



The Sizewell C Project

5.1 Consultation Report Annex H Stage 4 Section 42 Consultee Response Summaries

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

May 2020

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



Annex H – Stage 4 Section 42 Consultee Response Summaries

Contents

1.	Summary of Responses from Prescribed Consultees, Local Authorities and Town and Parish Councils	1
1.1	Aldeburgh Town Council.....	1
1.2	Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council	1
1.3	Blaxhall Parish Council	2
1.4	Blythburgh Parish Council	2
1.5	Bredfield Parish Council	2
1.6	Bromeswell Parish Council	3
1.7	Butely, Wantisden and Capel St Andrew Parish Council.....	3
1.8	Campsea Ashe Parish Council	4
1.9	Clopton Parish Council	4
1.10	Dunwich Parish Council.....	5
1.11	East of England Ambulance Service	5
1.12	SZC Co. Sizewell B Power Station	6
1.13	Essex County Council.....	6
1.14	Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council.....	7
1.15	Felixstowe Town Council	7
1.16	Forestry Commission.....	8
1.17	Great Glemham Parish Council	8
1.18	Abellio Greater Anglia Limited	8
1.19	Hacheston Parish Council	9
1.20	Historic England	10
1.21	Ipswich Borough Council	10
1.22	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council	10
1.23	Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council	11
1.24	Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council	12
1.25	Little Glemham Parish Council	13
1.26	Marlesford Parish Council.....	14

1.27	Martlesham Parish Council.....	15
1.28	Melton Parish Council.....	15
1.29	Middleton Cum Fordley Parish Council.....	16
1.30	Ministry of Defence.....	17
1.31	Nacton Parish Council.....	17
1.32	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc (National Grid Ventures).....	17
1.33	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc and National Grid Gas Plc.....	18
1.34	National Air Traffic Service.....	18
1.35	Natural England.....	18
1.36	Network Rail.....	19
1.37	NHS Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group.....	19
1.38	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority.....	20
1.39	Peasenhall Parish Council.....	21
1.40	Public Heath England.....	21
1.41	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.....	22
1.42	Rendlesham Parish Council.....	22
1.43	Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council.....	23
1.44	Saxmundham Town Council.....	23
1.45	Scottish Power Renewables.....	24
1.46	Snape Parish Council.....	24
1.47	Sudbourne Parish Council.....	25
1.48	Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council.....	25
1.49	Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.....	30
1.50	Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service.....	31
1.51	The Office of the Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner.....	31
1.52	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council.....	32
1.53	The Environment Agency.....	32
1.54	Trinity House.....	34
1.55	Ufford Parish Council.....	34
1.56	Walberswick Parish Council.....	34
1.57	Waldringfield Parish Council.....	34

1.58	Wickham Market Parish Council	35
1.59	Woodbridge Town Council.....	36
1.60	Yoxford Parish Council	36
2.	Summary of Responses from Section 42(1)(d) Consultees by Theme	36
2.1	Overall Proposals	36
2.2	Main Development Site.....	45
2.3	Pylon Options	49
2.4	Northern Park and Ride at Darsham	49
2.5	Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market.....	50
2.6	Sizewell Link Road/Theberton Bypass	50
2.7	Two Village Bypass	55
2.8	Yoxford Roundabout.....	58
2.9	Freight Management Facility	59
2.10	Rail Improvements.....	59
2.11	Sizewell Halt	60

Tables

None provided.

Plates

None provided.

Figures

None provided.

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

1.1 Aldeburgh Town Council

1.1.1 Aldeburgh Town Council commented that the site was too small, as evidenced by the need to relocate facilities at Sizewell B. They felt construction would damage the area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) and local environment. They believed planning permission to relocate facilities at Sizewell B should not be determined in isolation to the Sizewell C Development Consent Order (DCO). Pylons were considered unacceptable and, combined with the design of the buildings, were believed to breach criteria contained in the EN-6 (Nuclear Power Generation) National Policy Statement (NPS). The council suggested working with National Grid as part of a Visual Impact Provision Project to place the cables underground.

1.1.2 Concern was expressed about a lack of information about light goods vehicle (LGV) and car movements around the site and proposals for heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) were considered inadequate. The integrated transport strategy was preferred but the council wanted more rail to be included as part of it. They were disappointed by the lack of a legacy benefit from the new link road which, they commented, would also destroy footpaths and damage properties and farms, suggesting the D2/W route to be included instead. The plans for temporary constructions such as the Sizewell link road and accommodation campus at Eastbridge were considered too vague.

1.1.3 The council questioned SZC Co.'s application submission deadline of spring 2020 commenting that this did not allow for issues to be properly appraised. They further felt previously raised concerns about water supply had not been addressed, nor had an adequate economic assessment been carried out.

1.1.4 They believed that SZC Co. planned to transfer in skilled workers from construction at Hinkley Point C so questioned whether there would be any local employment benefit. They were concerned about tourism and requested that an impact assessment be carried out. The council raised the fact that mitigation funds had not yet been released and raised further concerns about the cumulative impact of other infrastructure projects within the locality. They also questioned the economic case for proceeding with Sizewell C given the increasing costs of the Sizewell C Project.

