | been a decrease in the area of land required across many sites which has been reflected in the application for development consent. Only the land essential to deliver the scheme will be acquired from landowners. | |
| Light pollution | Concern that light pollution from the various developments and vehicles will have an adverse impact on birds and the dark skies in the area. | <p>The landscape and visual impact of the development, including the impacts on dark skies and the interface with lighting are assessed in detail within Chapter 13 (Landscape and visual) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact on birds and wider ecology is considered within Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of the same document.</p> <p>The assessments are informed by a Lighting Management Plan appended to Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Description of the permanent development) (Doc Ref. 6.3) which was prepared following the Stage 3 consultation for both the construction and operational phases. It states that 24-hour working would be limited to large scale concrete pours and steel erections, which cannot be completed in a single working day. Lighting would be required in the relevant parts of the site during these events.</p> <p>The Lighting Management Plan sets measures, which when implemented, would minimise light spill from the development. With the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures,</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | the Sizewell C Project is considered appropriate in this regard. | |
| Wildlife and ecology | Concern about adverse impacts on wildlife and loss of habitats throughout the proposals, especially to rare birds and bats. | <p>The impacts of the development on ecology and wildlife, including protected species and marine ecology are assessed in detail in Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) and Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>A range of mitigation and compensation measures are proposed to minimise the effects on both habitats and species. These include the advanced creation of replacement habitats at Aldhurst Farm, off-site creation of fen meadow habitats and protected species translocations.</p> <p>Overall, with the proposed mitigation measures, the proposals are considered to be appropriate with regard to the impact upon these designated areas. Further details are contained within the abovementioned chapters of the ES.</p> | N |
| Further assessments | Suggestions for further assessments regarding impacts on the environment, archaeology, air quality, flood risk, | <p>SZC Co. has taken steps to identify the potential significant effects on the environment during the Sizewell C Project’s construction and operation phases.</p> <p>An extensive and detailed evaluation of the environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project has been undertaken in</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>waste management and water pollution as well as requests for more information about the environmental impact and ecological mitigation measures, landscape enhancement schemes and flood risk modelling.</p> | <p>accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (EIA Regulations 2009) (at Stage 1 and 2) and Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations 2017) (at Stage 3 and 4).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals comprise the most sustainable balance between being appropriately located, comprising an acceptable level of land take, and minimising impacts upon the environment and communities as far as possible. Consultation on Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) was undertaken at Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4. The DCO application is also supported by a comprehensive ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | |
| Mitigation | <p>Concern that proposed mitigation is not sufficient, questioning SZC Co.'s lack of commitment and understanding of the damage the</p> | <p>SZC Co. has taken steps to identify the potential significant effects on the environment during the Sizewell C Project's construction and operation phases.</p> <p>An extensive and detailed evaluation of the environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment)</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | proposals will cause. | <p>Regulations 2009 (EIA Regulations 2009) (at Stage 1 and 2) and Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations 2017) (at Stage 3 and 4).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals comprise the most sustainable balance between being appropriately located, comprising an acceptable level of land take, and minimising impacts upon the environment and communities as far as possible. Consultation on Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) was undertaken at Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4. The DCO application is also supported by a comprehensive ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | |
| Mitigation | Suggestion to apply industry accepted mitigation hierarchy and commitments to enhance the environment and to work with other councils such as Essex County Council and experts | <p>SZC Co. has taken steps to identify the potential significant effects on the environment during the Sizewell C Project's construction and operation phases.</p> <p>An extensive and detailed evaluation of the environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (EIA Regulations 2009) (at Stage 1 and 2) and Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | such as Natural England, the Marine Management Organisation, Environment Agency, the RSPB, Suffolk Wildlife Trust and Suffolk Preservation Society. | <p>Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations 2017) (at Stage 3 and 4).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals comprise the most sustainable balance between being appropriately located, comprising an acceptable level of land take, and minimising impacts upon the environment and communities as far as possible. Consultation on Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) was undertaken at Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4. The DCO application is also supported by a comprehensive ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Events | Concern about the lack of events SZC Co. held during the fourth stage of consultation, in particular not visiting Theberton, Eastbridge or | <p>Stage 4 was focused on a limited set of issues and proposals so SZC Co. held fewer exhibitions. At Stage 3 we had a wider range of proposals to consult on so we had more exhibitions. Exhibitions are not bespoke events for individual communities but provide a general presentation of the proposals. They were one of the many ways we engaged with local people. Others included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the information was available on our website, with a | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | Middleton. | <p>Freephone line and email address to have any queries addressed without having to leave home. Feedback could also be sent online.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We provided presentations to parish councils and community groups on request – including Theberton and Eastbridge. The Sizewell C Information Office was open Monday – Friday and on Saturday mornings throughout the consultation period. <p>All of the exhibitions were within a short drive of these villages. All of our exhibitions were close to where development was proposed and close to all parishes that could potentially be effected by Sizewell C’s construction. We also publicly offered to organise transport to exhibitions or provide home visits to anyone who had problems accessing the events.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> | |
| Events | Positive comments about the events, this included staff behaviour and the information that was presented. | <p>Positive comments welcomed.</p> <p>SZC Co. selected team members with the specific experience and expertise required to be helpful to the public. Many of the team members were also from the local area and so know the area well.</p> | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>In order to have a fair and independent measure of the quality of the consultation, including literature, exhibition materials and the conduct of staff, SZC Co. commissioned The University of Suffolk to survey people who attended the exhibitions as they left. The aim was to find out about people’s experience of the exhibition and consultation – not their views on Sizewell C.</p> <p>A total of 191 interviews took place across the exhibition venues at Stage 4. The overall levels of satisfaction with the exhibition boards and with interactions with SZC Co. members of staff have increased, in some cases by a very significant amount, since the Stage 2 consultation in 2016:</p> <p>77% of visitors left feeling ‘much better informed’ or ‘a little better informed’ as a result of the exhibition. More than 80% of visitors found information ‘very easy’ or ‘quite easy’ to follow. 82% of visitors found SZC Co. staff ‘very helpful’ or ‘quite helpful’.</p> | |
| Events | Negative comments about the events, including staff | On the rare occasion that a specific criticism was raised, this was addressed by the team in pre-briefings before each consultation event. | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>behaviour and the information displays and accessibility for people with disabilities.</p> | <p>SZC Co. selected team members with the specific experience and expertise required to be helpful to the public. Many of the team members were also from the local area and so know the area well.</p> <p>In order to have a fair and independent measure of the quality of the consultation, including literature, exhibition materials and the conduct of staff, SZC Co. commissioned The University of Suffolk to survey people who attended the exhibitions as they left. The aim was to find out about people’s experience of the exhibition and consultation – not their views on Sizewell C.</p> <p>A total of 191 interviews took place across the exhibition venues at Stage 4. The overall levels of satisfaction with the exhibition boards and with interactions with SZC Co. members of staff have increased, in some cases by a very significant amount, since the Stage 2 consultation in 2016:</p> <p>77% of visitors left feeling ‘much better informed’ or ‘a little better informed’ as a result of the exhibition. More than 80% of visitors found information ‘very easy’ or ‘quite easy’ to follow.</p> | |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | 82% of visitors found SZC Co. ‘very helpful’ or ‘quite helpful’. | |
| Consultation documents | Criticism of accuracy of documents, including incorrect references to compensation of marsh harrier land, certain red line boundaries and the true power generation capacity of Sizewell C. | <p>SZC Co. made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner. This was in accordance with the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) (November 2016).</p> <p>SZC Co. have been committed to an honest and fair approach to consultation throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. did not receive any feedback on inaccuracies in the documentation during the Stage 4 consultation.</p> | N |
| Consultation documents | Criticism of missing information such as background evidence, independent assessments, environmental impacts, road data, and rationales for rejecting options as well as concern that | <p>Comments raised in relation to a lack of sufficient detail mainly referred to SZC Co. not having completed the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>Technical work was ongoing throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project. The amount presented at each stage of consultation reflected the stage that the Sizewell C Project was at. Early environmental work was consulted on at Stage 1 within the Environmental Report Supporting Document (Stage 1). At Stage 2, the Consultation Document (Stage 2) contained the technical and preliminary environmental</p> | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | information will be held back until submission of a DCO. | <p>information which was available at that stage of the Sizewell C Project. The Stage 3 consultation went on to include three volumes of Preliminary Environmental Information. Please see Appendices B.5, D.7, E.2, E.3 and E.4 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The DCO application is accompanied by a full EIA – please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | |
| Consultation documents | Concern over the lack of an Environmental Impact Assessment, and suggestions that one should take place so people can understand what the impacts of Sizewell C will be. | <p>Stage 4 was a shorter period of consultation focussing on a limited set of updated proposals following Stage 3. The Stage 3 consultation documents included three volumes of Preliminary Environmental Information see Appendix E.5 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Further to ongoing engagement with stakeholders, the review of all consultation feedback, the completion of all additional surveys and assessments, and the identification of appropriate mitigation, the DCO application is accompanied by a full ES. Please refer to the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | N |
| Consultation documents | Suggestions that the information was presented in a biased or misleading way, such as the animated | SZC Co. made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner. This was in accordance with the Updated SoCC (November 2016), provided in Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | videos presenting an overly sanitised picture or that the integrated transport proposal is misnamed and should be called 'hybrid'. | <p>Care was taken to ensure that the material presented was factual, did not mislead and was not biased.</p> <p>The computer-generated imagery was labelled as providing a general representation of the local area with functions within the technology that can help to avoid misrepresentation, such as removing trees or switching to different seasonal characteristics. SZC Co. was grateful for any feedback on inaccuracies in documentation but no direct criticisms of the computer-generated imagery were made during Stage 4.</p> <p>SZC Co. have been committed to an honest and fair approach to consultation throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p> | |
| Consultation documents | Positive comments about clarity and detail of documents and large print appreciated for those with poor eyesight. | Positive feedback welcomed – we aimed to meet the standards outlined in the Updated SoCC. | N |
| Feedback form | Criticism of the questionnaire and feedback form for | SZC Co. provided the Stage 4 Questionnaire for guidance on the issues raised in the consultation. Respondents had the option to either complete the questionnaire or respond by | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | being biased, not providing enough space for people to respond or not asking questions on other topics such as how spent fuel will be handled. | <p>letter or email.</p> <p>SZC Co. produced a questionnaire that was as clear, accurate, unbiased and straight-forward as possible given Sizewell C is a complex major infrastructure project.</p> <p>At Stage 4 we also commissioned an easy-read version of the summary document for hard-to-reach audiences. This version used more images and simpler language to convey the proposals.</p> | |
| Consultation documents | Criticism that maps were indecipherable due to size, lack of details and accuracy, as well as concern that a information in the materials were designed to confuse respondents. | <p>SZC Co. made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner. This was in accordance with the Updated SoCC (November 2016), provided in Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>SZC Co. have been committed to an honest and fair approach to consultation throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>If anyone wanted larger maps, SZC Co. provided A3 versions of the summary document. Furthermore, the USB stick had all</p> | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | documentation on it and viewing the plans on a computer would allow respondents to enlarge maps and zoom in. | |
| Consultation process | Concern over the influence of responses on the consultation process and SZC Co. lack of consultation with Wickham Market or Hacheston Parish Councils. | <p>As the developer, SZC Co. has the responsibility to consult on its proposals. Adequacy of consultation is a key test in the DCO process which SZC Co. has to demonstrate – showing how it responded to the feedback raised by the public.</p> <p>It is a statutory requirement that SZC Co. must undertake consultation with the public and key stakeholders, and take the feedback received into account. The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) demonstrates that we have fully complied with such requirements in accordance with the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>SZC Co. has been committed to ensuring that the feedback received has informed the evolution of the Sizewell C Project. The responses received from both Wickham Market and Hacheston Parish Councils throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project have been summarised in the Annexes B, D, F and H of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>As set out in the Issues Tables, SZC Co. took into account all feedback received during consultations, as detailed in</p> | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Annexes A to D of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1). This feedback, in addition to further technical assessment work, informed the content of the Stage 3 consultation. | |
| Consultation process | General comments that respondents found the process did not include adequate information, was a waste of time and money and that the process lacked transparency. | <p>SZC Co. made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner. This was in accordance with the Updated SoCC (November 2016), provided in Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Public consultation is an exercise in openness and transparency and the issues and questions raised are addressed directly in this report on consultation.</p> | N |
| Continued engagement | Requests for continued engagement and offers to provide further information, as well as respondents reserving the right to make further representations and to request responses | SZC Co. has continued to engage with local communities and stakeholders outside of formal stages of public consultation throughout since 2012. The Sizewell C Information Office remains open to the public throughout the working week and the Project Team is accessible by email and on a Freephone line. This will be the case throughout the post-submission stage and beyond. This was made clear in the Sizewell C Community Newsletter which was distributed to the local community before submission of the DCO application in Q1 2020. | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | to questions raised. | | |
| Timescale | Concern over the limited timeframe to respond, short notice and consultation taking place over the summer holidays when many councils did not meet. | <p>The feedback from Stage 3 was clear: a further stage of consultation was wanted by a number of individuals and community groups. The notice period for the consultation was wholly in line with the Updated SoCC.</p> <p>It was a ten-week consultation on a more limited set of issues and proposals than those presented in the previous stages of consultation. The consultation ran for two and a half months which provided enough time for stakeholders to respond.</p> <p>It was also another opportunity to provide feedback on Stage 3 – which ran for 12 weeks.</p> <p>SZC Co. consulted local on the plans for Sizewell C for 22 weeks in the space of nine months in 2019.</p> <p>We funded an independent service for parish and town councils to help provide resources and support for their responses to the consultation.</p> <p>Running the consultation over a different season to previous stages also provided an opportunity for visitors to the area to see the proposals and provide their views.</p> | N |
| Suggestions | Suggestions that wider regional priorities, such as the New Anglia Local Enterprise | <p>The New Anglia LEP, along with the Suffolk local authorities, and other stakeholders, had the opportunity to respond to Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>In addition, outside of the formal stages of public consultation,</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>Partnership (LEP) should be considered and evidence for consultation options be published alongside evidence of peoples concerns, and that they were being listened to. Further consultation and greater background detail as well as a pause in the DCO process and apology for misleading statements.</p> | <p>SZC Co. has worked closely with New Anglia LEP to ensure that SZC Co’s proposals tie in with wider regional initiatives, particularly in terms of the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, provided in Appendix A of the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) and on the tourism survey.</p> <p>SZC Co. made every effort to make it clear within the consultation documents what was being consulted on and how respondents could influence the evolution of the projects. Feedback from each stage of consultation has influenced the proposals as set out in the Issues Tables at Annexes A, D, G, and J and within Chapters 4, 6, 9 and 10 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The consultation has run for seven years. SZC Co. has made every effort to ensure that the proposals were presented in an accurate, clear and neutral manner.</p> | |