1.2 Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council

1.2.1 The council commented that there are a number of homes, including sites catering especially to the elderly and Beach View Holiday Park, that will be

significantly impacted during construction of Sizewell C. They therefore requested that they be formally consulted despite the fact their boundary lies just outside the Sizewell shapefile.

1.3 Blaxhall Parish Council

1.3.1 Blaxhall Parish Council were concerned that SZC Co. had not responded to their Stage 3 feedback. The council stated that if the sea transport option did not exist, they would prefer a rail option but were concerned about potential closures of level crossings in Blaxhall. They requested that Network Rail prioritise improvements for this project, as roads were felt to already be at capacity and the council feared the countryside would be ruined by HGVs. They stated that traffic management methods and enhanced mobile coverage were essential to mitigate the increased traffic.

1.4 Blythburgh Parish Council

1.4.1 Blythburgh Parish Council asked that their response be treated as an addendum to Stage 3. They supported a rail-led strategy augmented by road improvements but opposed the integrated strategy. SZC Co.'s concern about time pressures was disputed because they suggested the deadline was self-imposed by SZC Co.. The council requested consideration of rolling highway train systems and the marine transport option. They also suggested the Woodbridge to Saxmundham line should be dual tracked to remove HGVs and provide legacy improvements.

1.4.2 The council commented on existing problems with road surfaces at the north entrance to the village and the bend on the A12 (the junction with the B1125), where there were issues with traffic flow and pollution. They disputed the baseline traffic figures for Blythburgh and stated that cut-through driving and fly parking within the village and along the B1125 had not been addressed. They felt that the A145/A12 junction was an accident hot spot which would be exacerbated with the additional traffic, and they requested that the Sizewell link road be kept after the construction.

1.4.3 The timing of the consultation and perceived lack of information was felt to be unsuitable, and they suggested concerns raised at earlier stages were not addressed. However staff at the "Have your Say" sessions and from Planning Aid England were described as helpful.

1.5 Bredfield Parish Council

1.5.1 Bredfield Parish Council reiterated points made in responses to the previous stages, particularly concerns about additional traffic and the wider effect this would have. They suggested the full impact of traffic levels on the southern

stretch of the A12 had not been fully addressed in the consultation documents and that vehicles accessing the A12 from Bredfield would face significant delays to join the road safely. They expressed concerns that traffic bound for the park and ride at Wickham Market would use cut-through routes through Bredfield, increasing traffic levels with a detrimental effect on the air quality for the area that had not been recognised.

1.5.2 The council raised concerns about the impact this could have on the local tourist industry as they have a number of tourist accommodation sites, and feel there was still no mention of any mitigation measures to alleviate these problems or any response to issues they raised in previous stages of consultations. They commented that some form of mitigation such as improvements to the Bredfield exit onto the A12 from Woodbridge Road would be required and they would welcome some mitigation.

1.5.3 The council commented on the rural nature of the area, and were concerned that the increased traffic would disrupt this, causing damage to properties, local flora and fauna. They felt that SZC Co. had not understood or addressed these issues.

1.6 Bromeswell Parish Council

1.6.1 Bromeswell Parish Council supported the development but claimed the information provided was inadequate. They preferred the use of sea transportation or mixed road and rail if that was not possible. They requested legacy improvements for rail and road infrastructure, specifically, improved road links along the A12 from the Seven Hills Interchange with the A14 to Darsham.

1.6.2 The council was concerned about the closing of rail crossings that linked local communities. They commented that current congestion on access roads to Bentwaters business park meant it should not be involved in the construction. They also stated that Sizewell C Project traffic should be banned from the A1152 between the Woods Lane roundabout on the A12 through Bromeswell, Eyke Rendlesham and other local villages.

1.7 Butely, Wantisden and Capel St Andrew Parish Council

1.7.1 Butely, Wantisden and Capel St Andrew Parish Council reiterated their comments from Stage 3 which they felt had not been taken on board. They opposed the proposals due to the cost per unit of electricity, limited lifetime of the plant, cheaper price of renewable energy, and long-term maintenance required due to coastal erosion. They further noted the cost and schedule overruns at Hinkley Point C and suggest that this could also affect

construction of Sizewell C. The council was further concerned that an influx of workers would overwhelm local facilities.

1.8 Campsea Ashe Parish Council

1.8.1 Campsea Ashe Parish Council believed the proposals lacked detail. They recognised the scheme's importance but stated that the social, structural and environmental impacts on East Suffolk had not been considered. They commented on the impact construction would have on Suffolk Coasts and Heath AONB, the Suffolk Heritage Coast and the impact on tourism and the landscape in general. The council also commented on the cumulative impact of other infrastructure projects in the region and were disappointed by the lack of response to their Stage 3 submission.

1.8.2 A rail-led strategy was favoured due to environmental concerns. The council acknowledged the potential benefits of the rail strategy whilst cautioning against the impact from vibrations and pollution. Traffic was a major factor in their rejection of the road strategy and a section of the A12 between its junction with the A14 and the Woodbridge A12 Woods Lane roundabout was a concern. They raised concerns about the potential use of the Bentwaters/Base Park. They stated that problems caused by HGVs on Ivy Lodge Road and Marlesford Road would be exacerbated and they requested a 7.5t weight limit and Traffic Regulation Orders to mitigate problems.

1.8.3 The council supported the principle of a southern park and ride but thought locating it further south should be investigated as they felt current proposals would increase traffic in Wickham Market and neighbouring villages to unmanageable levels. They supported the A12 two village bypass and the A12/B1122 Yoxford roundabout improvements in theory but raised concerns about pollution on the B1078, B1078/B1116 roundabout, the A12 slip roads and Wickham Market. They requested increased capacity on the slip roads, including at the B1078/B1116 roundabout. They suggested vegetation should be removed from areas around the B1078 bridge to give better visibility for traffic and that the 30 miles per hour (mph) speed limit in Lower Hacheston could be extended west to the B1078/B1116 roundabout.

1.9 Clopton Parish Council

1.9.1 Clopton Parish Council raised concerns about the overall impact on traffic and on the B1078 through Clopton in particular. They felt that the Wickham Market park and ride would increase traffic through the village.

1.9.2 The council believed the B1078 was unsuitable for HGVs because it was narrow, lacked pavements and had a high speed limit. The junctions at Monewden Road, Manor Road and Shop Road were of concern due to poor

visibility that had already led to accidents. They suggested it was important for residents to be able to cross the B1078 near the Shop Road junction to access the playing field and village hall. They were concerned that residents with houses on the B1078 would access the road directly from their driveway creating further hazards. The council requested a significant reduction in the speed limit prior to the start of the construction.

- 1.9.3 Existing problems on the A12 were also highlighted and the council asked SZC Co. to work with Suffolk County Council (SCC) to reduce congestion here as well as on the B1078. They also questioned the practicality of the diversion route around Wickham Market.

1.10 Dunwich Parish Council

- 1.10.1 Dunwich Parish Council stated that their concerns raised in Stage 3 had not been addressed and felt that Stage 4 had little relevance to the overall picture. They preferred the option for five pylons as they felt that this would lessen the visual impact. They preferred any transport option that minimised road use but had concerns about rail option 3; commenting that it enabled longer trains that would lead to more rail freight than was desirable. They objected to the Sizewell link road but commented that it would be a waste to remove it after the construction and this would cause more disruption.

1.11 East of England Ambulance Service

- 1.11.1 East of England Ambulance Service offered no opinion on the overall proposals but were supportive of the safe delivery of the scheme and looked forward to the ratification of the Strategic Relationship Protocol between SZC Co. and themselves.
- 1.11.2 In reference to the proposals at the main development site, they expressed support for the SCC response. They supported the option for four pylons as they perceived it to have less of an impact on services.
- 1.11.3 They suggested there be further investigation into the transport modelling for the freight management facilities (FMFs) proposed, and reiterated their Stage 3 comments on the need for robust management of HGV traffic.
- 1.11.4 They expressed a preference for the rail-led strategy due to it removing more vehicles from the roads, particularly in comparison to the road-led strategy which was their least preferred option. They recognised the potential benefits of the integrated strategy but still felt there would be significant vehicle movements on the roads, making it less suitable than the rail-led strategy.

1.11.5 They endorsed the SCC's response on proposed road improvements, including the Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass and the park and ride sites. They continued to believe that the option of a new rail siding adjacent to the existing line was the most appropriate option, and suggested that further consideration of the option of a new rail spur would be required.

1.12 SZC Co. Sizewell B Power Station

1.12.1 SZC Co. had no representations to make but stated that they would continue to monitor developments. They asked for future correspondence to be sent to the Planning & Development Consents Manager.

1.13 Essex County Council

1.13.1 Essex County Council were unclear if previous responses had been considered and wanted SZC Co.'s DCO submission to show how responses had shaped the final proposal. They noted potential benefits to the economy, community funding, infrastructure, and the provision of an approach for decommissioning nuclear waste. They wanted impacts to be minimised and sustainable transport in keeping with the sensitive nature of the area to be pursued.

1.13.2 They questioned the removal of the marine-led strategy and were concerned about HGVs causing congestion, resulting in social and economic impacts. They commented on potential noise and vibration impacts on residential sites close to railway lines. The council also felt there had been an omission of mitigation measures for the integrated strategy and suggested traffic in Essex had not been considered. They commented that existing problems on the A12 and the Copdock Interchange would be exacerbated.

1.13.3 Essex County Council were concerned about the cumulative impact from other developments and requested mineral supply and waste management audits. They opposed raising land in the same way as at Hinkley Point C due to ecological and environmental impacts but supported the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Concerns were raised about the landscape, coastal processes and closure of the Suffolk Coastal Walk. More information was required about mitigation of environmental damage and the beach landing facility (BLF). They felt there was a lack of regard for the impact, importance and purpose of the AONB and site of special scientific interest (SSSI). They further noted negative impacts on air quality, noise levels, light pollution, water quality and vibration damage. They felt the location of the accommodation campus had not been justified.