b. Main Development Site

Theme: Site Suitability



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| Size of the site | Concern that, at 32 hectares (ha), the site is too small for two reactors because the government recommends 30ha for a single power station. Some suggest this is further evidenced by the need for pylons and incursion into the SSSI. | <p>The site is suitable to accommodate all of the infrastructure that is required for the power station to function safely and effectively.</p> <p>The project design has been developed in tandem with the EIA process and an understanding of potential impacts addressed through an iterative design process.</p> <p>Specific matters such as impacts on designated areas have been the subject of public consultation and ongoing dialogue with stakeholders, including Natural England, AONB partnership and the local authorities.</p> | N |
| Sizewell B | Concerns that the relocation of Sizewell B and related construction impinged on the AONBs resulting in the loss of Coronation Wood and the Pill Box Field. As well as | <p>Some of the Sizewell B facilities are within the area of land that is identified in NPS EN-6 as potentially suitable for Sizewell C and relocation is therefore required.</p> <p>These facilities are ancillary to the process of electricity generation. The facilities would be upgraded to comply with current standards and regulations as part of the relocation.</p> <p>Whilst removal of Coronation Wood and the use of Pillbox Field for the relocated outage car park, will have adverse</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>suggestions that the Sizewell B plans be part of the National Infrastructure Planning Application and not be considered separately from Sizewell C.</p> | <p>effects on visual amenity in the area of outstanding natural beauty, additional landscaping is proposed to provide new elements of screening and the contouring of the land has been designed sensitively. Also, Coronation Wood has been assessed as being of relative poor quality and of limited longer term sustainability.</p> <p>The proposals for the above facilities are included in this application for development consent and further information can be found in Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Construction materials | <p>Concern spoil heaps will cause air pollution and pollutants in quarry pits will leach into the water table when they are refilled with excavated materials. Suggestion that proposals for mitigation of</p> | <p>An outline Dust Management Plan included within Appendix 12A of Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) sets the approach to dust mitigation that the contractors would be required to implement. The contractors would prepare Construction Environmental Management Plans including Dust Management Plans, in accordance with the CoCP and the associated oDMP, both of which accompany the DCO application.</p> <p>The assessment of activities without mitigation has identified a high risk of dust soiling impacts, principally associated with earthworks and trackout activities in Zones C and E for the duration of the construction. Earthworks</p> | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>impacts of spoil heaps on the landscapes, tourism and environment were needed.</p> | <p>and trackout activities in Zone D during phases 1 and 5, and construction activities during phase 2, without mitigation, also represent a high risk of dust soiling impact, along with trackout in Zone F.</p> <p>Mitigation within certain areas, such as for trackout impacts in Zone A and Zone C, may reduce the risks from the site as a whole and therefore reduce the level of mitigation required for the same activities within Zone D, subject to ongoing monitoring.</p> <p>The activities undertaken within Zones A, B and F would be located sufficiently far away from sensitive properties such that the risk of dust soiling impacts from activities within these zones would be negligible.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 12 of Volume 2 of the ES for further information (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> <p>All of the mitigation designed to minimise the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development (including as design, layout, planting, lighting and landscape management) is embedded into the scheme as ‘primary mitigation’, which has been outlined within Section 13.5 of Chapter 13 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> | |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Coastal processes | <p>Concern that the site is unsuitable due to its location by an eroding coastline, posing a threat to the site's future safety. Further suggestions that the planned rock armour defence is inadequate, and it should stop below the low water line.</p> | <p>We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is part of a changing coastline and our assessments have investigated the potential impact of the construction of the proposed power station. Whilst the jetty (proposed previously but removed from our proposals at Stage 2) would have caused impacts on coastal processes and erosion, the construction of the remaining marine infrastructure (beach landing facility, coastal defences intake and outfall works and fish recovery and return outfalls) are not predicted to have a significant or permanent effect on coastal processes locally or further afield within the Greater Sizewell bay.</p> <p>The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised scour will occur at the piles but this is not significant. Construction of the offshore structures will not have any effect on coastal processes, nor will construction of the coastal defences (much of which will be above mean high water spring tidal limits).</p> <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 20 (Coastal</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). | |
| Access Road | Concerns that the SSSI crossing will damage ecology, landscape, tourism and increase flood risk. Some favoured a bridge instead of a causeway and wanted details of secondary site access to the main site off Lover’s Lane. | <p>The potential environmental impacts of the new access road, including upon on wildlife and the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, have been fully assessed by SZC Co.. This assessment is set out within Chapter 14 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The impacts on wildlife and the potential for severance of the new access road and the SSSI Crossing in particular will be minimised by ensuring the culvert is suitably sized to retain the existing bank sides and bed substrates. It is acknowledged that vegetation would be lost overtime in the central part of the culvert due to shading.</p> <p>The slopes of the embankment would be planted with native shrubs to soften the entrances to the culvert and also to strengthen the connectivity of habitats to the north and south of the crossing, particularly for bats.</p> <p>Flood modelling does not predict significant effects from the SSSI crossing in respect of groundwater, fluvial, coastal overtopping and coastal breach flooding. Specifically, the</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>need for flood compensation areas has been discounted. Further information is provided in the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, Appendix A to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) sets out further details in relation to the alternatives that were considered in respect of the SSSI Crossing.</p> | |
| Construction materials | Concern over supply of minerals for construction, suggestions for a supply audit as well as requests for information on quantity/quality of materials excavated. | <p>Research has indicated that sufficient supply is likely to exist within the UK to source construction materials, with some very specialist and specific materials needing to be sourced from elsewhere in Europe. Due to the strict requirements for nuclear standard concrete, the approach taken for sourcing concrete supply is likely to replicate that used for the Hinkley Point C project, which sourced most material from within the UK.</p> <p>Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) provides details on the supply of materials required for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Volume 2, Appendix 3B of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) identifies the assumed quantity and quality of materials excavated and provides details of their management.</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Helipad | Concern the helipad will impact environmentally sensitive areas such as Crown Farm Corner or Upper Abbey Farm. Also requests for further information about frequency of use. | <p>SZC Co. has considered the concerns raised in regard of the location of the helipad to the south of the main development site, particularly in terms of limiting the development of Sizewell C within the AONB.</p> <p>Following Stage 3, SZC Co. decided to remove the helipad from the proposals. Helicopter trips would be limited for both Sizewell B and Sizewell C, and mostly required in the event of an emergency. It has therefore been determined that there is sufficient and suitable space elsewhere on the Sizewell Estate to land a helicopter, should it be required.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Sizewell C Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p> | Y |
| Site access roundabout | Comments on the site access roundabout including support for the increasing of the speed limit, concerns about | The design of the proposed roundabout is based on reducing the speed limit on the B1122 from 60mph to 30mph, to reduce the impact of the roundabout proposal on the local environment, especially existing trees. Suffolk County Council has indicated that they would support a reduction only to 40mph. This would result in a greater impact on local trees than would a reduction to 30mph. | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | how the design will impact on traffic flow and requests to be engaged with for its design so consultees can examine the impact it will have on heritage assets. | <p>The impact of the roundabout on existing traffic flows has been assessed and is reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Reg. 8.5). This concludes that the roundabout would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected traffic flows.</p> <p>The ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) also considers the impact on local heritage assets.</p> | |
| Further information | Requests for more information regarding layout and design details, transport of workers and materials, environmental impacts, water drainage and details of fen meadow compensation land as well as further information regarding funding | <p>Layout and design details for the Sizewell C power station are illustrated within the Sizewell C Main Development Site Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p> <p>Details on the transportation of workers and materials are set out in Chapter 4 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>Details of environmental impacts are set out in the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> <p>Outline drainage details for the power station are set out in Volume 2, Appendix 2A of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p> <p>Details of the fen meadow compensation areas are</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | for maintenance following decommissioning. | provided in Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 14 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Mitigation | Support for benefits of environmental mitigation especially for Fen Meadow, Marsh Harrier and flood compensation land. Further support for provision of amenities such as pedestrian links, reopening permissive paths, and sports facilities, though the need for a Construction Environmental | <p>SZC Co. welcomes the support given for the proposed environmental mitigation, amenities such as pedestrian links, reopening of permissive paths and sports facilities.</p> <p>SZC Co. has prepared a CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) which sets out how construction activities would be managed and controlled in order to deliver the mitigation commitments arising from the Sizewell C Project.</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | Management Plan was suggested. | | |
| Designated areas | <p>Concerns about damage to RSPB Minsmere, the Ramsar site, the Suffolk Heritage Coast, encroachment into the AONB, permanent loss of part of SSSI, impact on offshore SPA of Outer Thames Estuary and the destruction of Coronation Wood.</p> | <p>The impacts of the development on ecology and wildlife, including protected species and marine ecology are assessed in detail in Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) and Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology) of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> <p>A range of mitigation and compensation measures are proposed to minimise the effects on both habitats and species. These include the advanced creation of replacement habitats at Aldhurst Farm, off-site creation of fen meadow habitats and protected species translocations.</p> <p>More specifically, the impacts on Minsmere will be limited in part by the distance of the development to most of the reserve, but also by specific measures to address possible impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of surface water levels during construction though use of control structures on the Leiston drain. • The use of a 5m noise barrier along the northern edge of the construction area to minimise noise spill | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>to the north and to screen the construction site from long-range views from Minsmere to the north.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of on-site and off-site habitats for hunting Marsh Harriers, to support the Minsmere population during construction if they forage less over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. • Monitoring of any increase in visitor numbers to the outer part of the Minsmere reserve in response to ‘recreational displacement’ from Sizewell and measures to mitigate possible increases. <p>Overall, with the proposed mitigation measures, the proposals are considered to be appropriate with regard to the impact upon these designated areas. Further details are contained within the abovementioned chapters of the ES.</p> | |
| Land take | Concerns about increased land take, especially at the seaward boundary and for the new access road. Suggestion to disclose the total acreage being utilised | <p>No increased land take at the seaward boundary was proposed during the Stage 4 consultation. The application boundary includes land into the North Sea to allow for marine infrastructure.</p> <p>Further details on development in this location is set out in Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>during the construction and a full digest of the ‘end state’ and ‘end date’ for each land parcel.</p> | <p>Additional land was identified at the B1122 (Abbey Road) access junction in the Stage 4 consultation to accommodate a revised design speed through the roundabout of 40mph.</p> <p>The total land take during construction at the main development site is 372ha (onshore) and 640ha (offshore). An assumed construction programme is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Further Assessments | <p>Call for publication of assessments such as of the environmental impact, mineral supply, waste, archaeological evaluations as well as assessments of impacts from the beach landing facility. As well as requests for more information regarding environmental assessments and details of necessary</p> | <p>SZC Co. has taken steps to identify the potential significant effects on the environment during the Sizewell C Project’s construction and operation phases.</p> <p>An extensive and detailed evaluation of the environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (EIA Regulations 2009) (at Stage 1 and 2) and Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations 2017) (at Stage 3 and 4).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals comprise the most sustainable balance between being appropriately located, comprising an acceptable level of land take, and minimising</p> | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | engineering works for the construction of flood compensation areas. | impacts upon the environment and communities as far as possible. Consultation on Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) was undertaken at Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4. The DCO application is also supported by a comprehensive ES (Doc Ref. Book 6). | |

| Theme: Noise and Vibration | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Noise and Vibration | Concern that noise pollution and vibrations will damage the environment including for local walkers. | <p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact of noise from the Sizewell C Project. Chapter 11 (Noise and vibration) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes an assessment of noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment for the main development site considers the impact on ecological receptors, including bats and birds, as well as residential and other sensitive receptors such as users of public rights of way, or Leiston Abbey.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified in the ES (Doc Ref.</p> | Y |

| Theme: Noise and Vibration | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Book 6), and includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - boundary treatments, including acoustic fences and landscape bunds to screen impacts; - construction noise management and monitoring measures to control impacts arising from construction activities; and - provision of new foraging land for marsh harriers that may be affected by noise generated from the main development site construction. <p>Further details are contained within Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of Volume 2 of the ES.</p> | |

| Theme: Air Quality | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Air Quality | Concern about dust and air pollution from spoil heaps and other activities at the main development site. | <p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact on air quality from the Sizewell C Project, including from vehicle pollution, and dust and emissions impacts during the construction phase.</p> <p>Chapter 12 (Air Quality) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes the assessment of air quality impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic</p> | Y |

| Theme: Air Quality | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>network. The air quality, and associated impact assessments considers the impact on residential receptors as well as ecological receptors, including surrounding habitats (Chapter 14 of the ES (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology)), and users of public rights of way and Amenity and recreation (Chapter 15 of the ES (Amenity and recreation) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3)).</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified and are detailed in the ES. No significant effects are predicted to arise from vehicle emissions.</p> <p>An outline Dust Management Plan (oDMP) included within Appendix 12A of Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6) sets the approach to dust mitigation that the contractors would be required to implement. The contractors would prepare Construction Environmental Management Plans including Dust Management Plans, in accordance with the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) and the associated oDMP, both of which accompany the DCO application.</p> <p>The assessment of activities without mitigation has identified a high risk of dust soiling impacts, principally associated with</p> | |

| Theme: Air Quality | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>earthworks and trackout activities in Zones C and E for the duration of the construction. Earthworks and trackout activities in Zone D during phases 1 and 5, and construction activities during phase 2, without mitigation, also represent a high risk of dust soiling impact, along with trackout in Zone F.</p> <p>Mitigation within certain areas, such as for trackout impacts in Zone A and Zone C, may reduce the risks from the site as a whole and therefore reduce the level of mitigation required for the same activities within Zone D, subject to ongoing monitoring.</p> <p>The activities undertaken within Zones A, B and F would be located sufficiently far away from sensitive properties such that the risk of dust soiling impacts from activities within these zones would be negligible.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 12 of Volume 2 of the ES for further information (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> <p>All of the mitigation designed to minimise the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development (including as design, layout, planting, lighting and landscape management) is embedded into the scheme as ‘primary mitigation’, which has</p> | |

| Theme: Air Quality | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | been outlined within Section 13.5 of Chapter 13 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref 6.3). | |

| Theme: Landscape and Visual | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Visual Impact | Concern the construction will be a blight on the landscape from all aspects, including from the chimney, accommodation blocks, spoil heaps and pylons. | <p>The landscape and visual impacts of the development have been assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 13 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project has been designed in part to minimise landscape and visual effects. An assessment of how the Sizewell C Project conforms with policy is set out in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |
| Light Pollution | Concerns about light pollution from the site, particularly if 24 hour work is ongoing. | A Lighting Management Plan has been submitted as part of this application for development consent at Volume 2, Appendix 2B of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). This document outlines management procedures for artificial lighting, to enable safe working whilst addressing planning and | N |

| Theme: Landscape and Visual | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>environmental considerations.</p> <p>24-hour working is typically limited to where continuity of work is essential, such as large concrete pours. Further details are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |

| Theme: Ecology | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Ecological Impact | <p>Concern over disturbing wildlife and destroying the habitats of species of protected birds, bats, amphibians, insects and fish. Additional concern that the culvert watercourse crossings will impact ecology and request for reassurances over impact on marine life.</p> | <p>The impacts of the development on ecology and wildlife, including protected species and marine ecology are assessed in detail in Volume 2 Chapter 14 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) and Chapter 22 (Marine Ecology) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6).</p> <p>A range of mitigation and compensation measures are proposed to minimise the effects on both habitats and species. These include the advanced creation of replacement habitats at Aldhurst Farm, off-site creation of fen meadow habitats and protected species translocations.</p> <p>More specifically, the impacts on Minsmere will be limited in part by the distance of the development to most of the reserve, but also by specific measures to address possible</p> | Y |

| Theme: Ecology | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of surface water levels during construction though use of control structures on the Leiston drain. • The use of a 5m noise barrier along the northern edge of the construction area to minimise noise spill to the north and to screen the construction site from long-range views from Minsmere to the north. • The creation of on-site and off-site habitats for hunting Marsh Harriers, to support the Minsmere population during construction if they forage less over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. • Monitoring of any increase in visitor numbers to the outer part of the Minsmere reserve in response to ‘recreational displacement’ from Sizewell and measures to mitigate possible increases. <p>Overall, with the proposed mitigation measures, the proposals are considered to be appropriate with regard to the impact upon these designated areas. Further details are contained within the abovementioned chapters of the ES (Doc Ref. 6).</p> | |

| Theme: Amenity and Recreation | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | | |

| Theme: Amenity and Recreation | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Beach Access | <p>Concern that closing beaches, loss of rights of way and bridleway access will disrupt tourist economy.</p> <p>Suggestion that the green line as agreed for Sizewell B is not being adhered to and intrusion onto the beach is unacceptable.</p> | <p>SZC Co. will ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place when closing or diverting public rights of way. A full assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposals on amenity and recreation has been carried out. Further information can be found in Chapter 15 of Volume 2 and Chapter 8 of Volumes 3-9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3 to 6.10).</p> <p>Furthermore, potential effects on tourism are assessed as part of the socio-economic assessment. The assessment considers (through a tourism survey, empirical evidence from other projects and review of literature) the attractors of the area to tourists, and the potential sensitivities that may affect peoples’ perceptions of the area related to the Sizewell C Project which may change their opinion on whether to visit.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES and in the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9). In order to reduce the risk of observed perceptions materialising into actual effects, SZC Co. has developed a Tourism Fund which will be used to promote the area, support projects and events and deliver measures that may help to further enhance the existing tourist offer and avoid misconceptions of the Sizewell C Project’s effects.</p> | Y |

| Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Water Supply | <p>Concern over flooding and impacts on fragile hydrology, water quality and movements and lack of clarity over the required quantity of potable water and its source.</p> | <p>The Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 5.2) includes tables that summarise the overall flood risk to the main development site. These show some medium risks related to coastal and breach flooding during the construction and decommissioning phases and low risk for all types of flooding during the operational phase. Mitigation measures are provided in the FRA, Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>An assessment of the Sizewell C Project on hydrology is set out in Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The groundwater dewatering operation during early construction at the main development site will take place within a subsurface low permeability cut-off wall. Further information is provided within the Monitoring and Response Strategy contained in Volume 2, Appendix 19A of the ES.</p> <p>The proposal to realign the Sizewell Drain is assessed in this chapter and further described in Volume 2, Appendix 19C of the ES.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been incorporated that include the use of</p> | Y |

| Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and other techniques to mimic natural processes where possible, promoting infiltration and managing stormwater volumes, whilst recognising the need to manage potential pollutant loading such as sediment and hydrocarbons. These approaches are described in the Chapter 19 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), the Outline Drainage Strategy provided in Volume 2, Appendix 2A of the ES, and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>SZC Co. has developed a Site Water Supply Strategy, located at Appendix K of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), by engaging with stakeholders. This document provides greater clarity over potable water and its potential sources.</p> | |

| Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water | | | |
|--|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Costal Processes | Concerns about coastal processes being further impacted by the beach landing facility and supporting | <p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns regarding the beach landing facility (BLF).</p> <p>Grounding and docking of barges at the BLF would temporarily</p> | Y |

| Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water | | | |
|--|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>infrastructure, as well as suggestions that SZC Co. should work to protect the coastline and monitor how the beach landing facility is affecting coastal processes.</p> | <p>impede the flow of tidal currents and subtidal sediments. The effect on waves would be negligible because the BLF can only be used during low wave conditions (wave height less than 0.5m). The barge would also cause a temporary loss of seabed area, local suspension and bed level change due to flow acceleration around the barge (and scour) and a temporary blockage to longshore sand transport along part of the inner bar. In all cases, these pressures would be present for a single tidal cycle per docked barge, but during Sizewell C construction docking may occur on every tidal cycle for many months in some years.</p> <p>The duration is conservatively set to high as barge docking would take place over several years during Sizewell C construction. However, barge docking would not occur or be infrequent during November – March due to operational wave conditions and in those years when marine consignments would be low in number.</p> <p>Currents around the landward and seaward ends of the barge would increase by 0.38m/s and 0.16m/s respectively. The beach is highly resistant to this magnitude of change in currents, as it would not cause entrainment of beach shingle, however the bar would be less resistant with small patches of short-lived scour followed by rapidly infilling (high resilience). The overall</p> | |

| Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>sensitivity for the bar and shoreline receptors is low and the effect is negligible and not significant.</p> <p>The significance of the small area of seabed temporarily lost beneath grounded barges is negligible. Scour around the barge, and the temporary change in sedimentation entailed, would have a very low impact as the barge would only be present during low energy conditions. Any additional sand transport changes would be over a very small area (0.22ha) inshore of the barge during peak tidal flows and would be small (less than three percent increase in bed shear stress).</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 20 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> | |