1.13.4 Potential benefits for education and training were noted but further detail on the inter-relationships with Bradwell B was required. They referred to the impact on tourism and questioned the adequacy of the mitigation fund.

1.14 Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council

1.14.1 The Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council commented on the two village bypass by stating that SZC Co. had not considered routing it east of Foxburrow Wood. They believed the plans would be challenged through the DCO process. They commented that the western route would impact the dwellings at Farnham Hall and supported the eastern route, despite concerns about its impact on farming. They commented that SZC Co. had not considered the local environment, tourism and businesses, or the human rights of residents.

1.14.2 The council commented that the consultation underestimated the number of dwellings affected. They disagreed with the reasons for the proposed western route of the two village bypass. They questioned SZC Co.'s assumptions of driver behaviour, and SZC Co.'s claim that the woodland between Foxburrow Wood and Palant's Grove was 'ancient woodland', and that Stratford Plantation was part of Glemham Hall Registered Park and Garden. Consequently, the council felt an eastern route was more appropriate.

1.14.3 They claimed that SZC Co. had not disclosed a proper cost/benefit analysis including compensation under the Land Compensation Act 1973 and Compulsory Purchase Act 1965. They felt that an ecological survey of the land between Foxburrow Farm and Palant's Grove should have been undertaken. They raised concerns about local access to Farnham Hall Farmhouse and the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network serving Foxburrow Wood.

1.14.4 The council claimed that the mitigation of environmental impact was inadequate because, due to the lack of rain in the area, new trees and shrubs would require 3 years of weekly watering in the growing season to establish.

1.15 Felixstowe Town Council

1.15.1 Felixstowe Town Council reiterated their concern about the impact on road and rail capacity in and around Felixstowe. This had featured in their responses at Stages 2 and 3 and they were disappointed that their feedback was not reflected in Stage 4. They recommended that any FMF be located close to the Seven Hills junction rather than at Innocence Farm as the Innocence Farm site would increase HGV traffic on the A14, which will already be exacerbated by the growth of the Port of Felixstowe. This would

need to be considered alongside Suffolk Coastal Local Plan proposals for housing across the Felixstowe peninsula and the associated impact on traffic.

1.15.2 The Council accepted that the proposed Seven Hills FMF would necessitate upgrading the A1156/Felixstowe Road junction prior to construction commencing. They requested the introduction of additional lanes and intelligent traffic light signalling.

1.16 Forestry Commission

1.16.1 The Forestry Commission commented on the potential impact on ancient woodland and raised specific concerns about the Stage 4 red line plans. They commented that the A12 two village bypass would be close to Foxburrow Wood ancient semi-natural woodland and the proposed branch line would pass close to Buckle's Wood ancient semi-natural woodland. In both cases fuels, construction materials and spoil should not be stored nearby, and buffer zones would need to be used.

1.17 Great Glemham Parish Council

1.17.1 Great Glemham Parish Council opposed the development and highlighted its proximity to an AONB and SSSI as well as the receding coastline. They stated that concerns raised in Stage 3 had not been addressed and they had not changed their opinion.

1.17.2 They opposed the Theberton bypass and favoured a direct link road, favouring the D2/W route. They requested further information on how accidents on the A12 would be dealt with and noted there was already congestion on the A12, specifically from the A12 roundabouts at Foxhall Road to the dual carriageway at Ufford. They requested a collaborative approach between stakeholders to review how lorry movements from the freight management sites are marshalled. They were also concerned that Yoxford would suffer from congestion. They commented that satellite navigation would route large volumes of traffic along unsuitable country lanes, particularly when approaching Sizewell via the A14.

1.17.3 They disputed the necessity of pylons but stated a preference for option 2. They opposed the Wickham Market park and ride site because of the lack of legacy benefits and suggested that it was too far from nearby villages.

1.18 Abellio Greater Anglia Limited

1.18.1 Abellio Greater Anglia limited were concerned about impacts on current or future growth in patronage of the East Suffolk line. They welcomed planned maximisation of rail transport but suggested that the upgrades did not go far

enough. They supported dualling of the rail line from Woodbridge to Saxmundham but felt that exiting congestion in the Ipswich area could increase.

- 1.18.2 In addition to level crossing upgrades, they felt the line speed should increase to 90mph to improve service resilience and journey times. This would make it more attractive than the A12 and reduce the need for road upgrades. They requested the release of freight paths on the East Suffolk line that were required for Sizewell A de-commissioning works. They also suggested there should be provision of a “clockface” frequency all day on the line, and an additional loop on the northern section of the route.

1.19 Hacheston Parish Council

- 1.19.1 Hacheston Parish Council reiterated their opposition to the location of the southern park and ride site and suggested it be moved further south to reduce traffic on the A12. The current location was felt to have a negative visual impact and they were unconvinced by the mitigation plans. Concerns about current pinch points such as the Fiveways roundabout and the lower part of Wickham Market High Street were also raised. They opposed the Sizewell C Project and reiterated the concerns and requests for more information they had made at the previous stages.

- 1.19.2 They noted the changes to the red line boundary for the southern park and ride and requested more information on the proposals. They suggested deceleration markings be shown before the A12 northbound and for slip roads to be lengthened.

- 1.19.3 The road-led strategy was a concern due to the impact on traffic flows, pollution and the unsuitability of existing roads for HGVs, or if there was a major incident. In the absence of the marine-led strategy they strongly supported the rail-led strategy. They considered that the integrated strategy incorporated more of the road-led elements and they were disappointed to see a lack of legacy rail improvements. They noted that 5 of the 6 rail movements would be overnight and cause noise pollution.

- 1.19.4 The council requested the release of traffic movement data from the Hinkley Point C park and ride to assess the likely impact of the proposals. They claimed that SZC Co. had not provided projections of traffic movements at the Fiveways roundabout nor had it considered the combined effect of other planned infrastructure and housing constructions. The council considered that the proposal did not provide enough information concerning the height of the pylons in order to form a conclusion on which of the options would be more appropriate.

1.20 Historic England

- 1.20.1 Historic England acknowledged that the Sizewell C Project would result in public benefit as well as having impacts upon the historic environment. They therefore supported the process of continued engagement. They declined the opportunity to make detailed comments in response to the changes, but they did comment that many of the specific comments made in relation to the Stage 3 Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report remained valid.
- 1.20.2 They noted some of the changes that had been made but still had concerns about the impact of the green rail route on Leiston Abbey and requested further clarification over any changes to Leiston Road roundabout. They requested an evidence based approach to which pylon option is carried forward, and favoured whichever option would cause the least visual harm to the two primary designated heritage assets.
- 1.20.3 They recommended continued dialogue with the county and district councils as well as specialist heritage advisors regarding changes to the redline boundaries.

1.21 Ipswich Borough Council

- 1.21.1 Ipswich Borough Council restated their concerns from Stage 3. They requested a rail-led strategy and commented that the changes made in Stage 4 had not considered the impact on the Ipswich Garden Suburb from pollution and traffic. They requested that the Ipswich housing market be included in the Accommodation Strategy. The council was disappointed that the integrated strategy did not provide any legacy improvements to rail infrastructure. Concern was raised about the lack of information about the impact on the roads, accommodation and air quality in Ipswich.

1.22 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council

- 1.22.1 The council highlighted their concerns about the lack of data presented in the documentation, outlining specific areas where they considered that the data was inadequate or incomplete, such as traffic data and the PEI. They also commented on the perceived inadequate detail provided for maps and figures.
- 1.22.2 They outlined their concerns about the amount of rail use proposed and believed the estimated traffic load remained too high, with resulting impacts on the environment, residents and local industries such as farming and tourism. They criticised the dependence of the transport strategies, including the integrated strategy, on road transport and the lack of proposals to repair or renew the local road network.

- 1.22.3 The council commented on the potential carbon footprint of the Sizewell C Project and questioned if it would actually be able to produce enough power to be worth the high carbon cost of construction. They expressed concern about the increased land take proposed for the development and commented that little had been done to avoid impacts on the environment and community, for example, concerning pollution.
- 1.22.4 They commented against SZC Co.'s reasoning for the chosen Sizewell link road route. They expressed strong opposition to several proposed junctions of the link road and made detailed comments concerning the creation of cut through driving routes. They questioned plans for alternative routes in case of A12 closure and how construction traffic would be effectively managed.
- 1.22.5 They expressed concern about repair and renewal with regards to several of the road transport proposals. They stated that they had assumed that construction standards for highway changes had been agreed with SCC. They commented that a lack of information had been provided about road surface safeguarding and outlined their concerns about each of the proposed road improvements, including the Yoxford Roundabout. They requested that more information about the proposals, such as the FMF, be provided.
- 1.22.6 They expressed opposition to the stabling of trains on the Saxmundham to Leiston Branch line and commented that they would not support the proposed upgrades to the line without evidence that noise pollution would be limited. They requested that the green rail route be fully completed and operational prior to any road freight being initiated.
- 1.22.7 They expressed strong concerns about potential effects on water supplies in the area. The council also suggested the disturbance and air pollution resulting from the construction would have a deleterious effect on mental health and asthma. They also opposed the proposed annual cap on the community fund and suggested including an independent audit of 'impact mitigation' proposals.

1.23 Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council

- 1.23.1 Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council reiterated their concerns from Stage 3. They said that their belief that the site was too small was reinforced by the need for pylons and incursion into the SSSI. They supported the option for five pylons but were concerned about visual impact. They feared there would be pressure on local accommodation and asked how off-site accommodation would be managed. The council requested that SZC Co. invest more in facilities, and for infrastructure to be constructed prior to work on the main platform. They further requested that SZC Co. publish a timeline of the development.