c. Pylon options

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Landscape and Visual | Concern that pylons will be a visual blight and suggestions that cables should be placed underground and the National Grid's Visual Impact Provision project could be used to achieve this. | The potential for undergrounding the cables has been assessed. There are, however, a number of significant safety and programme-related risks associated with the construction and operation of an underground cable option. Further details, and the consequent need for overhead pylons, are set out in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). Whilst the pylons would contribute towards visual effects this must be considered in the context of the visual effects of the main development site as a whole. Considered in this context the pylons are not likely to contribute to any change in the significance of residual visual effects. | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Site Suitability | Concerns that the pylons will be located in the SSSI, SPA & SAC & Ramsar sites and will | SZC Co. have considered various alternative pylon schemes through consultation. The four-pylon option proposed represents the most appropriate approach with regard to visual impact. Whilst the pylons would contribute towards visual effects this must be considered in the context of the visual effects of the | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>impact the AONB, Minsmere Reserve and Heritage Coast.</p> | <p>main development site as a whole. Considered in this context the pylons are not likely to contribute to any change in the significance of residual visual effects, albeit it is acknowledged that the nature of effects on visual receptors would be different by the introduction of pylons to the effects resulting from the proposed power station structures, and in particular in views from close proximity, including along Sizewell beach, which is within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast.</p> <p>Some of the pylons are located within land that will be taken from Sizewell Marshes SSSI, including on land that was already necessary for the development of the power station. The proposed development would require the re-stringing of wires on the overhead pylon. Wet woodland in the SSSI would be coppiced to ground level stumps and then allowed to re-grow to an appropriate height.</p> <p>No pylons are proposed on SPA, SAC or Ramsar designated sites.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | | |
| Wildlife and ecology | Concern that the pylons will negatively impact wildlife such as birds. | There would be no significant increase in the extent of overhead lines (compared to the cabling already in place within the existing power station complex) and the new pylon and gantries would be within the footprint of the power stations in areas likely to be avoided by birds. Further details are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 14 of the Es (Doc Ref. 6.3). | N |
| Criteria | Preferences expressed for whichever option causes the least visual impact to the landscape, without specifying which choice they would prefer. | SZC Co. have considered various alternative pylon schemes through consultation. This has included a four- pylon scheme (option 1), two at circa 48m in height and two at circa 65m in height and an alternative (option 2) that brought the height of one of the taller pylons down but required an additional pylon (i.e. a five pylon scheme). We have considered these options from a number of viewpoints and option 1 is preferable in terms of visual impact from key viewpoints. Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Further Information | Calls for the pylons to be subject to a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and the impacts of wildlife, habitats and flood risk to be evaluated. | <p>All development has been subject to Environmental Impact Assessment and the findings are set out in Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Findings relating to flood risk are set out in the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p> <p>SZC Co. have considered various alternative pylon schemes through consultation. This has included a four-ylon scheme (option 1), two at circa 48m in height and two at circa 65m in height and an alternative (option 2) that brought the height of one of the taller pylons down but required an additional pylon (i.e. a five pylon scheme). We have considered these options from a number of viewpoints and option 1 is preferable in terms of visual impact from key viewpoints. Whilst the pylons would contribute towards visual effects this must be considered in the context of the visual effects of the main development site as a whole. Considered in this context the pylons are not likely to contribute to any change in the significance of residual visual effects.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| More information | Calls for release of information regarding the pylon heights, justification for their construction and impact on military aircraft. | <p>The heights of pylons are contained within Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) and are: up to 75m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) (two Sizewell C pylons); up to 59m AOD (two Sizewell C pylons); and up to 67m AOD (one National Grid pylon).</p> <p>Annex C to NPS EN-6 contains the Strategic Siting Assessment for Sizewell C, which identified that the site passed the assessment for proximity to military activities and proximity to civil aircraft movements.</p> <p>Two of the four pylons will be 65m in height and two will be 48m in height. The pylons will have no impact on military aircraft.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p> | N |
| Mitigation | Suggestions for SZC Co. to use less intrusive designs, or with help from National Grid to put alternative cables underground. | <p>The potential for undergrounding the cables has been assessed. There are, however, a number of number of significant safety and programme risks associated with the construction and operation of an underground cable option. Further details, and the consequent need for overhead pylons, are set out in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Site Suitability | Comments preferring the use of four pylons over the five pylon option due to it having a reduced visual impact. | <p>Following Stage 4 consultation, SZC Co. undertook further analysis of options 1 (four pylons) and 2 (five pylons) presented at Stage 4 consultation, from four appraisal viewpoints. This is set out in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>Of the viewpoints considered in the appraisal, Sizewell beach is closest to the proposed development, and currently comprises views south along the beach that are not influenced by overhead power lines.</p> <p>It is judged that option 2 generates greater adverse effects in views from Sizewell beach than option 1. Option 2 would result in a greater amount of visual ‘clutter’ extending out from the existing, and proposed power station structures into what is an otherwise relatively simple coastal landscape. As such particular consideration should be given to visual receptors in this</p> | Y |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | location, their sensitivity and susceptibility to change. Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). | |
| Site Suitability | Comments suggesting constructing shorter pylons for the five pylon option would have a reduced visual impact. | The purpose of the five pylon option was to enable one of the two 65m pylons required for the four pylon option to be reduced in height to 48m. The consequence would be the need for an additional 48m pylon. Having considered the two options, the four pylon option is preferred having regard to visual impact from key viewpoints. Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). | Y |
| Site Suitability | Concern the construction of five pylons will cause increased damage to the SSSI and AONB. | SZC Co. have considered and discounted the five pylon option. Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3) | Y |

d. Northern park & ride

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Community Impact | Concern the northern park and ride site is located too close to residences and will decrease the value of properties. | <p>A 10m buffer to the east of the site would be maintained throughout construction, operation and the removal and reinstatement phase where residential properties back onto the site.</p> <p>3m high landscape bunds would be located along part of the eastern boundary, which would aid in the screening of the proposed development from the residential properties and also provide acoustic screening.</p> <p>Once the park and ride is no longer necessary for the construction of the main development site, the land would be reinstated to agricultural use. Therefore, any potential impact on the nearby properties would be temporary. Further detail on the proposals and relevant mitigation for the northern park and ride can be found in Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4).</p> | Y |
| Community Impact | Concern the northern park and ride would lead to an increase in traffic and congestion on the A12 as well as cut | <p>SZC Co. have carried out detailed traffic modelling to understand the impacts of the park and ride proposals on adjacent roads. The purpose of the park and ride is to mitigate against the increase in trips, and to encourage the construction workforce to use shuttle buses to reach the main development site. Further information is found in the Transport</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | through traffic on local roads. | Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | |
| Land take | Concern about the reasons for the increased land take for construction of the northern park and ride. | SZC Co. has continually refined the schemes which has led to variations in land take. The justification for the increase in land take at the northern park and ride side is due to the development of the park and ride design to include a roundabout into the site. This is in response to feedback received from the Stage 2 consultation about safety and congestion concerns of a southern access to the northern park and ride site and SZC Co. having carried out further studies. The roundabout addresses these concerns. The red line boundary has also decreased over part of the site due to feedback received from the Stage 4 consultation. | N |
| Further assessments | Suggestions that the proposed changes for the northern park and ride necessitate further assessments for the roundabout, junction with the A12 and a Road Safety Audit. | Further highway and environmental impact assessments of the proposals continued past Stage 4 and informed the final designs submitted in the application for Development Consent. The proposals remained largely the same in light of these assessments but minor changes, including a reduction to the development site boundary were made. Please refer to Chapters 1-12 of Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) for further details. | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| More information | Requests for more information regarding the northern park and ride such as pedestrian access, water drainage and reasoning behind the changes to the design from Stage 3. | The design of the park and ride was altered following Stage 3 consultation to align more closely with land ownership boundaries, and to facilitate access to the fields to the north of the site. Further information regarding the park and ride proposals can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4). | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Air quality | Concern the northern park and ride will result in increased air pollution with potential health concerns, as a result of increased traffic. | Mitigation measures have been embedded into the operational design of the park and ride in order to ensure that negative air quality impacts are not felt. Further information is available in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4). | N |
| Light pollution | Concern about light pollution from | The impact of lighting at the northern park and ride site has been assessed as part of Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.4) | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>increased traffic travelling to and from the northern park and ride and the site itself, with particular concern about the threat this poses to Darsham’s dark skies designation.</p> | <p>and suitable mitigation has been proposed. Lighting impacts are managed through the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>The Associated Development Site Design Principles (Doc Ref. 8.3) also provides details regarding the height and lighting levels in order to minimise light spill.</p> <p>Cars travelling to and from the park and ride will use the existing highway network. The park and ride will reduce the number of vehicles on the road.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p> | |
| Noise pollution | <p>Concern the northern park and ride will create high levels of noise pollution for residents living nearby.</p> | <p>There are anticipated to be significant impacts on receptors close to the site from construction noise, major impacts on soils due to the temporary change of use from agricultural use and major-moderate impacts on landscape character given the transition of the site from agricultural use to the proposed temporary park and ride.</p> <p>However, these are to be mitigated as far as possible to accord with the NPSs and local planning policy. These impacts are unavoidable as the type of development onsite requires the</p> | N |



| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>removal of soils to enable the construction of the temporary park and ride facility.</p> <p>SZC Co. would implement a Noise Mitigation Strategy. This Noise Mitigation Strategy would offer funding for temporary rehousing to local residents affected by significant or very infrequent but significant levels of construction noise. Where longer-term increased noise impacts are predicted (for example adjacent to road and rail infrastructure), the Noise Mitigation Strategy would offer funding for noise insulation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures will ensure noise is kept to acceptable levels. Further details are contained in Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration) of Volume 3 of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6).</p> | |

e. Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Community impact | Concern the southern park and | Mitigation measures are sought as part of the proposals to ensure that impacts are addressed where possible. For | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | ride will negatively impact the local community due to its proximity to residential properties. | communities close to the park and ride, this includes the retention of established vegetation, new planting, screening through bunds and measures set out in the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11). Further information is available in Chapters 4 (Noise and Vibration), 5 (Air Quality) and 8 (Amenity and Recreation) of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5). | |
| Community Impact | Concern about cycle access to the southern park and ride and how the associated traffic will affect roads used by cyclists. | SZC Co. has assessed the potential traffic impacts including those on cyclists. For the southern park and ride, a priority junction is proposed to which cyclists will have access. Further information is available in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | Y |
| Heritage Impact | Concern about the southern park and rides proximity to the historic village of Wickham Market and its listed buildings. | SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the southern park and ride, including on designated heritage assets. Potential settings impacts have also been assessed but no significant effects have been identified following implementation of landscape design measures. Further information may be found in Chapter 9 (Terrestrial Historic Environment) of Volume 4 of the ES . | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Land take | Concern over the increased land take for the southern park and ride. | SZC Co. has continually refined the schemes which has led to variations in land take. Land take at the southern park and ride has increased to include the highway and some small land parcels either side to allow for highway improvement works including a deceleration land to the entrance of the site. Only the land essential to deliver the scheme will be acquired from landowners and mitigation measures have been included in the design to mitigate impacts where possible. | N |
| Site restoration | Concern that the southern park and ride site will not be restored post construction. | Once the construction of Sizewell C is complete, the park and ride facilities would be removed and the land restored to agricultural use, using top soil stored whilst the park and rides are in operation. Please refer to Chapter 2 of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5) for further details. | N |
| Safety | Comments highlighting safety issues for traffic leaving or accessing the southern park and ride with particular concern about the slip roads. | <p>The access to the southern park and ride site has been subject of a Stage 1 road safety audit, as reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). This did not highlight any safety concerns at the access, which has been designed to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards.</p> <p>There is no other road safety concern in this area.</p> <p>SZC Co. have identified poor visibility to the right where the A12 southbound exit slip road meets the B1078 south west of</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | the park and ride site. This is caused by the overbridge parapet and could not easily be rectified. At Stage 3, SZC Co. therefore proposed that SCC extend the 30mph speed limit across the overbridge to the B1116/B1078 roundabout and will continue to encourage them to do so. | |
| Traffic and congestion | Concern that the increase in traffic from the southern park and ride will have a particularly negative impact on the parish of Hacheston and Wickham Market, on the B1078 in particular. | <p>The temporary southern park and ride at Wickham Market is required to support the construction of Sizewell C through the capture of wider workforce traffic from the south and west of the A12.</p> <p>A large amount of the impacts of the southern park and ride have been assessed to be minor, including impacts on heritage assets, soils and land use given the temporary nature of the site's proposed use, impacts on the transport network, noise impacts, ecological impacts, groundwater impacts and other impacts on amenity.</p> <p>There are anticipated to be fewer impacts on nearby receptors than with the northern park and ride given its relatively isolated location in comparison. There would be moderate impacts in terms of landscape on users of footpaths near to the site and their views. This is the only impact that is considered to be moderate, and is to be mitigated as far as possible to accord with the NPSs and local planning policy.</p> <p>Potential traffic impacts in Wickham Market are proposed to be</p> | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>mitigated through local measures which have been discussed and agreed in principle with the parish council.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.5).</p> | |
| Further assessments | <p>Requests for further assessments regarding the southern park and ride’s archaeological and environmental impacts, as well as pollution and traffic modelling.</p> | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential impacts of the Sizewell C Project, including on buried archaeology, designated heritage assets, traffic and pollution. This is set out in the ES (Doc Ref. 6).</p> <p>A programme of archaeological evaluation has been carried out on the southern park and ride site including archaeological geophysical survey and trial trenching. This scope of this was agreed with SCC Archaeological Service who also monitored the fieldwork. This identified remains associated both with the known Romano-British settlement of Hacheston and its Late Iron Age precursor.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation <i>in situ</i> has been identified on the site.</p> <p>The temporary southern park and ride at Wickham Market is required to support the construction of Sizewell C through the capture of wider workforce traffic from the south and west of the A12.</p> <p>A large amount of the impacts of the southern park and ride have been assessed to be minor, including impacts on heritage assets, soils and land use given the temporary nature of the site’s proposed use, impacts on the transport network, noise impacts, ecological impacts, groundwater impacts and other impacts on amenity.</p> <p>There are anticipated to be fewer impacts on nearby receptors than with the northern park and ride given its relatively isolated location in comparison. There would be moderate impacts in terms of landscape on users of footpaths near to the site and their views. This is the only impact that is considered to be moderate, and is to be mitigated as far as possible to accord with the NPSs and local planning policy.</p> <p>Potential traffic impacts in Wickham Market are proposed to be mitigated through local measures which have been discussed and agreed in principle with the parish council.</p> | |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Further information can be found in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.5).</p> <p>Further information may be found in Chapter 9 (Terrestrial Historic Environment) of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5).</p> | |
| More information | Call for more details regarding the southern park and ride’s planned traffic management plans, water drainage and changes to the development boundary. | <p>Changes have been made to the development boundary following the Stage 3 consultation to include additional highways land.</p> <p>Further detail regarding drainage proposals can be found in Chapter 12 (Groundwater and Surface Water) of Volume 4 (Southern Park and Ride) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5) and the Outline Drainage Strategy provided in Volume 2, Appendix 2A of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3). Further detail on traffic management can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> | N |
| Mitigation | Support for the southern park and ride mitigation plans to alleviate traffic pressure on Wickham Market and leave a legacy benefit. | SZC Co. welcomes support for the southern park and ride mitigation plans. The provision of shuttle buses to the main development site will help alleviate the pressure of the construction workforce on local roads, including those through Wickham Market. Further information is contained in Volume 4 (Southern Park and Ride) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5). | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Mitigation | Requests for more information regarding mitigation for the southern park and ride because the plans are unclear. | Please refer to Chapter 2 of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5) for a description of the proposals for the southern park and ride at Wickham Market. Further information regarding the mitigation proposed is explained within Chapters 4 to 12 of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5). | Y |
| Mitigation | Concern planned mitigation associated with the southern park and ride is inadequate, such as the diversion route and general traffic mitigation. | SZC Co. has rigorously tested for the impacts associated with the southern park and ride, and the mitigation measures proposed are considered suitable to ensure that impacts do not reach unacceptable levels. Further information regarding the mitigation proposed is explained within Chapters 4 to 12 of Volume 4 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5). | Y |

| Theme: Environmental – General | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Air quality | Concern that the impact of air pollution associated with the southern park and ride had | Air quality modelling has been undertaken for the early year and peak year traffic assessment scenarios for all key road links on the network affected by the Sizewell C Project. The assessment of traffic emissions is presented in the air quality chapters of each of the proposed development site volumes | N |

| Theme: Environmental – General | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | been understated. | of the ES (Doc Ref. Book 6). No significant air quality impacts area predicted as a result of the increased traffic associated with Sizewell C. Further information regarding air quality can be found in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of Volume 4 (Southern Park and Ride) of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.5). | |
| Hydrology | Concern about constructing the southern park and ride in a flood zone and that SZC Co. have not properly considered this. | <p>The Southern Park and Ride Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.4) considers all sources of flooding. The assessment is designed to understand the impacts and to mitigate risk where necessary to offset any changes in hydrology.</p> <p>The site is identified to lie in Flood Zone 1 – low risk of flooding. Mitigation is proposed in the form of swales as part of the detailed drainage design for the one part of the site that is at risk of surface water flooding.</p> | N |
| Landscape and visual impact | Concern about adverse impact on the rural and agricultural landscape from the southern park and ride, particularly because the site position is elevated. | SZC Co. recognises the importance of the landscape to the local population, and for this reason has proposed mitigation to address these impacts. This mitigation includes both temporary and permanent planting, the creation of landscaped bunds and the retention of existing woodland and hedgerows where appropriate. Further information regarding landscape mitigation is set out in Chapter 6 (Landscape and Visual) of Volume 4 (Southern park and ride) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5). | N |

| Theme: Environmental – General | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Light pollution | Concern about light pollution and the lack of screening of the southern park and ride site. | Impacts from lighting are managed through the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11). Screening measures are also proposed to ensure that any impacts from lighting are mitigated. | N |
| Noise pollution | Concern about noise and vibration from the southern park and ride, with particular concern about its elevated position and noise from reversing alarms of vehicles. | Detailed noise modelling has been undertaken to understand the effects of operational use of the park and ride on nearby receptors. The incorporation of landscaped bunds into the design would provide a sound level reduction. Plant will also be selected to ensure that limit values would be met. Further details are contained in Chapter 4 (Noise and Vibration) of Volume 4 (Southern park and ride) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5). | N |
| Wildlife and ecology | Concern about the western boundary of the southern park and ride’s proximity to the field edge, bridleway and woodland, with concerns it will affect the habitat of wildlife living there. | This comment is noted. Chapter 7 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 4 (Southern Park and Ride) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.5) identifies all designated wildlife sites and sensitive habitats in and around the site. Mitigation through the provision of landscaped bunds, a 1.8m high perimeter security fence and the controlling of operational lighting and drainage are considered to be suitable for the protection of wildlife. | N |