- 1.23.2 They were concerned about traffic, transport and its impact on tourism, but were keen to engage with SZC Co. and involve Suffolk Highways and Leiston Together. They commented on the pressure on the B1069/B1119 junction and questioned whether SZC Co.'s plans could alleviate this, suggesting a one-way system might be necessary.
- 1.23.3 The council was pleased that early trains would be held outside Saxmundham and rail freight would only increase on the green rail route. They commented that an automated crossing was needed on Buckleswood Road and suggested that the footpath from Fishers Farm should have an off-road stretch to the crossing. In addition to planned rail improvements, the council suggested that SZC Co. upgrade the Station Road crossing.
- 1.23.4 For the Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) they preferred a new rail spur but should the option of an overhead conveyer be used, they commented that SZC Co. would need to ensure the train fitted fully into the railhead. In either case they suggested the King Georges Avenue rail crossing should be automated and that the park and ride, HGV and caravan park traffic should exit onto Lovers' Lane. They felt a signalled crossroads might be necessary near the Valley Road/Sandy lane junction and that if plans for access onto King Georges Avenue continued it would necessitate a roundabout at the Crown Farm junction. They were concerned by the removal of soil from Sandy Lane and stated that only one HGV should be allowed on it at once. They raised concern about noise and road surfaces and requested that SZC Co. resurface Sizewell Gap Road, Abbey Road, Haylings Road (through to west Knodishall) and Waterloo Avenue.
- 1.23.5 They supported the construction of a link road and other highway infrastructure but wanted them to be retained after the construction. If use of Sizewell Gap Road and the current Sizewell B site entrance continued, they suggested a new off-road route should be extended from the heliport entrance to the site entrance. They requested a signalled crossing at the heliport entrance which should be assessed by Suffolk Highways. They commented that a pedestrian crossing to the Kenton Hills Walks from the replacement bridleway (19) was also needed to improve safety measures and provide a legacy amenity.

1.24 **Levington and Stratton Hall Parish Council**

- 1.24.1 The council expressed a preference for a marine-led strategy, followed by a rail-led strategy, with the integrated strategy third and the road-led strategy as the least favoured option, as they felt that SZC Co. should minimise road transportation during construction of Sizewell C.

- 1.24.2 The council observed that a FMF would only be required under the integrated and road-led strategy and commented that, based on the integrated strategy, there would be an HGV movement every 1 to 2 minutes. They understood that this would be a 10% increase on current traffic, but suggested this would have a greater impact than anticipated, particularly on the quieter local roads and junctions.
- 1.24.3 They commented that the facility at Seven Hills would require vehicles to pull out at the already busy Seven Hills roundabout, and that crossing the Old Felixstowe Road would be problematic on a bend with limited visibility and where local traffic often has to wait in the middle of the road when turning off onto a smaller road. Further, they commented that the ‘trombone effect’ will make these problems twice as bad, and that as there is no mention of any road improvements the proposal would increase the likelihood of road traffic accidents in the area.
- 1.24.4 The council commented that, for the option of a facility at Innocence Farm, traffic would be leaving and re-joining a very fast stretch of the A14. They thought that this site would have similar issues as the Seven Hills site, increasing traffic and endangering road users in the area.
- 1.24.5 They commented that the absence of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) means there was no indication of the pollution that would be generated and this was particularly relevant for the Seven Hills FMF as there are residents that are close to the site.
- 1.24.6 The council suggested that, as both proposed FMF sites use Orwell Bridge, this could act as a pinch point. They did not feel there was enough provision for the high numbers of HGVs when the site would be closed.
- 1.24.7 They opposed both options for a FMF and suggested some potential sites that could allow entry and exit whilst travelling in the same direction including at the park and ride site at Wickham Market, an old Toys R Us site at Copdock or a site to the west of the A12 between the Seven Hills junction and the Foxhall roundabout.

1.25 Little Glemham Parish Council

- 1.25.1 The council focused most of their comments on transport issues. They commented that they accepted the need for a power station and welcomed the wider socio-economic benefits, even though they felt there was a lack of detail in some of the proposals.
- 1.25.2 They reiterated their Stage 3 comments, including concern about the transport impacts, the impacts of people moving to the area, travelling to and

from the campus, and the inadequacy of the two village bypass in comparison to the four village bypass. They felt the two village bypass would negatively impact local amenity, property values and exacerbate current traffic problems. They preferred a marine-led or rail-led strategy and noted the latter would require changes to the East Suffolk line, but was preferable to a road-led strategy. Concern was raised about cut-through traffic and they supported diverting traffic away from the Little Glemham. Improvements to the A140/B1078 junction were welcomed but they were surprised none were planned for Coddenham.

- 1.25.3 The council supported the use of park and ride sites albeit with some concerns about visual impact and that the park and ride site at Wickham Market might increase congestion on the northbound exit from the A12 to the B1078, B1078/B1116 roundabout and the Wickham Market area. Concern about safety for traffic joining the B1078 and A12 was raised but the council felt that this could be mitigated by lengthening slip roads and removing vegetation.
- 1.25.4 Concerns about pressure on the housing market, local services and impact on tourism were also raised. They suggested the pressure on these could be mitigated by on-site medical facilities, funds for other facilities and the promotion of tourism. Further to this they suggested measures to encourage sustainable private letting and reusing of empty buildings. They also requested on-site recreational facilities and disciplinary measures to stop anti-social behaviour.
- 1.25.5 They were disappointed by the short notice given regarding the launch of Stage 4, and the short time frame for responses, with the consultation being held over summer when many parish councils do not hold meetings.

1.26 Marlesford Parish Council

- 1.26.1 Marlesford Parish Council commented that at previous stages they had “kept an open mind”, but now did not support the proposals because their concerns had not been addressed. They felt that requested information had not been provided and wanted the process paused to resolve outstanding issues.
- 1.26.2 They opposed the location of the southern park and ride because of its impact on the landscape, air and noise pollution. They requested mitigation measures, legacy improvements and landscape restoration after the construction. Electric buses were suggested, as was the incorporation of the “Suffolk Energy Gateway” or four village bypass into the two village bypass. The council was concerned about increased traffic on the A12 and Wickham Market, and unhappy about the lack of improvements to the Marlesford/Little

Glemham stretch of the A12. They suggested using the existing Martlesham park and ride instead of Wickham Market.

1.26.3 In the absence of a marine-led strategy, a rail-led strategy was preferred but they requested engagement with Network Rail and central government. They felt the integrated strategy would increase HGV use, and the council wanted a reduction in night train movements under any strategy, but with particular reference to the integrated strategy. They suggested the use of the “Q Path” for daytime rail deliveries and asked for clarification about plans for the Bentwaters site.

1.26.4 The council suggested that the impact from other local infrastructure and housing projects had not been considered and questioned whether the reactor would withstand a catastrophic event caused by rising sea levels. They requested the undergrounding of cables and consideration of new siting criteria. Concerns were raised about the ecological impact on the SSSIs, Minsmere Reserve and how the water supply could cope with low rainfall in the region.

1.27 Martlesham Parish Council

1.27.1 The council felt that insufficient evidence had been released and that its concerns from Stage 3 were still valid. They commented that Stage 4 had not accounted for the government declared climate emergency and asked for a low-carbon strategy for the construction. Greater engagement with councils and promotion emergency planning proposals was also felt to be needed.

1.27.2 They supported the use of rail transport as that would provide legacy benefits but cautioned against disturbance from night trains. They felt more information about the national disposal facility was needed and they were concerned that other local infrastructure projects had not been accounted for. They also commented that construction should not take place at the same time as construction of the Ipswich Northern Route.

1.27.3 The council requested further consultation about the A12 laybys at Martlesham. They advised that if footpath 9 was closed where it crossed the railway, it would need to be diverted under the bridge. They suggested traffic lights were needed at the A12/A14 roundabout and raised concerns about the impact of increased traffic on pedestrians, cyclists, and the local environment.

1.28 Melton Parish Council

1.28.1 Melton Parish Council restated concerns from Stage 3, commenting that they had not been addressed, including their comments about the congestion they

felt the road-led strategy would cause. They commented that the integrated transport strategy would also cause damage to the environment and tourism industry due to congestion and pollution from traffic.

- 1.28.2 They opposed the use of pylons due to concerns about the AONB and believed the compensation funds for community, property and tourism were inadequate. They welcomed the planned apprenticeship scheme and noted the employment opportunities.
- 1.28.3 The council preferred use of rail transport, if sea could not be used, and were concerned that the integrated strategy would increase HGV movements and closures of rail crossings, leading to greater congestion and pollution. They commented that any rail option would also need investment in infrastructure.
- 1.28.4 They commented on recent housing developments near the Woods Lane roundabout on the A12, Woods Lane, Melton and the Deben Peninsula as this had increased traffic at the A12 junction and along the A1152, from Woods Lane to Melton village, the Melton level crossing, the Wilford Bridge and the roundabout junction with the B1083. The council felt that this made the Woodbridge/Melton reserve park and ride site less suitable.
- 1.28.5 The council raised concerns about a shortage of water in the Suffolk area that they felt would be exacerbated by the development and which SZC Co. had thus far not produced plans to mitigate.

1.29 Middleton Cum Fordley Parish Council

- 1.29.1 The council was concerned about the impact of increased traffic on the B1122 and B1125 and restated their comments about the lack of information. They reaffirmed their Stage 3 response and maintained their opposition to the proposals.
- 1.29.2 The suitability of the site was questioned due to the eroding coastline, fragile surrounding and size. They were concerned that local woods and amenities would be lost. Concerns were raised about the damage to the local environment, the tourism industry and the disruption for local people and farms.
- 1.29.3 The use of rail transport was welcomed but the impact on residents from closing or revising rail crossings was raised as a concern. The council also requested the reintroduction of the D2/W link road.