f. Sizewell Link Road / Theberton Bypass

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Traffic / congestion | Support for the link road due to its removal of traffic from the B1122 allowing for less congestion on the roads used by the general public. | SZC Co. welcome the comments in support of the Sizewell link road. The proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. For details regarding the proposed Sizewell link road refer to Chapter 2 (Description of the Sizewell link road) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). | N |
| Mitigation | Support for the mitigation measures proposed as part of the Sizewell link road, including a bridge for non-motorised users to cross the road. | SZC Co. welcome the comments in support of the Sizewell link road. For details regarding the proposed Sizewell link road refer to Chapter 2 (Description of the Sizewell link road) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). | N |
| Suitability | Challenges to the selection of the link road as 85% of traffic will be coming from | Details of the route selection can be found in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>the south, meaning it will travel along the A12 before reaching the link road.</p> | <p>The route chosen is the most effective at relieving the B1122 of construction traffic, which was a concern consistently raised at Stage 2 consultation. Hence, at Stage 3, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road. SZC Co's analysis based on 85% of HGV traffic from/to south. To reach the Sizewell link road, this traffic does have to use the A12 Saxmundham bypass but this road has significant spare capacity and the impact of the additional traffic is small. Also, the construction traffic volume also comprises cars (primarily journeys to work and visitors), buses (to and from the two park and ride sites) and light goods vehicles. This traffic is split approximately 50/50 between north and south, which is why for example the two park and ride sites are of equal size.</p> | |
| Access | <p>Concerns Sizewell link road will divide communities, particularly Middleton and Theberton, disrupt pedestrian routes and prevent access to farms damaging agricultural interests.</p> | <p>The proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. For details regarding the proposed Sizewell link road refer to Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). SZC Co. has worked closely with landowners to minimise disruption to existing accesses and provide revised access arrangements where necessary. Please also see Chapter 10 (Soils and agriculture) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7) for further details about impact on soils and agriculture and Chapter 8 (Amenity and recreation)</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>of the same volume for details regarding amenity and recreation impacts.</p> <p>SZC Co. has worked with councils in Suffolk and other stakeholders to develop a package of measures as set out in the Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13) to ensure opportunities are maximised locally – for people and businesses. A transport strategy will be put in place to minimise disturbance as far as practicable and funding is earmarked for public realm, pedestrian and cycle improvement projects in Leiston to increase its attractiveness and use by pedestrians and cyclists.</p> | |
| Suitability | <p>Concern the Sizewell link road will only have a limited impact on reducing traffic due to its poor design and the underestimation of traffic.</p> | <p>The Sizewell link road would reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton by approximately 92% during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project according to Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). The flow remaining on the B1122 would be about a tenth of the current traffic volume.</p> <p>This is based on the strategic traffic modelling that SZC Co. have done, working alongside Suffolk County Council throughout the process. The model has met stringent Department for Transport WebTAG criteria before being used</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>to forecast future traffic flows. It allows for background traffic growth, committed developments that already have planning permission but have not yet been built and other significant developments such as that proposed by ScottishPower Renewables. It then adds all Sizewell C construction traffic, i.e. heavy and light goods vehicles, buses and cars, into the model to give a robust prediction of future traffic volumes.</p> <p>The design of the Sizewell link road has evolved through consultation stages 3 and 4. This design process is explained within Chapter 3 (Alternatives and design evolution) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). The process has included, for example, consideration of existing topography, land ownership, utilities, landscape and other environmental constraints, highway design standards, drainage and road safety.</p> | |
| Safety | Concern over safety due to the Sizewell link road because it will delay ambulance access and increase the risk of road accidents, as well as | Following comments made at Stage 2 consultation about use of the B1122 as a construction route and during an evacuation, at Stage 3 consultation SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road. This would relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic, reduce road accidents and be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | suggestions to provide safe provision for cyclists and pedestrians and evacuation in case of an emergency. | of the DCO submission. The scheme includes provision for cyclists and pedestrians where appropriate. | |
| Tourism | Concern over reduced holiday letting, in particular at Mile Hill Barn, due to increased traffic on the new link road. | The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) has identified relatively small changes in the volume of traffic and journey times on links, and a long-term improvement in traffic flows on the strategic network once mitigation is in place. Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) identifies the potential effects on tourism, part of which is related to perceived changes in traffic in the area. It concludes that while actual changes are not likely to be significant, there is recognition that at certain times and in certain locations perceptions of change may arise that could materialise into real effects if not mitigated, and therefore proposes a Tourism Fund. Further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) | N |
| Legacy | Concern link road proposals offer no legacy benefit so are not worth the | The proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. The road would be a permanent development and therefore | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | disruption. | provide a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project. Further information can be found in Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). | |
| Suggestion | Suggestion that the link road become the sole through-route to Sizewell and is retained after construction. Further suggestion that environmental audits are necessary in order for the land to be restored. | These comments are welcomed by SZC Co. The road would be a permanent development and therefore provide a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project. Further information on the Sizewell link road can be found in Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). | N |
| Mitigation | Suggestions for mitigation of the impact of the Sizewell link road such as clear span | Two single span bridges are proposed as part of the Sizewell link road, as described in Chapter 2 (Description of the Sizewell link road) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). Please refer to Chapter 12 (Groundwater and surface water) of Volume 6 of the | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>crossings to minimise flood risk, wildlife measures to achieve net gain, routes be kept open for community vehicles and legally binding commitments to reduce pollution.</p> | <p>Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7) for details regarding the likely impacts on groundwater and surface water due to the Sizewell link road. Please also refer to the Sizewell Link Road Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.6).</p> <p>Flood risk from surface water is variable across the site. The majority of the site is at ‘Very Low’ risk of flooding from surface water, however areas associated with watercourses are at ‘High’ risk of flooding from this source.</p> <p>Hydraulic modelling was undertaken for five of the seven watercourses that would be crossed by the proposed development. The modelling results show that flood risk from the proposed development is not significant in respect of fluvial flooding.</p> <p>The proposed development is classed as being ‘Essential Infrastructure’ under the NPPF and is located in Flood Zone 1. As per the Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility, the development is considered appropriate in terms of flood risk vulnerability.</p> <p>The increase in impermeable area associated with the proposed development will require sustainable management of surface water run-off through the attenuation and controlled</p> | |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>discharge of flows to the surrounding environment, most likely infiltration to ground.</p> <p>Based on the information presented, the proposed mitigation measures and in line with NPPF guidance, the development site is considered to be appropriate in terms of flood risk.</p> <p>A biodiversity net gain assessment has been undertaken to inform the scheme design. No residual significant adverse effects on ecology are expected. Please refer to Chapter 7 (terrestrial ecology) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7) for details regarding the likely effects on ecology. The mitigation proposals for Sizewell C include a wide range of measures which are ‘embedded’ within the project design and a large number of controls of construction which are defined within the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> | |
| Restoration | General support for removal of the Sizewell link road following the construction phase and for the land to be restored. | The proposed development would be permanent and is expected to become part of the adopted highway network. The proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton. It would be a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project. The temporary contractor compounds would however be removed | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>following completion of construction.</p> <p>Further information on the impact of the Sizewell link road can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> | |
| Restoration | <p>Support for removal of the Sizewell link road conditional on it being returned to original use and ‘full life cost’ should be visible at the point the Sizewell C Development Consent Order is made.</p> | <p>The proposed development would be permanent and is expected to become part of the adopted highway network. The proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton. It would be a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project. The temporary contractor compounds would however be removed following completion of construction.</p> <p>Further information on the impact of the Sizewell link road can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> | N |
| Criteria | <p>Suggestion that those living close to the Sizewell link road should be consulted about its restoration.</p> | <p>The potential for the Sizewell link road to be removed following construction of Sizewell C was included within the Stage 4 consultation and local residents were able to respond.</p> <p>Generally support was given for the Sizewell link road, noting that it is critical, would be an improvement to the area and would be of</p> | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | benefit both during construction and also during the operation of Sizewell C. Further information can be found in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (doc Ref 8.4). | |
| Restoration | Concern about removing the link road because there will still be a lot of Sizewell traffic after the construction phase, and the restoration could negatively impact the hydrology and wildlife. | The proposed development would be permanent and is expected to become part of the adopted highway network (see Chapter 2 (Description of the Sizewell link road) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7) for further details). | Y |
| Further assessments | Suggestions for further assessments regarding environmental impacts, walkover earthwork surveys and alternative | Further environmental impact assessment of the proposals continued past Stage 4 and informed the final designs submitted in the application for Development Consent. Please refer to Chapters 1-12 of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7) for further details. Details of the route selection can be found in the Site | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>routes for the link road. Additionally, requests for more information regarding the Sizewell link road such as its post-construction removal, current ecology, public rights of way, water drainage and traffic predictions.</p> | <p>Selection Report provided in Appendix A in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). The proposed development would be permanent and is expected to become part of the adopted highway network.</p> | |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Alternative route | <p>Support for the previously proposed D2 route or Route W as an alternative to the Sizewell link road due to it being more</p> | <p>For the D2 route and Route W, the engineering works to traverse the landform were considered to likely have a significant adverse effect on the existing landscape character. Route W (north & south) traverses a landscape typically characterised by a series of small to large scale arable and pasture fields, intersected by a network of B-roads and PRow</p> | N |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>effective at dealing with traffic coming from the south and having fewer impacts on local communities.</p> | <p>with occasional villages and numerous dispersed hamlets and farmsteads. Blocks of ancient semi-natural woodland are scattered throughout the area. The alignment of Route W (south) would intersect an area of Ancient Woodland.</p> <p>The western section of the route comprises the landscape between the A12 and Hill Farm. Here, the topography of the landscape is formed by a series of narrow valleys that are well-vegetated. This creates a sense of intimacy that would be disrupted by the necessary engineering works that would be required to facilitate a highway through this area, which could result in significant adverse effects. It was also considered that the route could have an adverse effect on the setting of the existing nearby heritage assets including Hurts Hall and Leiston Abbey as they are situated approximately 450m north and 300m north of Route W respectively. The length of Route W/D2 was longer than other considered (Routes X and Z). Route W would also impact a greater number of PRow, roads and railways compared to the other routes considered.</p> <p>Route W is located to the south of Saxmundham. Whilst Route W was the most southerly, and therefore best placed to intercept the Sizewell C heavy goods vehicles (HGV) from the south, it would not provide traffic relief to either Middleton Moor</p> | |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>or Theberton, which was one of the key objectives of the proposed link road. Instead, it would provide an alternative route for traffic otherwise using the A1094/B1069 through Leiston and Knodishall and Saxmundham crossroads. Whilst this is a benefit to those places, Route W would not address the concerns raised by Middleton Moor and Theberton residents.</p> <p>Please refer to the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.</p> | |
| Alternative route | Suggestions for alternative route to the link road either north or south of the current route, but not the D2 route, would be more appropriate. | SZC Co. has considered a number of different routes for the Sizewell link road. Please refer to the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details. | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Air quality | Concern traffic on the Sizewell link road / Theberton bypass will adversely impact air quality, with particular concern for residents living nearby. | <p>No congestion is predicted along the Sizewell link road because the peak construction daily flow is approximately 8,500 vehicles per day and the DMRB identifies that congestion on a single carriageway road is unlikely to occur below approximately 23,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p>The modelling and assessment of traffic emissions associated with the Sizewell C and other traffic is presented in the Environmental Statement. No significant air quality effects are predicted to arise during construction or operation of Sizewell C.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 12 (Air quality) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | N |
| Environment | Concern the Sizewell link road will damage the environment in general, with particular concern for the area's tranquillity and habitats. | <p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Sizewell link road has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). The assessment considers the potential construction and operational impacts of the development.</p> <p>The route and design have sought to minimise the impact on the surrounding environment, including impacts on landscape, heritage and ecological features, noise and emissions impacts on residential properties, and pedestrian amenity.</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed, including the implementation of a CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution, and other measures such as the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors and screen the development. It is also proposed to develop a lighting strategy that seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety standards. Full details can be found in Chapters 3 to 12 of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p> | |
| Landscape / visual | <p>Concern the link road will create a scar across the landscape with particular concern about the visual impact of embankments and cuttings up, as well as concern about light pollution from vehicles using the link road.</p> | <p>The route and design of the Sizewell link road have sought to minimise impacts on the landscape and restrict visual impacts and light pollution in the area in general and to residential properties.</p> <p>A few properties have the potential to be impacted by the light from vehicles using the Sizewell link road, and SZC Co. has sought to mitigate impacts through measures such the provision of landscaping, planting and buffer zones to protect receptors and screen the development, where possible.</p> <p>Further details can be found Volume 6 of the Environmental</p> | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). | |
| Noise pollution | Concern the Sizewell link road will cause damage to local houses via vibration and produce significant levels of noise pollution that will affect many residents. | <p>The route and design of the Sizewell link road have sought to minimise impacts on the local area as much as possible, including the impact of noise and vibration to residential properties during both construction and operation.</p> <p>During construction, a number of mitigation measures to control noise and vibration impacts would be adopted in accordance with standard good practice, as set out in the CoCP (Doc ref. 8.11).</p> <p>A full assessment of the noise and vibration impacts can be found in Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). No significant impact from vibration is expected and so no damage to nearby dwellings is expected.</p> | N |
| Wildlife / ecology | Concern the proposed link road will destroy habitats and woodland, as well as suggestions to use culverts so as not to disturb wildlife movements. | <p>Woodland planting is proposed to compensate for any areas of woodland loss. Hedgerow planting is also proposed to integrate the road with the surrounding landscape, compensating for the loss of hedgerow severed by the route. These would connect into the existing hedgerow network, where possible to minimize habitat loss and fragmentation. Replacement ponds would be created to compensate for the temporary and permanent loss of ponds. Drop kerbs or filter</p> | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | drains/underpasses to accommodate newts over or under the road to mitigate for isolation of fragmented Great Crested Newt populations. The drainage design is yet to be designed in detail but where the development design includes embankments and in areas of greatest importance to great crested newts, culverts or underpasses would be considered where practicable and depending upon the further survey results to enable great crested newt movement across the road. These culverts or underpasses would be at least 1m in width, and newt fencing and appropriate green infrastructure would be installed along the length of the embankment to a distance of about 100m either side to the culvert/underpass to guide newts towards the culvert as recommended by Natural England. Please refer to Chapter 7 of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7) for further information. | |

g. Two Village Bypass

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Need Case | Support for two village bypass and mitigation to reduce impact from | SZC Co. welcomes the comments in support of the two village bypass. The design of the route proposes to avoid direct loss of | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | pollution, upgrade bridleway and avoid direct loss of Foxburrow Wood. | <p>Foxburrow Wood.</p> <p>Footpaths E-243/003/0 and E243/011/0 (on the east side of the proposed route of the two village bypass) would be upgraded to a bridleway, with agreement from SCC. However, other than the crossing, no physical changes would be required to footpaths E-243/003/0 and E243/011/0 to facilitate the change to a bridleway.</p> <p>See Chapters 1-12 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) for further details.</p> <p>A CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.12) has been included in the Sizewell C DCO application for the Sizewell C Project, which sets out the measures and controls that SZC Co. will require its contractors to adopt during the construction phase of the proposed development, where appropriate.</p> | |
| Traffic / congestion | Support for the benefit from the two village bypass of improving the traffic flow on the A12 and other roads. | <p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the two village bypass. The two village bypass would play an important role in significantly reducing the amount of construction traffic travelling through Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. Further detail on the two village bypass, in the context of the wider construction transport strategy, is provided in the Transport</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | |
| Traffic / congestion | Concern the two village bypass will increase traffic and be ineffective at reducing traffic overall. | The two village bypass would play an important role in significantly reducing the amount of construction traffic travelling through Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. Further detail on the two village bypass, in the context of the wider construction transport strategy, is provided in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | N |
| Alternative suggestions | Suggestions that the four village bypass should be adopted instead of the two village bypass and disappointment it was not part of the proposals. | Analysis suggests that congestion is only likely within Farnham due to the narrowing of the road at the Farnham bend. Therefore, SZC Co. concluded that the impact of Sizewell C traffic would not be sufficient to justify a bypass of all four villages. Please refer to Chapter 3 (Alternatives and design evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) for further details. | N |

Theme: Site Suitability

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
|-------------------|---|--|--------|
| Alternative route | Challenge over the planned route of the two village bypass due to its proximity to ancient woodland, dwellings, and that the plans rely on inaccurate information as well as suggestions that alternatives have not been considered. | <p>The design of the route proposes to avoid direct loss of ancient woodland in Foxburrow Wood. The Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) explains the route selection for the two village bypass.</p> <p>Please also refer to Chapter 3 (Alternatives and design evolution) of Volume 5, of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) for information regarding the alternatives considered from an environmental perspective.</p> | N |
| Route selection | Concern the two village bypass route cuts through Farnham Hall, Stratford St. Andrew and the Foxburrow Wood. Suggestions the route should go east of Foxburrow Wood rather than west. | <p>The design of the route proposes to avoid direct loss of Foxburrow Wood. The Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) explains the route selection for the two village bypass, including amendments made to the boundary of Farnham Hall.</p> <p>The alternative alignment put forward by Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council suggests routing the two village bypass (travelling from west to east) to the south of Pond Barn Cottages before curving northwards, passing Foxburrow Wood on its east side, and meeting the proposed Friday Street roundabout to the north. This would be an alternative to the current proposal to pass Foxburrow Wood on its west side.</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>The alternative alignment put forward by the Parish Council was reviewed, taking into account the impacts on woodland, environment and nearby receptors as well as operational matters, but it was not considered to be a better solution.</p> <p>Please also refer to Chapter 3 (Alternatives and design evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) for information regarding the alternatives considered from an environmental perspective.</p> | |
| Access | <p>Concern the two village bypass would adversely impact access to properties, damage the local community and limit public access to the countryside.</p> | <p>The Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) explains the route selection for the two village bypass, including the steps taken to reduce impacts on access to properties.</p> <p>Please also refer to Chapter 3 (Alternatives and design evolution) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) for information regarding the alternatives considered from an environmental perspective.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) has identified relatively small changes in the volume of traffic and journey times on links, and a long-term improvement in traffic flows on the strategic network once mitigation is in place. Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) identifies the potential effects on tourism, part of which is related to perceived changes in traffic in the area.</p> <p>It concludes that while actual changes are not likely to be significant, there is recognition that at certain times and in certain locations perceptions of change may arise that could materialise into real effects if not mitigated, and therefore proposes a Tourism Fund. Further information can be found in Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p> | |
| Land take | Concerns about the increased land take for the two village bypass. | Since the Stage 4 consultation, SZC Co. has further refined the design and land take along the two village bypass which has led to an overall reduction in land take since Stage 4. Only the land essential to deliver the scheme will be acquired from landowners. | Y |
| Local community | Concern that local businesses, such as tourism, will be negatively affected by the two village bypass and that they are being ignored. Also requests for | SZC Co. notes that in some instances, due to changes to the road network associated with the scheme, businesses may perceive a loss of passing trade, or severance which they may consider affects their business models. SZC Co. has carefully considered each of the elements of physical mitigation associated with changes to the transport network to create an overall network that limits significant effects on travel as a result of the Sizewell C Project. Businesses have the right to | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | information about provision of mitigation and compensation plans. | <p>make a claim for statutory compensation should they perceive that they are significantly affected.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Safety | Concern about safety on the two village bypass due to an increase in traffic. | <p>The new bypass would be designed to current Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards. New roads of this type have a significantly lower accident rate than the existing roads.</p> <p>The design has already been subject to a stage 1 road safety audit. Stage 2 would take place after detailed design is completed, stage 3 one month after the scheme had opened to traffic and stage 4 after 12 months of use.</p> <p>The new road will be significantly safer, particularly at the Friday Street junction, than the existing roads.</p> | Y |
| Heritage impact | Concern the two village bypass will damage Grade II listed buildings and other heritage assets in the area. | <p>SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the two village bypass, including on listed buildings. No direct significant effects are predicted on listed buildings.</p> <p>Potential loss of heritage significance through change to</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>setting would be addressed through mitigation measures including standard CoCP measures to minimise noise and air quality effects (construction phase), retention of existing vegetation where possible, design and screening, including hedgerow planting along the route of the development.</p> <p>Once operational, some assets should experience beneficial effects comprising potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting from decreased traffic through the two villages</p> <p>Chapter 9 of Volume 5 (Historic Environment) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) provides further detail.</p> | |
| Property blight | Concern properties will be severely blighted by the two village bypass proposals and SZC Co. underestimate the number that will be impacted. Further concern the value of | <p>Please see Chapters 3-12 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6), which provide the likely environmental effects of the two village bypass. In particular, Chapter 4 covers noise and vibration, Chapter 5 covers air quality and Chapter 8 with amenity and recreation.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) has identified relatively small changes in the volume of traffic and journey times on links, and a long-term improvement in traffic flows on</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | the properties will be reduced. | <p>the strategic network once mitigation is in place. Chapter 9 (Socio-economics), Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) identifies the potential effects on tourism, part of which is related to perceived changes in traffic in the area.</p> <p>SZC Co. has launched a Property Price Support Scheme which offers homeowners within the PPSS boundary the difference between the ‘without Sizewell C’ value and the ‘with Sizewell C’ value when they sell their property. Where an eligible property within the scheme boundary sells at a value which has been reduced as a consequence of the Construction of Sizewell C, SZC Co. will offer the owner the difference in value, as determined by a surveyor.</p> | |
| Further assessments | Calls for further assessments regarding environmental and health impacts, noise reduction plans, a cost/benefit analysis and drainage proposals related to the two village | <p>Activities with the potential to impact upon local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines of the Environmental Statement (e.g. air quality, noise, transport), and these have informed the scope and focus of a health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the Sizewell C Project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in Chapter 28 (Health and</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | bypass. | Wellbeing) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). | |
| Suggestion | Suggestions to keep abnormal loads off the two village bypass. | The bypass would be significantly safer than the existing road, so all abnormal loads would use the bypass and not the existing road through Stratford St Andrew and Farnham. | N |
| Suggestions | Suggestions for safe cycle crossings over the two village bypass. | <p>The proposed River Alde overbridge would maintain a headroom clearance of 6m from river bank level to the underside of the bridge to allow use of the track by agricultural vehicles.</p> <p>Non-motorised users (pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) would also be able to pass beneath the bridge. The proposed Foxburrow Wood footbridge would also serve non-motorised users (including cyclists).</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5)</p> | Y |
| Mitigation | Suggestions to mitigate the impact of the two village bypass with further steps to alleviate | Please see Chapters 3-12 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) which provide the likely environmental effects of the two village bypass and the proposed mitigation. Steps have been taken to mitigate adverse landscape and | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>visual impacts, suggestions for water drainage, and safe crossings for animals and people.</p> | <p>visual effects. For example, retention of existing vegetation where possible, proposed planting to integrate and screen and the sinking of the route to mitigate visual effects (see Chapter 6 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) for further details).</p> <p>The proposed River Alde overbridge would maintain a headroom clearance of 6m from river bank level to the underside of the bridge to allow use of the track by agricultural vehicles. Non-motorised users (pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) would also be able to pass beneath the bridge. The proposed Foxburrow Wood footbridge would also serve non-motorised users (including cyclists). Please see Chapter 7 (Terrestrial ecology and ornithology) of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6) for information about crossings from an ecological perspective. Details of water drainage can be found in Chapter 12 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p> | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Air quality | <p>Concerns that air pollution from the two village bypass that would impact residents and drift into the woods harming wildlife habitats.</p> | <p>The two village bypass would allow construction traffic to avoid the A12 through Farnham and Stratford St Andrew and would be open to the public.</p> <p>The closest human receptors to the site are located along the A1094 (SX10), the A12 near Stratford St Andrew and Farnham (SX5 to SX7 and SX15), and to the south of these villages where the proposed development will be built (SX8, SX9 and WM1)</p> <p>Foxburrow Wood county wildlife site (CWS) (also identified as ancient woodland) lies to the east of the proposed development.</p> <p>There is one air quality management area (AQMA) in the study area. This AQMA is located along the A12, within Stratford St Andrew, approximately 150m from the site boundary. This AQMA was declared in 2014 for exceedances of the NO₂ annual mean objectives.</p> <p>As detailed in Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES, a number of primary and tertiary mitigation measures have been identified through the iterative EIA process, and have been incorporated into the design and construction planning of the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed alignment of the two village bypass would offer</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>road users an alternative route for the A12, reducing traffic flows within Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham during both the peak construction of the Sizewell C Project and upon completion of the power station.</p> <p>The site boundary has been designed to avoid sensitive receptors and increase distance of construction works and the proposed development where reasonably practicable.</p> <p>Air quality impacts arising from the construction phase would be managed through a range of control measures detailed in the CoCP, which will include measures as per the IAQM Guidance (Ref. 5.12) based on a ‘high risk’ site. These measures will be incorporated into construction working practices to reduce the likelihood of significant adverse dust impacts, and would include measures such as the requirement to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● positioning site access as far as reasonably practicable from sensitive receptors; ● any potential use of concrete batching plant located as far as practicable from receptors; ● locating mobile crushing and screening plant as far as practicable from receptors. | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● covering potentially dusty loads (loose earth, spoil, aggregates etc) in transit; ● managing site run-off of water or mud; ● cover, seed or fence stockpiles to prevent wind whipping; ● ensure an adequate water supply to the site for effective dust/PM₁₀ suppression/mitigation, using non-potable water where possible and appropriate; ● display the name and contact details of person(s) accountable for air quality and dust issues on the site boundary; and ● develop and implement dust management measures, in accordance with the CoCP. <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 5, of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.6).</p> | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Landscape and visual | Concern over adverse visual impact of the two village bypass and concern about light pollution from vehicle headlights. | <p>The landscape and visual impact of the two village bypass has been assessed in Chapter 6 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Site observations confirm that vegetation and buildings within the landscape significantly reduces the extent of visibility towards the site from that illustrated by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility. Field boundaries are typically formed from established hedgerows, often with frequent hedgerow trees, and roads and PRow are also typically bordered by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. Within settlements, trees further contribute to visual screening and limit views to the site.</p> <p>As detailed in, Chapter 6 of Volume 1 of the ES, a number of primary mitigation measures have been identified through the iterative EIA process, and have been incorporated into the design and construction planning of the proposed development. Tertiary mitigation measures are legal requirements or are standard practices that would be implemented as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>The General Landscape Strategy for the landscape proposals for the proposed development has been designed to minimise potential effects on ecological, heritage</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>and landscape and visual receptors through provision of appropriate planting and will follow the design principles set out in the Associated Development Design Principles document (Doc Ref. 8.3).</p> <p>Chapter 2 of this volume of the ES details a number of primary mitigation measures that seek to mitigate the potential impacts of the proposed development. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The retention of vegetation where possible, ● Hedgerow planting ● The route of the proposed two village bypass would be within a cutting as it passes between Farnham Hall and Farnham Hall Farmhouse to reduce visual impacts on residents of these properties. ● Woodland planting to provide visual screening and ecological connectivity. ● The route of the proposed two village bypass | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>would be mostly unlit to minimise light spill,</p> <p>The listed mitigation measures aim to control and limit views of the proposed development from neighbouring receptors, including the villages of Farnham and Stratford St. Andrews, and the surrounding properties.</p> <p>a) Tertiary mitigation</p> <p>Tertiary mitigation will be required regardless of any EIA assessment, as it is imposed, for example, as a result of legislative requirements and/or standard sectoral practices.</p> <p>The following tertiary mitigation measures have been included within the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) to minimise landscape and visual effects during the construction phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● avoidance of unnecessary tree removal and appropriate protection of trees and vegetation to be retained; ● design of hoardings around construction activities to include consideration of the character of the surrounding landscape; and ● site lighting, where required to ensure safety will | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | be positioned and directed to minimise intrusion into occupied residential properties and sensitive areas, and will not create a road hazard. | |
| Noise pollution | Concern about noise and vibrations from the two village bypass, with particular concern for how this will affect residents of Farnham. | <p>The site predominantly comprises rural fields, woodland and farms, except where it connects to the A12 at each end of the site. The villages of Stratford St Andrew and Farnham are located to the north west of the site, and there are also isolated farmsteads which are adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The sound environment is generally dominated by traffic close to the A12 but away from these areas, there is quite a high proportion of natural sounds as well as agricultural noises and occasional aircraft. The existing noise daytime noise levels close to the A12 are fairly high, however, noise levels reduce overnight.</p> <p>As detailed in Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES, a number of primary and tertiary mitigation measures have been identified through the iterative EIA process, and have been incorporated into the design and construction planning of the proposed development. Tertiary mitigation measures are legal requirements or are standard practices that would be</p> | N |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>implemented as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>Primary mitigation measures, which minimise the noise impact of the proposed development, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed alignment of the two village bypass would offer road users a more direct route than travelling through Stratford St Andrew and Farnham. This would reduce traffic flows, during both the peak construction of the Sizewell C Project and upon completion of the power station through the villages, and reduce associated traffic noise. • The site boundary has been designed to maximise the separation distance of construction works and the proposed development from noise sensitive receptors where reasonably practicable. • The proposed route of the two village bypass would be in an approximately 4.5m deep cutting, which would help to reduce the noise impact on Farnham Hall and its nearby neighbouring properties, compared to being at grade. <p>There are also primary measures to minimise and manage additional traffic on the roads associated with the construction and operation of the Sizewell C Project. These measures are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES.</p> | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Tertiary mitigation will be required regardless of any EIA assessment, as it is imposed, for example, as a result of legislative requirements and/or standard sectoral practices.</p> <p>The standard of good practice outlined in BS 5228-1 (Ref. 4.742) would will be followed. Primary mitigation for the control of noise and vibration would will therefore include, but not be restricted to the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • selection of quiet plant and techniques in accordance with good practice in BS5228 for all construction, demolition and earth moving activities; • switching off equipment when not required; • use of reversing alarms that ensure proper warning whilst minimising noise impacts off-site; and • provision of training and instruction to construction site staff on methods and techniques of working to minimise off-site noise and vibration impacts. <p>SZC Co. will have a system for the receipt and recording of any noise or vibration complaints from occupiers of noise sensitive receptors, and procedures for investigating and acting appropriately as necessary upon those complaints.</p> | |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | During construction, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7) and, a Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8) will be implemented to help manage the effects of traffic generated by the Sizewell C Project – (see Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement for more detail). | |
| Wildlife / Ecology | Concern the two village bypass will ruin the ecology with particular concern for wildlife movements and habitats at and around Foxburrow Wood, and ancient woodland that will be affected. | <p>There are 12 statutory designated sites of nature conservation importance within 5km of the site. The proposed development will involve no direct land take from any of these designated sites; however, the site is hydrologically linked to the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, SAC, Ramsar and SSSI, as the River Alde flows through the site boundary upstream of this designated site. In addition, indirect impacts may be experienced by Foxburrow Wood County Wildlife Site as it is adjacent to the site boundary.</p> <p>As detailed in Volume 1, Chapter 6, a number of primary mitigation measures has been identified through the iterative EIA process, and has been incorporated into the design and construction planning of the proposed development. Tertiary mitigation measures are legal requirements or are standard practices that will be implemented as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>A summary of the primary and tertiary mitigation that has been</p> | Y |

| Theme: Environment – General | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>incorporated into the design of the proposed development that will protect the existing habitats and species is provided in Chapter 7 or Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.6).</p> <p>The proposed mitigation includes (amongst other things) the retention of Foxburrow Wood CWS ancient woodland in its entirety. A buffer distance of 15m from earthworks would be applied to prevent impacts to the trees on the edge of the woodland. Some limited footpath works would however be required at the edge of this zone.</p> | |

h. Yoxford Roundabout

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Congestion | Concerns about the Yoxford roundabout, especially that it will not be an adequate solution to congestion, potentially | The A12/A1120, A12/B1122 roundabout, the level crossing, Darsham park and ride access and the A12/A144 junctions are all included in a VISSIM microsimulation model used to test the impact of Sizewell C traffic on the operation of the highway network in this area. The results of the modelling are reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | Y |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>increasing it due to its proximity to the park and ride at Darsham. Further concerns include congestion causing increased air pollution in the area.</p> | <p>The A12/B1122 roundabout proposal is mitigation proposed as a result of this work and the proximity of the other junctions has been an important element of the analysis. The analysis shows that the proposed Yoxford roundabout and the Darsham park and ride access are sufficiently far apart (approximately 2.2km) so that there is no interaction between the junctions.</p> <p>The closest human receptors to the site are located around the junction at the A12 and B1122. Primary mitigation for construction of the proposed Yoxford roundabout includes locating the site boundary to avoid sensitive receptors as far as practicable, including avoidance of Roadside Nature Reserve 197. Tertiary mitigation measures include the requirement that air quality impacts arising from the construction phase would be managed through a range of control measures detailed in an CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 5 of Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.8).</p> | |
| Further assessment | <p>Suggestions for further assessment to be carried out at the Yoxford</p> | <p>An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Yoxford roundabout has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.8). The assessment considers the potential construction and operation the</p> | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>roundabout, with particular reference to potential flood risk, environmental and archaeological impact as well as the safety of the route with alternative speed limits.</p> | <p>development.</p> <p>Where potential significant effects have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed. This includes the implementation of a CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11) to control construction impacts such as risk of pollution, as well as other measures such the provision of landscaping, buffer zones and SuDS to protect receptors and reduce the risk of flooding. It is also proposed to develop a lighting strategy which seeks to minimise the effects of light spill on the surrounding environment whilst meeting necessary safety.</p> <p>Following Stage 4, further archaeological evaluation has been carried out at the Yoxford site comprising trial trenching. The scope of this was agreed with SCC Archaeological Service who also monitored the fieldwork. Further information, including the fieldwork results, may be found in Chapter 9 (Historic Environment) of Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p> <p>Whilst the speed limit could be reduced by Suffolk County Council in Yoxford, this would have a similar effect to the roundabout which will require traffic to slow as they approach and navigate the roundabout.</p> | |
| Suggestion | Suggestions that | As indicated in the Implementation Plan appended to the | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | work on the Yoxford roundabout be completed prior to construction. | <p>Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), the associated developments will be phased in the early years of construction to minimise disruption to the A12, and ensure traffic flows are maintained.</p> <p>The proposed Yoxford roundabout is estimated to take up to nine months to construct and work would start in the early years of the Sizewell C construction period. Therefore, it would be in place to improve traffic flows in the area as soon as possible to support the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> | |
| Mitigation | Support for wildlife and preservation of archaeological value, traffic management measures and provision for cyclists, as well as the roundabout itself for reducing congestion. | <p>This support is welcomed. An assessment of the environmental impacts of the Yoxford roundabout has been undertaken and is reported in Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.8). The assessment considers the potential construction and operation the development.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation <i>in situ</i> has been identified on the site.</p> | N |



| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Further information may be found in Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.8). | |

i. A140/B1078 west of Coddendam

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Need Case | Comments welcoming the change to the A140/B1078 west of Coddendam but concern about the impact on flood risk and lack of a crossing for cyclists raised. | <p>The A140/B1078 junction is in Flood Zone 1 according to Environment Agency flood risk mapping. This is the lowest category of flood risk. The proposed modifications to the junction are largely improved road signage and road markings, which would have no impact on flood risk.</p> <p>There is a Sustrans national cycle network route just to the south of the junction, which would not be affected by proposed junction improvements.</p> | N |

j. A12/A144 south of Bramfield

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| More information | Comments questioning the planned changes to the A12/A144 south of Bramfield and asking for more details. | <p>The A12/A144 junction is currently a ghost island layout. During the morning peak period, there is queuing and delay for the right turn movements towards the A12 south. Traffic modelling has indicated that this would be exacerbated by the Sizewell C traffic flows. The traffic modelling work has indicated that a single lane dualing improvement (a physical central island and waiting area) would increase capacity and mitigate the impact of Sizewell C traffic.</p> <p>This is the scheme that is proposed in the DCO, described in Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.8) and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> | N |

k. A12/B119 at Saxmundham

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Need Case | Comments on improvements to the A12/B1119 west of Saxmundham, asking for more | The improvement scheme for this junction that is proposed in the DCO is described in Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.8) and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>detail and suggesting a cycle path be included.</p> | <p>There is a Sustrans National Cycle Route link between Saxmundham station and National Cycle Network Route 1 to the west that passes through this junction. However, traffic survey data from June 2016 shows very few cyclists using this route. There have been no accidents involving cyclists during the period May 2014 to May 2019 and SCC have not raised any concerns about cyclists at the junction with SZC Co.</p> <p>The number of cyclists at the junction would be unlikely to increase as a result of Sizewell C because it is beyond the distance that workers would be willing to cycle to work.</p> | |

I. A1094/B1069 south of Knodishall

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Need Case | <p>Comments welcoming the speed reduction and the proposed changes to the A1094/B1069 south of Knodishall, as well as comments</p> | <p>The improvement scheme for this junction that is proposed in the DCO is described in Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.8) and reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>SZC Co's proposal, which is supported by SCC, for SCC to promote a speed limit reduction through the junction from the</p> | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | requesting greater clarity on the upgrades. | national speed limit (60mph for cars) to 40mph would improve safety at this junction. | |

m. Freight Management Facility

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Need Case | Support for freight management facility, as helping to ease congestion, control traffic flow and for the proposals being thorough and well assessed. | SZC Co. notes the support for the freight management facility as a means to ease congestion. | N |
| Further assessment | Request for more information regarding construction hours, HGV movements to and from the facility and junction, convoy | Information regarding construction hours is set out in the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11). Modelling for the movements of HGVs has been carried out as part of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). Full information regarding the proposals for the establishment | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | lengths and provision for traffic at north end of A12. Full disclosure of proposals for establishment and operation of the facility at both sites. | and operation of the facilities is located at Chapter 2 (Description of Freight Management Facility) of Volume 8 (Freight Management Facility) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.9). | |
| Site Suitability | Concern over both sites being to the east of Orwell Bridge, often suggesting that as this can close in high winds it would lead to congestion and traffic routing through Ipswich town centre. | The majority of the Sizewell C project freight traffic is expected to come from the port at Felixstowe, which is to the south east of the proposed freight management facility site. The freight management facility's location was chosen to accommodate this freight traffic without it having to pass over the Orwell Bridge, and so traffic will therefore travel along the A14 and A12 towards the main development site and will therefore not be susceptible to change if the Orwell Bridge was to close. Further information is available in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | N |
| Land take | Concern over the increased land take for the facilities compared with Stage 3 and questions as to why | Since the Stage 3 consultation land take has decreased to the north of the site and increased to the south-west of the site to include areas of highway to allow for highway improvements. Only the land essential to deliver the scheme will be acquired from landowners. | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | this is necessary. | | |
| Air quality | Concerns over the impact on the air quality around the site of either of the freight management facilities. | Construction activities with the potential to impact upon local communities have been investigated and assessed as part of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. Book 6), including Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of Volume 8 (Freight Management Facility) (Doc Ref. 6.9). Air quality impacts arising from construction are managed through the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11). No significant effects are predicted. | N |
| Light pollution | Worries about the visual impact and light pollution that will emanate from any potential freight management site. | This comment is noted. The proposals include use of landscape bunds, perimeter planting, shorter lamp columns and a best practice approach to lighting to minimise light spill. Structures and buildings have been designed to create an unimposing appearance that harmonises with the surroundings and with the buildings screened as far as possible in line with the Associated Developments Design Principles document (Doc Ref. 8.3). Further information can also be found in Chapter 6 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) of Volume 8 (Freight Management Facility) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.9). | N |
| Further assessments | Suggestion that there is still a need for more assessment to be conducted to | The rationale for proposing the Freight Management Facility (FMF) is to accommodate approximately 150 HGVs to allow a controlled pattern of deliveries to site with reduced movements | Y |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>select an appropriate site, including environmental assessments and traffic modelling.</p> | <p>during peak or sensitive hours on the network. The facility would provide ancillary buildings and structures where paperwork, and goods can be checked prior to delivery to the Sizewell C main construction site. The facility would also provide a location where, in the event of an accident on the local road network HGVs could be held.</p> <p>In considering appropriate locations for a FMF site, the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) predicts that the port of Felixstowe will play a major role in the delivery of materials to the Sizewell C main development site, and therefore the FMF site location needs to consider HGVs arriving on the A14 from the east in addition to HGVs arriving on the A14 from the west. HGVs would continue their journey to the Sizewell C main development site via the A12, and therefore the FMF needs to be located with close proximity to the A14 and A12.</p> <p>To be identified as potentially suitable, however, sites needed to be of sufficient size to accommodate the facilities, but also to allow them to be 'self-contained' with respect to, for example, any requirements for perimeter landscaping, sustainable drainage, and interim soils storage prior to restoration following the cessation of operational activities.</p> <p>There were then two filter stages before two options were consulted on. The site at Seven Hills has emerged from the</p> | |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>filtering process as being the most suitable and appropriate for the siting of the proposed FMF. The proposed development incorporates the site requirements set in the Site Selection Report, as well as the environmental mitigation required to be acceptable.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p> | |
| Traffic / congestion | <p>Concern over exacerbation of congestion around the A12/A14 junction, and increased HGV movements causing disruption to the Ipswich area, including the Orwell Bridge and new and existing roundabouts on the A14.</p> | <p>The purpose of the freight management facility is to mitigate against congestion caused by HGV traffic, including at the A12/A14 junction through the management and controlled release of HGVs to the main development site, with reduced movements during peak or sensitive hours on the network. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> | N |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Air quality | Concern air quality will be damaged by pollution caused by increased HGV movements, affecting residences near the Innocence Farm site. | Following Stage 3 consultation, Innocence Farm was not been pursued as the proposed freight management facility site, with Seven Hills being SZC Co. preferred location. Further information is set out in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | N |
| Noise pollution | Concern over noise pollution due to Innocence Farm’s proximity to housing and a school. | Following Stage 3 consultation, Innocence Farm was not been pursued as the proposed freight management facility site, with Seven Hills being SZC Co ‘spreferred location. Further information is set out in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | N |
| Traffic / congestion | Concern that traffic would increase on nearby roads and junctions such as A12/A14, and added danger from HGVs joining the A14 as well as suggestions for a robust traffic management system to ensure HGVs stick | Impacts on the transport network have been assessed as part of the proposals. Details regarding the potential impacts of the proposals on the existing transport network can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). Further information can also be found in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref 8.7), the Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref 8.8) and the Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) (Doc Ref. 8.6). | N |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | to the agreed route. | | |
| Safety | Concern over the safety of the Seven Hills site due to a dangerous cross-over of traffic flows. | The introduction of a ghost island junction will allow HGVs to safely enter and exit the site without impacting on the safety of other traffic. Further details regarding the potential impacts of the proposals on the existing transport network, including a consideration of safety, can be found in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | N |
| Traffic / congestion | Concern that the Seven hills site will exacerbate traffic problems at Seven Hills roundabout, restricting access to Seven Hills crematorium. Potential for conflict with Operation Stack when Old Felixstowe Road is closed to traffic entering from the A1122. | There is currently moderate peak period queueing on the A12 north and A1156 approaches to the Seven Hills junction and longer queues on the A14 westbound exit slip road. The junction will become partially signal controlled, with additional traffic lanes, as part of the Adastral Park committed development, as reported in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment . This would lead to a minor improvement in junction performance. Sizewell C would increase traffic volumes at the junction by about 2% in both the early years and peak construction scenarios. This increase is small but could lead to some additional queuing during peak periods. | N |
| Alternative sites | Suggestions for alternative locations | The Seven Hills site has been considered as an optimal location for the freight management facility as access does not | N |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | for the freight management facility such as land on the Bucklesham side of Seven Hills roundabout, or using part of the Wickham Market park and ride site as a facility for freight management. | involve any detours or doubling back, unlike other sites previously considered in the area. The Wickham park and ride proposals initially set out the inclusion of a lorry park on-site, but this was dropped at Stage 2 when other strategies for freight management were considered. Further information is set out in the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | |

n. Rail Improvements

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| East Suffolk line | Support for the legacy benefits expected to arise from upgrades to East Suffolk line, including benefits for passengers, the economy and | Support for the legacy benefits of the East Suffolk line upgrades is welcomed, however, these proposals no longer form part of the Integrated Strategy and are therefore do not form part of the DCO application. Future aspirations were considered when developing the rail-led and integrated proposals, including aspirations for a higher frequency service, and reduced journey times between Ipswich | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | tourism. | and Lowestoft, and the work proposed by SZC Co would not preclude further development of these plans should stakeholders such as the Department for Transport, train operating company or local authorities wish to explore these further in the future. | |
| Level crossings | Concerns over closing of several level crossings and the disruption this would cause even if necessitated for safety. Also, comments that current crossings needed upgrading and more details were required. | SZC Co. worked closely with Network Rail to identify a safe and deliverable solution to maximise the amount of freight transported by rail. The integrated strategy would not require the large number of level crossing interventions necessary for the rail-led strategy, and closures and upgrades on the East Suffolk line are no longer proposed, informed by risk assessment work undertaken by Network Rail. | Y |
| Level crossings | Specific comments about the closure of Blaxhall 2 level crossing, suggesting it would sever the Little Glemham 10 footpath which continues over | As set out in the Site Selection Report , provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co .have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co's programme for the Sizewell C Project. | Y |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | the crossing as Blaxhall 37. | The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line, including the Blaxhall 2 level crossing, are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application. | |
| Level crossings | Concern over the Melton Bromswell level crossing proposals, suggesting it is unclear how existing public access would be improved. Suggestions that SZC Co. should find a safe way of avoiding the closure of the footpath between Bromeswell and Ufford. | <p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co's programme for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line, including the Melton Bromeswell level crossing, are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO</p> | Y |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | application. | |
| Level crossings | Suggestions for how SZC Co. could mitigate the closure of a section of Footpath 9 such as identifying an alternative route for the footpath or working with National Rail to identify a suitable way to cross the level crossing. | <p>The closure of the Bromeswell and Ufford footpath was part of the proposals for upgrades to the East Suffolk line. As those upgrades no longer form part of the DCO application, the footpath closure is no longer proposed.</p> <p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co's programme for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> | Y |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Level crossings | <p>Comments asking for more information about the work on level crossings on the Saxmundham to Leiston line, as well as opposing planned closures of crossings on the line.</p> | <p>There are currently no regular freight services on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line which is currently only used by occasional maintenance trains. None of the level crossing works would involve the permanent stopping up or diversion of PRowS, with only temporary closures to the crossings as the upgrade works are carried out. These upgrades are required to support the delivery of freight by rail, to ensure safety for users of the level crossings, and to maintain community access during operation of the rail improvement works.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 2, Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10), eight of the existing level crossings on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line are proposed to be upgraded. The Sizewell level crossing will not be upgraded as freight trains will not be using Sizewell Halt, with a temporary rail terminal to be built at land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) for deliveries by rail in the early years. As such, no trains would use the Sizewell level crossing and no upgrade works are necessary.</p> <p>Further details on the final proposals for the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line can be found in Chapter 2, Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p> | Y |



| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| East Suffolk line | Support for upgrades to the East Suffolk line to provide legacy improvements and to avoid disruption to existing commuters. | As set out in the Site Selection Report , provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.2), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable due to deliverability issues. The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application. | N |
| East Suffolk line | Suggestions for upgrades to the East Suffolk line such as changing speed limits, dualing the track and suggesting SZC Co. and Network Rail work together to improve the line. | As set out in the Site Selection Report , provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.2), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable due to deliverability issues. The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application. | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| East Suffolk line | Concern that a single passing loop is inadequate and an additional loop on the northern section of the route is needed. | As set out in the Site Selection Report , provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.2) SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable due to deliverability issues. The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application. | N |
| Saxmundham to Leiston line | Suggestion that improvements should be made on the Saxmundham to Leiston line, such as dualing the line. | The DCO application includes improvements to the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line, including the replacement of the existing track (approximately 7.2km in length) and upgrades to eight level crossings. Dualing of the line would not be necessary to support the integrated transport strategy for up to three trains per day (six movements) on the branch line. The improvements are proposed to mitigate the likely impacts of the Sizewell C project. Given dualing of the branch line is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Sizewell C Project, it would not be justified to include it in the proposed improvement works on the branch line. | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Saxmundham to Leiston line | Concern that increased use of the Saxmundham to Leiston line will have adverse impacts on wildlife movement and habitats of animals residing in nearby woodland. | <p>The Saxmundham to Leiston branch line site is predominantly comprised of existing rail infrastructure. Habitat alongside the branch line is likely to comprise of scrub, rough grassland, tall ruderal species and linear belts of trees. Mitigation is proposed for the rail improvement works and it is considered that there would be no likely significant effects, as presented in the Stage 4 consultation, because any habitat loss would be limited to that alongside the branch line.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapters 2 and 7 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement.</p> | N |
| Green rail route | Suggestions for green rail route including ensuring there are plenty of crossings points for walkers, noise abatement measures to combat noise pollution and that the route should be completed prior to construction. | <p>Footpath diversions would be in place during the construction, operation and removal and reinstatement of the green rail route. None of the existing crossing points (both PRowS and roads) would be permanently stopped-up or diverted and access across the site would be retained.</p> <p>The existing footpaths would all be reinstated to their current alignment following removal of the green rail route. To the west of the B1122 (Abbey Road), the footpath diversion to the south of the proposed rail extension route, linking Footpaths E-363/006/0 and E-363/010/0 would be retained following completion of the Sizewell C Project as a permanent legacy</p> | Y |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|----------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>benefit to the existing footpath network.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures, including landscape bunds, are incorporated into the design of the green rail route to prevent impacts on users of the footpaths and local residents in general in terms of noise and the visual landscape.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapters 2, 4, 6 and 8 of Volume 9 of the ES.</p> | |
| Green rail route | Concern over the impact the green rail route will have on communities and businesses by restricting current access routes. | <p>Footpath diversions would be in place during the construction, operation and removal and reinstatement of the green rail route. None of the existing crossing points (both PRowS and roads) would be permanently stopped-up or diverted and access across the site would be retained.</p> <p>The existing footpaths would all be reinstated to their current alignment following removal of the green rail route. To the west of the B1122 (Abbey Road), the footpath diversion to the south of the proposed rail extension route, linking Footpaths E-363/006/0 and E-363/010/0 would be retained following completion of the Sizewell C Project as a permanent legacy benefit to the existing footpath network.</p> | N |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Both the B1122 (Abbey Road) and Buckleswood Road would remain available for access. Whilst the level crossings would cause some short delays during periods when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements would predominantly be at night.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 2 of Volume 9 of the ES.</p> | |
| Green rail route | <p>Request for further details about the green rail route, especially regarding rail movements, flood risks, length of construction and environmental impact.</p> | <p>The physical proposals for the green rail route at Stage 4 consultation were unchanged from Stage 3 consultation. The only difference is that under the integrated freight management strategy the green rail route would accommodate three freight trains per day at peak construction (six movements per day) compared to five freight trains proposed under the rail-led strategy (ten movements per day).</p> <p>Under the integrated strategy there would only be one daytime freight movement (running in a gap in the passenger timetable) and the five other movements would need to run along the East Suffolk line overnight. These train movements would not be subject to the same capacity constraints because they would run outside of the passenger service hours. For this reason,</p> | Y |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>there would be no need to increase the speed above the current 20mph: these trains would travel within the current operation controls in place on the East Suffolk line and no changes to level crossings would be necessary. Therefore, the integrated strategy presented at Stage 4 represented a more feasible option in terms of the existing constraints on the rail network.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk and environmental impact in general, mitigation is proposed in order to reduce the impacts of the green rail route as much as possible, including the use of swales and infiltration basins as appropriate. For more information, please see Chapters 2 to 12 of Volume 9 of the ES.</p> <p>Construction work for the green rail route is envisaged to take circa 18 months and is expected to be operational within the first 2 years of the Sizewell C Project construction programme.</p> | |

o. Sizewell Halt

Theme: Site Suitability



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
|-------------------|---|--|--------|
| Community Impacts | Concern that use of a rail terminal at Sizewell Halt will affect commuter trains and disrupt passenger journeys, in particular on the Ipswich to Lowestoft line. | <p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the neither the Sizewell Halt nor the rail siding options should be taken forward. Instead the rail spur option introduced at the Stage 4 consultation is proposed in the application for development consent.</p> <p>During construction of the Sizewell C Project there would be two trains in and two trains out (four movements) at night on the East Suffolk line between 23:00 to 06:00. Freight trains would be held on the branch line, off of the East Suffolk line, between 06:00 to 07:00 so as to not disrupt the passenger service commencing on the main East Suffolk line.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement.</p> | Y |
| Community Impacts | Concern about disruption for nearby residents and businesses from noise pollution, vibration from the unloading of trains | <p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. removed the rail siding following the Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>SZC Co. is progressing with the rail spur option consulted upon at Stage 4 as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. This option does not follow the existing rail</p> | Y |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | as well as concern about dust pollution for those living next to the rail terminal. | <p>alignment adjacent to Eastlands Industrial Estate and instead involves a spur, which is further from many of the existing properties.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
| Criteria | Suggestions that those directly impacted, by the development at Sizewell Halt should have their views considered in deciding what approach SZC Co. are to take. | <p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. removed the rail siding following the Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>SZC Co. is progressing with the rail spur option consulted upon at Stage 4 as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. This option does not follow the existing rail alignment adjacent to Eastlands Industrial Estate and instead involves a spur, which is further from many of the existing properties.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | Y |
| Further Assessments | Suggestions that more impact assessments are required including | Details of the temporary development at Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | on timings, activities on the LEEIE, train idling and passing points. | <p>During construction of the Sizewell C Project there would be two trains in and two trains out (four movements) at night on the East Suffolk line between 23:00 to 06:00. Freight trains would be held on the branch line, off of the East Suffolk line, between 06:00 to 07:00 so as to not disrupt the passenger service commencing on the main East Suffolk line.</p> <p>Once the proposed rail extension route is operational, three trains (six movements) per day will travel along the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line to the new terminal within the main development site. Trains would move at a low speed of no more than 25mph.</p> <p>Further details can be found in Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement which includes sets out the predicted environmental effects associated with the rail movements.</p> | |
| | Suggestion that more information is required about the operation of the LEEIE at the different stages of | <p>Details of the temporary development at Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>During construction of the Sizewell C Project there would be two trains in and two trains out (four movements) at night on</p> | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | <p>construction, rail movements on the East Suffolk and branch lines and questions about level crossing use at the end of the rail terminal.</p> | <p>the East Suffolk line between 23:00 to 06:00. Freight trains would be held on the branch line, off of the East Suffolk line, between 06:00 to 07:00 so as to not disrupt the passenger service commencing on the main East Suffolk line.</p> <p>Once the proposed rail extension route is operational, three trains (six movements) per day will travel along the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line to the new terminal within the main development site. Trains would move at a low speed of no more than 25mph.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 2, Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10), eight of the existing level crossings on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line are proposed to be upgraded. The Sizewell level crossing will not be upgraded as freight trains will not be using Sizewell Halt, with a temporary rail terminal to be built at land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) for deliveries by rail in the early years. As such, no trains would use the Sizewell level crossing and no upgrade works are necessary.</p> <p>Further details on the final proposals for the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line can be found in Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p> | |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Land take | Concern that SZC Co. are taking further land at Sizewell Halt which will lead to the industrialisation of Greenfield sites. | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed Sizewell Halt from the proposals. | Y |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Safety | Concern that proposals for an overhead conveyer crossing over Kings George's Avenue are dangerous. | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed the conveyer over King George's Avenue. | Y |
| Noise pollution | Concern that noise pollution from the long conveyer route will radiate over a wide area. | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed the conveyer over King George's Avenue. | Y |
| Community Impact | Support for the option of a new rail spur as it will result | SZC Co. welcomes support for the rail spur option and this now forms part of the application for development consent. | Y |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | in less disruption to residents and businesses elsewhere on Kings George's Avenue or to residential areas. | | |
| Traffic / congestion | Support for new rail spur because it allows for longer trains to be used so can help reduce road traffic. | SZC Co. welcomes support for the rail spur option and this now forms part of the application for development consent. | Y |
| Environmental Impact | Support for the option of a new rail spur as it will reduce the overall impact of noise and air pollution. | SZC Co. welcomes support for the rail spur option and this now forms part of the application for development consent. | Y |
| Noise pollution | Concern over noise pollution emanating from the use of a new rail spur, in particular at Crown Farm, Crown Lodge. | Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) contains the noise and vibration assessment for the main development site. It states that night-time noise will be below the significant observable adverse effect level (SOAEL) and above the lowest observable adverse effect level (LOAEL) for parts of the construction phase. Measures to minimise both | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>noise and vibration levels would include an acoustic fence or bund around the perimeter of Crown Lodge within Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate.</p> <p>Please see Volume 2, Appendix 11H of the ES, for further information of the Noise Mitigation Scheme.</p> | |
| Air pollution | <p>Concern that a new rail spur would increase amount of dust and diesel fume pollution for local residents. Further suggestions that analysis of the impact on residents at Crown Lodge had not been carried out.</p> | <p>Volume 2, Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) contains the air quality assessment for the main development site, including consideration of the rail spur. It states that mitigation measures including pre-existing screening and wet suppression of construction dust will be available to mitigate effects on local residents, including Crown Lodge. The effect of diesel fumes on local residents is assessed as being not significant in the above chapter, due in part to the layout of the site and the infrequent use (two trains per day during the early years of construction) of the spur by the trains.</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

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

a. Overall Proposals

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---------------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Location | Positive comments about the location of Sizewell C due to existing nuclear infrastructure already being in place. | SZC Co. welcomes support for the location of Sizewell C. | N |
| Mitigation | Comments supporting SZC Co's plans to mitigate landscape and visual impacts, believing these will be of benefit to the area. | SZC Co. welcomes support for the proposed approach to mitigating landscape and visual effects. | N |

| Theme: Safety | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|---------------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Security | Concern over the potential security threat a new nuclear plant entails, | Safety and security of the proposed development is of utmost importance for SZC Co. and has been an underlying consideration in the development of the | N |

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

| Theme: Safety | | | |
|---------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | and questions about how SZC Co. will prevent the site being exploited by terrorists. | <p>proposals.</p> <p>The safety and security arrangements of the Sizewell C nuclear power station are strictly regulated through existing legislation, compliance against which would be assessed by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) prior to the granting of a Nuclear Site License.</p> <p>The ONR will hold SZC Co. accountable for ensuring that the operator fulfils its regulatory and legal responsibilities in this regard.</p> <p>Further information on the proposed safety and security arrangements is provided within Chapter 27 (Major Accidents and Disasters) of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Economic benefits | Challenging SZC Co. over the claims of economic benefits suggesting the figures | SZC Co. has undertaken a robust assessment of the potential likely significant benefits to the local and wider economy in terms of employment creation, supply chain spending, additionality and wages and benefits to | N |

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | produced are inaccurate and would need updating. | <p>employment, skills and education.</p> <p>These assessments are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3), and within the Economic Statement (Doc Ref. 8.9) which also includes appendices that set out measures to enhance benefits to the supply chain and labour market (via employment, skills and education interventions).</p> <p>Economic figures are based on national published datasets, feedback from contractors, and experience at Hinkley Point C and Sizewell B, and therefore represent the best available data sources for predication of economic benefits of Sizewell C. As with any assessment over this timescale, there is inherent uncertainty and the construction phase of Sizewell C is likely to include at least one economic cycle – as such, assessments have included the potential for effects during economic peak and troughs, and mitigation/enhancement strategies are flexible to respond to economic changes.</p> | |
| Community Impacts | Concern that the peace and tranquillity of the area will be lost to local residents as a result of the developments. | SZC Co. have undertaken a full assessment of the environmental aspects – including noise, transport, socio-economics, visual amenity and air quality – as part of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). Each assessment considers the likelihood of | Y |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Socio-economics | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>significant adverse effects, and where appropriate, measures to reduce or avoid them. This includes physical design measures embedded into the design, and management plans that will be enacted during the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>In order to aid local residents in understanding the potential effects on their communities, SZC Co. has also developed a Community Impact Report (Doc Ref. 5.13) which summarises at a local ward level the effects of the Sizewell C Project on local communities.</p> <p>SZC Co. also recognises that there will be multiple residual, intangible effects on communities which may result in perceptions of a reduction in quality of life. As such, SZC Co. has proposed a Community Fund that will be used to fund measures, projects and programmes in local communities which seek to improve quality of life for those most affected.</p> | |

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | | |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Other road users | Concerns about the lack of provision for cyclists as part of SZC Co's transport proposals, this includes the concern over closure of cycle routes and crossings as well as forcing cyclists to mix with the increased traffic. | <p>SZC Co. have considered cyclists as reported in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>There are no proposals to close cycle routes or crossings other than bridleway 19 where it would cross the main development site. For this route, a comprehensive diversion route has been designed and is included in the DCO. Cyclists would be encouraged to use this route to stay off road and not mix with the Sizewell C construction traffic.</p> | Y |
| Designated areas | Concern that the transport proposals will cause knock on disruption to designated sites such as RSPB Minsmere and that the pollution will impact Sizewell Marshes SSSI. | <p>SZC Co. have taken care to avoid and reduce impacts on ecology, including designated sites. Chapter 14 of Volume 2 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6) presents the assessment of potential effects of the main development site on terrestrial ecology and ornithology. The potential for construction works to impact on ecology as a result changes in air quality is considered in the ES.</p> <p>Mitigation included within the design to minimise effects on ecology include (but is not limited to) boundary treatments to reduce disturbance from construction activities, the provision of pollution prevention measures within the Outline Drainage Strategy (refer to Volume 2, Appendix 2A of the ES (Doc Ref. 6)) and the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> | Y |
| Rail-led Strategy | Support for the rail-led strategy as having the least overall impact on | Further environmental assessment work undertaken as part of Stage 4 concluded that the predicted impacts of the three options are broadly comparable and therefore there | Y |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | the environment. | <p>was no environmental reason to prefer road based strategy, having regard to the clear policy preference for rail over road where practicable.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led and Rail-led Strategies, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • beach landing facility; • green rail route; • two village bypass; and • Sizewell link road. <p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by</p> | |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | |
| Rail-led strategy | General comments expressing concern about environmental damage that will be caused by the rail-led strategy. | <p>SZC Co. have concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | Y |
| Road-led strategy | Concern that the road-led strategy will have a negative impact on the lives of people who live near some of the main routes proposed, such as Middleton, by making it much more difficult for | <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | residents to use roads and access services as a result of the increased traffic. | | |
| Criteria | Suggestions that whichever transport option is chosen; it should be the one that has the least overall environmental impact. | <p>Further environmental assessment work undertaken as part of Stage 4 concluded that the predicted impacts of the three options are broadly comparable and therefore there was no environmental reason to prefer road based strategy, having regard to the clear policy preference for rail over road where practicable.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led and Rail-led Strategies, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | Y |
| Safety | Concern that existing safety problems would be exacerbated by the proposed road improvements, without specifying which aspects | <p>Chapter 10 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) reports on road safety considerations.</p> <p>All of the proposed highway improvements have been designed to DMRB standards and subject to a Stage 1 road safety audit. There will be subsequent safety audits</p> | Y |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Transport (Overall Strategy) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | they are referring to. | (stage 2) of the proposals after detailed design is completed as part of Suffolk County Council's technical approval process, one month after the junction is opened to traffic (stage 3) and after twelve months of use (stage 4). | |
| Beach Landing Facility | Suggestion that navigational markings should be of a high standard and small craft mooring should be provided. Further suggestion that other ports might need to be considered for abnormal indivisible loads. | The Beach Landing Facility (BLF) would be used to receive large deliveries, including abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) to Sizewell C by barge. Barges would be loaded at a transshipment port and on approach to the BLF the barge would be assisted by tugs and moor at the end of the BLF at high water. As the water level drops, the barge would ground. Large deliveries would then be transported to site along the BLF access road. The BLF would facilitate occasional AIL deliveries during the operational life of the station, approximately every 5-10 years. Further information can be found in Chapter 22 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3). | Y |
| Climate change | Support for whichever park and ride option would have lowest greenhouse gas emissions. | The development of both park and rides (northern and southern) would assist in lowering climate change as they would capture traffic movements from both the north and south of the A12 and also west of the A12. By maximising the interception of construction worker traffic in this way, the park and rides will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project. | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Materials | Specific suggestions that Stage 4 materials should include further details, for example, about the Saxmundham user worked crossing. | <p>The Stage 3 consultation provided detailed information on the Sizewell C Project as a whole, including the relevant planning policy context, socio-economic and transport strategies, and detailed scheme descriptions for the development at the main site and each of the different associated development components – based on the two alternative freight management strategies: a rail-led and a road-led strategy.</p> <p>The purpose of the Stage 4 consultation was to provide an update on SZC Co’s thinking in relation to the various components of the Sizewell C Project and to introduce, and seek views upon, an alternative third option for the management of freight transport, referred to as the ‘integrated strategy’.</p> <p>The details of proposals such as the level crossing types had not altered at Stage 4 and therefore it was not considered necessary to present this information again. However, SZC Co. welcomed further comments on the detailed proposals at Stage 3 as part of the Stage 4 consultation.</p> | N |
| Publicity | Concern over how well publicised the | The Stage 4 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Updated SoCC (November 2016), as agreed with | N |

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | consultation was, including concerns that the summary booklet was not distributed door-to-door and many residents were not made aware of consultation. | <p>Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC), as discussed in Appendix D.6 to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Stage 4 was widely publicised through traditional and social media. Sizewell C Community Forum members, Parish Councils and statutory stakeholders received emails announcing the start of consultation over two weeks prior to its launch on 18 July 2019.</p> <p>Over 40,000 newsletters were sent to homes and businesses announcing the consultation and advertising the events.</p> <p>All publicity and activity was undertaken in accordance with the Updated SoCC.</p> | |
| Timescale | Concern that the consultation process has been too bureaucratic and long-winded. Suggestion that it was time to start work, and that responses should be published within 12 weeks. | <p>Adequacy of consultation is a requirement of the planning process. Stage 4 focussed on a limited set of updated proposals but they were a significant change from those presented at Stage 3, so it was decided that a shorter, additional stage of consultation was necessary.</p> <p>In accordance with the Updated SoCC, SZC Co. summarised the feedback received in a presentation to the Sizewell C Community Forum on 19 December 2019 and in a newsletter distributed to over 40,000 homes and</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Consultation Process | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | businesses within a ten-mile radius of Sizewell in January 2020. | |

b. Pylon Options

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Landscape / visual | Comments stating lower height pylons are less intrusive without reference to either of the proposed pylon options. | <p>SZC Co. have undertaken an assessment of the potential visual impacts of an option that would reduce the height of one of the taller pylons, but would consequentially require an additional pylon. On balance it is considered that the four pylon scheme (two at circa 48m in height and two at circa 65m in height) is preferable to the option that would introduce a fifth pylon.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Environment | General concern that the use of overhead cables will adversely impact the environment. | <p>SZC Co. noted a preference from consultees during the Stage 4 consultation for the undergrounding of the connection, to remove the need for overhead lines. The consultation confirmed that SZC Co. would continue to assess the practicability of this, and the implications for the Sizewell C Project – although noting that these implications were likely to be significant.</p> <p>Whilst adverse effects are anticipated on visual receptors along Sizewell beach during construction and operation arising from the power station structures/sea defences, the choice of an option that would reduce the visibility of pylons from Sizewell beach would be preferable. The difference in pylon heights between Options 1 and 2 makes a marginal difference to the effects arising from the remaining viewpoints assessed. On balance reducing the visibility of pylons from Sizewell beach is considered to be more important and so the four-pylon option (Option 1) is preferred.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p> | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Health | General concern that the use of overhead cables will be a health hazard for people living nearby. | As detailed in Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.3), the Sizewell C Project grid connection would align with the existing infrastructure and would comply with the Department of Energy and Climate Change Code of Practice, set to preclude any material risk to public or occupational health. On this basis, once operational there is a negligible change in electromagnetic fields (EMF), and no measurable risk to health. | N |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Safety | Support for the option of constructing five pylons as being a safer option due to it avoiding overhead cables going over the diesel generator building. | Either of the pylon options would be safe to construct and operate. Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4). | N |
| Visual and landscape | Concern that the five pylon option will have a greater impact on the landscape due to the increased number of pylons. | Following Stage 4 consultation, SZC Co. undertook further analysis of Options 1 and 2 presented at Stage 4 consultation, from four appraisal viewpoints. Details of the appraisal viewpoints, including a brief description of the existing view is set out at Table 3.4 of the Site Selection Report , appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref | N |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>8.4).</p> <p>Of the viewpoints considered in the appraisal, Sizewell beach is closest to the proposed development, and currently comprises views south along the beach that are not influenced by overhead power lines.</p> <p>It was judged that Option 2 generated greater adverse effects in views from Sizewell beach than Option 1. Option 2 would have resulted in a greater amount of visual ‘clutter’ extending out from the existing and proposed power station structures into what is an otherwise relatively simple coastal landscape. As such, particular consideration should be given to visual receptors in this location, their sensitivity and susceptibility to change.</p> <p>Whilst adverse effects are anticipated on visual receptors along Sizewell beach during construction and operation arising from the power station structures/sea defences, the choice of an option that would reduce the visibility of pylons from Sizewell beach would be preferable. The difference in pylon heights between Options 1 and 2 makes a marginal difference to the effects arising from the remaining viewpoints assessed. On balance reducing the visibility of pylons from Sizewell beach is considered to be more important and so the four-pylon option (Option 1) is</p> | |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>preferred.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Site Selection Report, appended to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref 8.4).</p> | |

c. Northern Park and Ride

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Alternative locations | Comments suggesting the northern park and ride site at Darsham should be located further north, without specifying a location. | The park and ride at Darsham is proposed in this location in order to be located close to the predicted routes that would be used by the construction workforce, the majority of which are predicted to use the A12. The site at Darsham also has other qualities that SZC Co. sought, including self-containment and being of a sufficient size to accommodate the facilities. For further information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Site Selection Report provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4). | N |
| Legacy | Support for the potential legacy benefit of the park | Support for the proposals at Darsham are noted. | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | and ride site at Darsham, in particular with the car park being able to support passengers using Darsham station in the future. | | |
| Community impact | Concern that the northern park and ride will have an adverse impact on residents' access to routes in the area. | The park and ride at Darsham is intended to capture construction workforce traffic from the A12, and to then transport workers to the main development site by shuttle bus. The transporting of workers by bus is to mitigate against impacts on the local transport network. Further information is available in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | N |
| Other road users | Concern the northern park and ride will increase traffic volumes that severely restrict cycling and impact the national cycle route that crosses the A12. | The impacts of the proposals on nearby cycle routes have been considered and assessed. The proposals include a new three-arm roundabout, which would be built to the north of the existing A12/Willow Marsh Lane junction, and Willow Marsh Lane would be closed to vehicular traffic between the existing junction with the A12 and the access into the site. This section of Willow Marsh Lane would remain open to pedestrians and cyclists, as well as for vehicular access to and from White House Farm. This would help to safeguard the amenity of people cycling along this part of Willow Marsh Lane to access the Sustrans link to National Cycle Route 1. Further | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | information can be found in Chapter 8 (Amenity and Recreation) of Volume 3 (Northern Park and Ride) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.4) | |
| Wildlife / ecology | Concern that flora and red deer habitats would be adversely impacted by the northern park and ride. | This comment is noted. Chapter 7 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 3 (Northern Park and Ride) of the Environmental Statement identifies all designated wildlife sites and sensitive habitats in and around the site. Mitigation through the provision of landscaped bunds, a 1.8m high perimeter security fence and the controlling of operational lighting and drainage are considered to be suitable for the protection of wildlife. | N |
| Safety | Concern that traffic associated with the northern park and ride will pose a danger to pedestrians due to congestion and the lack of foot crossing. | The proposals include a new three-arm roundabout and the partial closure of a section of Willow Marsh Lane to protect the amenity of cyclists and pedestrians. Further information can be found in Chapter 8 (Amenity and Recreation) of Volume 3 (Northern Park and Ride) of the Environmental Statement . | N |

d. Southern Park and Ride

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Community Impact | Concern that traffic associated with the southern park and ride might impact Wickham Market infrastructure and damage roads or local buildings. | The park and ride is proposed to be accessed off the northbound slip road of the A12, to the east of Wickham Market. The majority of traffic is anticipated to arrive on the A12, although there may be some traffic accessing the site through Wickham Market given that the intention of the southern park and ride is to capture traffic from the west of the A12. Traffic impacts associated with the southern park and ride have been assessed as part of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). | N |
| Mitigation | Concern that the planned mitigation associated with the southern park and ride could have an adverse impact on safety of road users and pedestrians. | <p>The access to the southern park and ride site has been subject of a Stage 1 road safety audit, as reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5). This did not highlight any safety concerns at the access, which has been designed to DMRB standards. There will be subsequent safety audits after detailed design is completed as part of the technical approval process (stage 2), one month after opening to traffic (stage 3) and after 12 months of use (stage 4).</p> <p>There is no other road safety concern in this area.</p> <p>SZC Co. have identified poor visibility to the right where the A12 southbound exit slip road meets the B1078 south west of the park and ride site. This is caused by the overbridge parapet and could not easily be rectified. At</p> | Y |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Stage 3, SZC Co. therefore proposed that SCC extend the 30mph speed limit across the overbridge to the B1116/B1078 roundabout and will continue to encourage them to do so.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be a significant number of pedestrians in the area around the park and ride site.</p> | |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

e. Sizewell Link Road / Theberton Bypass

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Restoration | Comments supporting the removal of the link road after construction in order to remove the visual and environmental impact it had. | <p>The proposed development would be permanent and is expected to become part of the adopted highway network. The proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton. It would be a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project. The temporary contractor compounds would however be removed following completion of construction.</p> <p>The landscape and visual impact and environmental impact of the Sizewell link road is assessed in Chapter 6 (Landscape and visual) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p> | N |
| Other road users | Suggestions that access for cyclists is maintained in the design of the new link road, allowing safe crossings for cyclists and protection for cyclists using the route. | A new overbridge, single span, up to 44m long would carry non-motorised users only (pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians) over the Sizewell link road and connect to Pretty Road on either side. In area 3 of the Sizewell link road a new walking and cycling route from the existing Littlemore Road, which will continue along the proposed Middleton Moor link, is proposed to allow a crossing point over the route of the proposed Sizewell link road east of the junction with the Middleton Moor link, and joining Littlemore Road on the south side of the route. For further | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | details please see Chapter 2 (Description of the Sizewell link road) of Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.7). | |
| Further assessments | Suggestion for further assessments of how wider environmental change such as rising sea levels should be taken into account in restoration planning for the Sizewell link road. | <p>Further environmental assessments have been undertaken since the Stage 4 consultation. Please see Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement (Book 6) for details. The proposed development does not include any marine infrastructure and there are no pathways which would lead to any likely significant effects on the marine environment.</p> <p>The HCDF would be designed to protect the main platform from still water levels up to 1 in 10,000-year return period for the entire operation phase and the spent fuel store decommissioning phases. The sea defence crest level would initially be constructed to a level of 10.2m AOD with adaptive design to potentially raise the defence in the future up to 14.2m AOD, if sea level changes require.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p> | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

f. Two Village Bypass

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | Support for the two village bypass due to safety benefits of having traffic using the bypass rather than travelling through Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham. | <p>The new bypass would be designed to current Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards. New roads of this type have a significantly lower accident rate than the existing roads.</p> <p>The design has already been subject to a at Stage 1 road safety audit. Stage 2 would take place after detailed design is completed, stage 3 one month after the scheme had opened to traffic and stage 4 after 12 months of use.</p> <p>The new road will be significantly safer, particularly at the Friday Street junction, than the existing roads.</p> | N |
| Other road users | Concern about the safety of cyclists who will be forced on to the A12 as a result of the two village bypass proposals, as well as a suggestion that SZC Co. consider the impact on cyclists. | <p>Cyclists travelling along the A12 would be able to choose to use either the bypass or the existing road. Since the traffic volume on the existing road will be extremely low once the bypass is opened, cyclists would almost certainly choose to use the existing road and not the bypass. Cycling volumes along the A12 are likely to be low in any event.</p> <p>Cyclist safety has been considered in the Stage 1 safety audit and would be considered in subsequent stage 2, 3 and 4 safety audits of the bypass scheme.</p> | N |

g. Yoxford Roundabout

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Other road users | Suggestions for cycle access crossings to be included as part of the designs for the proposed Yoxford roundabout. | <p>The traffic surveys undertaken at Yoxford showed a very low level of cycling on the highway network. Consequently, the roundabout design does not currently make explicit provision for cyclists.</p> <p>The stage 1 safety audit did not raise any concerns about the provision for cyclists. However, it may be that as the design is developed in more detail, post DCO, some provision for cyclists could be made within the proposed layout.</p> | N |

h. Freight Management Facility

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Other road users | Concerns over the safety of cyclists if HGVs were to be making their way to and from a freight management facility site. | <p>There is a Sustrans national cycle route about 1.5km south of the proposed freight management facility. Cyclists travelling in this area would almost certainly use this route in preference to cycling along the Old Felixstowe Road adjacent to the freight management facility.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the highway access proposals for the freight management facility, designed to DMRB standards, have been subject to a stage 1 road safety audit, which did not raise any concerns about cyclists.</p> <p>There will be subsequent safety audits (stage 2) of the proposals after detailed design is completed as part of Suffolk County Council's technical approval process, one month after the junction is opened to traffic (stage 3) and after twelve months of use (stage 4).</p> | N |
| Safety | Concern that either of the proposed facilities will lead to an increased risk of traffic accidents, especially at the junction between the A14 to Croft Lane. | <p>The Innocence Farm site, presented as an option at Stage 4 consultation and accessed from Croft Lane, has not been taken forward into the DCO proposals.</p> <p>The alternative site, accessed through the Seven Hills junction, has been preferred by SZC Co. and forms part of the DCO. The effect of this scheme on road safety has been considered and is reported in the Transport</p> | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5), which concludes that there would be no significant impact on road safety. | |
| Restoration | Concerns that SZC Co. will not restore the land used once construction is complete. | SZC Co. note this concern. Part of the mitigation for the loss of agricultural land in this location is its remediation and restoration following the ceasing of the freight management facility use. This is secured through the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11), with the development of a Soil Management Plan. Further information is available in Chapter 10 (Soils and Agriculture) of Volume 8 (Freight Management Facility) of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.9). | N |
| Wildlife / ecology | Concern that freight traffic to and from either facility will have a significant and negative impact on the environment and wildlife. | This comment is noted. Chapter 7 (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of Volume 8 (Freight Management Facility) of the Environmental Statement identifies all designated wildlife sites and sensitive habitats in and around the site. Mitigation through the provision of landscaped bunds, a 1.8m high perimeter security fence, additional ecological fencing, the installation of SuDS, and the controlling of operational lighting and drainage are considered to be suitable for the protection of wildlife. | N |
| Other road users | Suggestions for dedicated cycle paths on the old Felixstowe road, through areas at Trimely, use of existing hatched | The site at Innocence Farm is not being pursued as a site for the freight management facility by SZC Co. so these measures are not proposed. | N |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|----------|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | areas with 'Armadillo' bollards both sides of Trimley roundabout and a new path marked adjacent Kirton Road. | | |

i. Rail improvements

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

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | development set out within the DCO application. | |
| Level crossings | Suggestion that an alternative to the proposed Martlesham level crossing is needed to avoid closing off the Fynn Valley Walk. | As set out in the Site Selection Report , provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.'s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. Level crossing upgrades on the East Suffolk line are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application. | N |
| Public rights of way | Concern over the proposed green rail route as disrupting public rights of way, as well as concern about the closure of Buckleswood Road. | In order to keep the PRoW on the green rail route open, temporary diversions of the existing footpaths will be provided. A temporary diversion of Footpath E-363/003/0 will be provided, passing along the southern edge of the proposed rail extension route to Wood Farm, before continuing north-west over the new barrier-controlled level crossing on to Buckleswood Road. | Y |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>Footpath E-363/006/0 and Footpath E-363/010/0 would be diverted eastwards to the proposed Bridleway 19 diversion, on the western side of the B1122 (Abbey Road) level crossing, before heading back westwards and re-joining their original alignment.</p> <p>The footpath diversion to the south of the proposed rail extension route, linking Footpaths E-363/006/0 and E-363/010/0 would be retained following completion of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>At the Stage 4 consultation, respondents continued to favour the option of a level crossing at Buckleswood Road, rather than a footbridge option. It was therefore decided to take the level crossing option forward to the DCO application. The level crossing was preferred as it would keep Buckleswood Road open to vehicular traffic and would better resolve the concerns expressed by respondents in terms of disruption, safety and access. The footbridge option would also have a greater visual impact on the surrounding landscape and was therefore discounted as an option following Stage 4.</p> <p>For further detail, please refer to Volume 9 of the</p> | |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.10). | |
| Other road users | Suggestions for improvements to cycle paths near the green rail route and calls for more information regarding the green rail route and its potential impact on cyclists. | <p>The proposed footpath diversions, together with their connectivity with Bridleway 19 would ensure that existing cycle routes in the area are not lost while the green rail route is in place.</p> <p>Whilst the level crossings would cause some short delays to cyclists on Buckleswood Road and the B1122 (Abbey Road) during periods when the crossings are closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements are likely to be spread throughout the day.</p> | N |
| Access | Concern that the Saxmundham crossover will adversely affect, or fully prevent access to and egress from the properties near the Saxmundham crossover. | <p>As set out in the Site Selection Report, provided in Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the rail-led strategy would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co's programme for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Integrated Strategy proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the rail-led strategy by including only those rail improvements that</p> | Y |

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | | <p>do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application such that three trains per day (six movements) can be supported rather than the five trains per day (ten movements) under the rail-led strategy.</p> <p>The Saxmundham crossover was part of the rail-led strategy and therefore does not form part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> | |
| Other road users | Suggestion that the crossing of the National Cycle Network 42 over the Leiston to Saxmundham railway should be maintained for cyclists. | National Cycle Network 42 currently crosses the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line at the Saxmundham Road level crossing. This crossing is proposed to be upgraded within the DCO application and will remain part of National Cycle Network 42. Whilst there would be short delays when the level crossing is closed, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements are likely to be spread throughout the day. | N |
| Level crossing | Support for improvements to the Leiston to Saxmundham line, including level crossings. | SZC Co. recognises and welcomes the support for the proposed improvements to the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line. | N |



j. Sizewell Halt

| Theme: Need Case | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Traffic / congestion | Support for the use of Sizewell Halt as a method for reducing road use. | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed Sizewell Halt from the application for development consent. Rail facilities will instead access Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate via the rail spur included in the Stage 4 consultation. | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Designated areas | Concern that the site is too close to Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Minsmere and Sizewell Marshes SSSI site. | <p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed Sizewell Halt from the application for development consent. Rail facilities will instead access Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate via the rail spur included in the Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>The chosen rail option is located within land already identified for construction activities in previous consultations. Volume 2, Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) assesses the impact of development on designated sites, including RSPB Minsmere and Sizewell Marshes SSSI.</p> | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Wildlife / ecology | Concern about disturbing rare birds as a result of the development of Sizewell Halt. | <p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed Sizewell Halt from the application for development consent. Rail facilities will instead access Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate via the rail spur included in the Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>Further information on the assessment of terrestrial ecology and ornithology can be found in Chapter 14, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | Y |
| Criteria | Suggestion that the option selected should be the one with the lowest social impact. | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has chosen to proceed with the rail spur option presented in the Stage 4 consultation. Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) assesses Sizewell C Project activities that may have an impact on health and wellbeing, including rail. | N |
| Criteria | Suggestion that the options selected should be the one with the lowest environmental impact. | The rail spur consulted upon at Stage 4 consultation was chosen as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. Further details are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). | Y |

| Theme: Site Suitability | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Criteria | Suggestion that the priority should be getting freight off roads and supporting whichever option does that most effectively. | The rail spur consulted upon at Stage 4 consultation was chosen as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. Longer trains are able to remove more freight from roads. Further details are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). | Y |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| Longer trains | Support for the option of an overhead conveyer as a result of it being able to accommodate longer trains. | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed the conveyor over King George's Avenue. SZC Co. is progressing with the rail spur option consulted upon at Stage 4 as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. Further information can be found in Volume 9 of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.10). | Y |
| Landscape and visual | Concern that an overhead conveyer will | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed the conveyor over King George's | Y |

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | have a negative effect on the appearance of the area. | Avenue. | |
| Landscape and visual | Support for a new rail siding on land east of Eastland's Industrial Estate, to prevent an 'unsightly' overhead conveyor over King George's Avenue. | Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed the conveyor over King George's Avenue. SZC Co. has chosen to proceed with the rail spur as it will enable longer trains to deliver to Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate. | Y |
| Longer trains | Support for a new rail spur as allowing more freight to move by train, minimising HGV road use in East Suffolk and wider network. | SZC Co. welcome support for a new rail spur at Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate, which is the chosen option following Stage 4 consultation. | Y |
| Community impact | Concern that splitting the estate as shown in the option of a new rail spur, will make it difficult for the caravan pitches to access King George's Avenue other than by foot. Suggestions that this will lead to | Proposed temporary development at Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate includes a private footpath for construction workers to access Leiston, which is routed from the caravan pitches to the existing footpath at the western end of Valley Road. It is highly unlikely that there would be a direct connection between the caravan pitches and King George's Avenue and therefore residents of King George's Avenue would not be disturbed. | N |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Alternative Site Assessment | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | Change |
| | disturbance of residents when people return to their caravans. | Further details of temporary development and activity at Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate, are set out in Chapter 3, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc. Ref. 6.3) . | |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table G.3: Summary of Section 42 Responses to the Targeted Consultations

| Theme: Site Suitability | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response |
| Wet Woodland | Concern over location and quantum of wet woodland. | <p>SZC Co. has proposed the addition of 0.7ha of wet woodland in this targeted consultation, which would be located to the west of the Grove and would establish over the long-term. This location is low-lying and considered to be capable of providing wet woodland habitat with relatively modest levels of excavation.</p> <p>This will provide beneficial compensation for the loss of wet woodland associated with the proposed development, specifically permanent development at the main platform and SSSI crossing.</p> <p>It is recognised that there would be an overall net loss of 1.9ha of wet woodland. Wet woodland is not a habitat type for which Sizewell Marshes SSSI is designated although it partly supports the invertebrate assemblage designated feature.</p> <p>SZC Co. has therefore committed to preparing a Wet Woodland Strategy, in consultation with key stakeholders, which will identify additional opportunities to provide wet woodland compensatory habitat.</p> <p>In respect of location, there are few locations within the main development site which are suitable for wet woodland creation and which would not have the</p> |



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Site Suitability | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response |
| | | <p>potential to cause adverse impacts to the Sizewell Marshes SSSI or require very extensive excavation. The proposed location combines an element of a flood storage compensation (part of earlier proposals) in a relatively low-lying area which would require relatively modest excavation.</p> <p>Further details on the Wet Woodland Strategy are set out in Chapter 14, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> |

| Theme: Ecology | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| Wet Woodland | Supportive of wet woodland creation. | SZC Co. is pleased that the opportunity to create wet woodland is supported. Further details of the approach are provided in the row above. | N |

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| Theme: Ecology | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| Biodiversity net gain | Consideration of whether the development achieves biodiversity net gain. | <p>The water resource storage area and the adjacent wetland area have been assessed as part of the development of the Sizewell C proposals within a biodiversity net gain assessment. This is located at Volume 2, Appendix 14E of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The biodiversity net gain assessment demonstrates that the development as a whole would achieve biodiversity net gain.</p> | N |

| Theme: Ecology | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| Species-specific mitigation | Suitability and effectiveness of mitigation for specific species (bats, marsh harrier). | <p>The water resource storage area and wetland habitat area would be built on a small part of the EDF Energy Estate that has already been established as marsh harrier compensatory habitat. That compensatory habitat is for the predicted loss of foraging land at Sizewell Marshes SSSI, which is required due to a barrier effect caused by construction activity on the main development site.</p> <p>Independently of the water resource storage area and wetland habitat area, the marsh harrier habitat is being further improved through the addition of measures such as scrub planting.</p> <p>The water resource storage area and wetland habitat area are considered to further improve the quality of habitats for marsh harriers, as they will comprise two wetland features, amongst other design considerations. These wetland features can be expected to attract small numbers of wetland birds and mammals, which in turn should attract marsh harriers.</p> <p>Existing woodland corridors adjacent to the main development site boundary in this location, which are used</p> | N |



| Theme: Ecology | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|---|--|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| | | <p>for foraging, commuting and roosting by bats, would be unaffected by the proposed development.</p> <p>There will be no fixed lighting at the water resource storage area and the adjacent wetland, as secured by the Lighting Management Plan, which is located in Appendix 2B of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water

| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Groundwater and surface water | Request for additional information to understand impacts on groundwater and surface water. | <p>The impacts of the water resource storage area and the adjacent wetland area on groundwater and surface water have been assessed as part of the main development site in the Environmental Impact Assessment and are reported in Chapter 19, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). No new significant effects are considered to result on groundwater and surface water receptors as a result of these proposals.</p> <p>Additional information on construction is set out in Chapter 3, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). The Outline Drainage Strategy, which is inter-related with groundwater and surface water matters, is located in Appendix 2A, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | N |



| Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| Water Supply | Concern raised as to where 25,000m3 of water will come from without impacting on the adjacent wetlands, particularly in times of drought. | <p>The water supply for the water resource storage area is likely to come from winter flows, stored for use over summer. More specifically, the storage area is expected to capture and store excess water, as well as both greywater and treated effluent collected from within the main development site. All sources of water would be in excess of the natural requirements of the site and surrounding area.</p> <p>In addition to the above, SZC Co. has developed a water supply strategy by engaging with stakeholders including the Environment Agency, Essex & Suffolk Water and Anglian Water to discuss and assess other potential sources of water supply during the construction phase. Further details are set out in Appendix K of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> | N |

| Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| Flood Compensation | Concerns regarding increased flood risk to the site and off-site receptors. | <p>The lined water resource storage area is to be located in Flood Zone 3 which has the potential to reduce the extent of the floodplain. However, the adjacent wetland area would involve excavation on the edge of the existing floodplain, thereby providing additional flood compensation, which would help offset this.</p> <p>The impacts of the water resource storage area and the wetland area have been assessed as part of the overall development in the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.2). With mitigation in place, all flood risk remains within acceptable levels and there would be no new flooding to receptors and no effect on the overall duration of flooding.</p> | N |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Construction impacts | Concern over construction impacts of | The construction impacts of the water resource storage area and the adjacent wetland area have been assessed | N |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>noise, lighting on nearby habitats and on landscape character.</p> | <p>as part of the overall development, in both the Environmental Impact Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment processes and reported in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Shadow HRA report (Doc Ref. 5.10) respectively.</p> <p>Construction works would be timed to minimise disturbance effects on foraging marsh harriers during their breeding season, and effects on both these birds and wintering waterfowl species are assessed as not significant in Chapter 14, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>There will be no fixed lighting at the water resource storage area and the adjacent wetland, as secured by the Lighting Management Plan, which is located in Appendix 2B, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Screening planting would be provided along the eastern side of Sandy Pytle Plantation and at the northern edge of Dove House Hill. As well as vegetation screening, the banks of the water resource storage area would have a naturalistic design. Further details on design considerations are set out in Chapter 3, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| Theme: Construction Impacts | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| Construction impacts | Concern over construction impacts of noise, lighting on nearby habitats and on landscape character. | <p>The construction impacts of the water resource storage area and the adjacent wetland area have been assessed as part of the overall development, in both the Environmental Impact Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment processes and reported in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the Shadow HRA report (Doc Ref. 5.10) respectively.</p> <p>Construction works would be timed to minimise disturbance effects on foraging marsh harriers during their breeding season, and effects on both these birds and wintering waterfowl species are assessed as not significant in Chapter 14, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>There will be no fixed lighting at the water resource storage area and the adjacent wetland, as secured by the Lighting Management Plan, which is located in Appendix 2B, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref.</p> | N |

| Theme: Construction Impacts | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Topic | Summary of Comments | Response | |
| | | 6.3). Screening planting would be provided along the eastern side of Sandy Pytle Plantation and at the northern edge of Dove House Hill. As well as vegetation screening, the banks of the water resource storage area would have a naturalistic design. Further details on design considerations are set out in Chapter 3, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3). | |