1.30 Ministry of Defence

1.30.1 The Ministry of Defence (MOD) noted that the site did not fall in the MOD's statutory safeguarding zone but was in an area used for generic military low flying training activities. They requested certain tall and narrow profile structures to be fitted with aviation warning lights and the visual impact of this to be assessed. Plans for overhead cables required review in relation to their low flying activities, to ensure they were marked on aviation charts. They commented that SZC Co. would also need to ensure that any planned maritime installations and works did not impact on defence interests.

1.31 Nacton Parish Council

1.31.1 The council asked SZC Co. to provide evidence for the dropping of the marine-led option but the council also expressed support for the rail-led strategy which, it felt, should provide a legacy. This strategy was felt to alleviate road traffic, be more environmentally friendly and the council recommended it was prioritised by central government. The council opposed the road-led strategy but preferred the integrated strategy if rail could not be used.

1.31.2 They suggested the FMF at Seven Hills would increase traffic, in particular on the inside lane of the A12 as HGV drivers tried to access the facility. If the facility was used they felt the T-junction on Felixstowe Road should be improved to cope with the increased traffic. The council was concerned about the risk to pedestrians accessing the crematorium. They questioned where lorries would go when the Orwell bridge was closed and expressed concern about congestion and cut-through traffic.

1.32 National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc (National Grid Ventures)

1.32.1 National Grid Ventures highlighted their planned Nautilus and EuroLink Interconnector projects in Suffolk. SZC Co.'s proposed green rail route would intersect with National Grid Venture's planned cable route and alternative options would be closer to the Sizewell power station and further into the Sizewell C main development site and sub areas, They suggested this would result in a conflict with SZC Co.'s first additional flood compensation site. The road-led strategy would also run into National Grid Venture's cable route options corridor area south of Theberton.

1.32.2 National Grid Ventures intended to make a Relevant Representation and register as an Interested Party when the plans are submitted for approval. They requested further technical and environmental assessments and for

SZC Co. to engage with the Nautilus team and National Grid Ventures in general to minimise disruption.

1.33 National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc and National Grid Gas Plc

1.33.1 In a joint response National Grid noted that there are no gas transmission assets located within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits, but that there are a number of overhead lines and underground cables, as well as some high voltage substations in close proximity to the consultation area.

1.33.2 They requested SZC Co. take into consideration their right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect their assets. They also suggested statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times, with no buildings closer than 5.3 metres (m) to the lowest conductor. They commented that this must be maintained if any ground level changes are proposed beneath or in close proximity to existing overhead lines and that any landscaping uses flora that will not interfere with overhead lines. They suggested that drilling or excavation could disturb the foundations of existing towers and that any work that could impact National Grid access to underground cable is communicated to them ahead of time.

1.33.3 They commented that the draft DCO should include sufficient land within the red line boundary to enable the necessary works to overhead lines and the substations.

1.34 National Air Traffic Service

1.34.1 National Air Traffic Service noted that as they operate no infrastructure within 40 kilometres (km) of the application's location they anticipated no impact and had no comments to make on the application.

1.35 Natural England

1.35.1 Natural England were pleased the two village bypass avoided Foxburrow Wood but were concerned about pollution and environmental damage. They advised that the semi-natural buffer be planted and use of a green bridge to maintain ecological connectivity. They raised ecological concerns about the River Alde crossing that necessitated a clear span bridge. Clarification of whether the red line boundary extended into deciduous woodland was needed and the potential for pollution from rail movements was raised.

1.35.2 They felt the EIA needed to outline impacts on all Section 41 priority habitats and show how they would be avoided, mitigated or compensated.

Assessments of the marsh harrier mitigation sites was necessary, and ‘compensation’ could only be used if mitigation was not possible.

- 1.35.3 SZC Co.’s commitment to assess the practicality of undergrounding cables was welcomed but they asked about the height of pylons in both options. They were concerned about impact on the SSSI, including the crossing and the visual impact on an AONB. They reiterated their Stage 3 feedback.
- 1.35.4 Changes to the Kenton Hills car park were noted to mitigate the ecological impact from recreation but they requested ‘on-site’ alternative greenspace. Additionally, they asked for strategic ‘off-site’ measures and ongoing monitoring.
- 1.35.5 Natural England commented on the loss of SSSI habitat, including fen meadow, which would be difficult to recreate. They also suggested it was unclear how much SSSI habitat land would be lost. They requested assessments of existing biodiversity and compensation sites to allow for restoration of former fen meadow rather than enhancement of existing meadows. Natural England suggested the environmental parameters needed to match local high quality M22 stands and they encouraged use of Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Biodiversity Net Gain Metric 2.0 which they were keen to discuss further with SZC Co..

1.36 Network Rail

- 1.36.1 Network Rail identified several tactical interventions to the local rail network that included the closure of 12 and changes to 33 level crossings. They suggested this would require a separate Transport and Works Act order outside of the DCO process that could influence the timescale. For the Transport and Work Acts orders and DCOs, Network Rail have standard protective provisions which may need to be included in the DCO. They also commented that DCO, Transport and Works Act orders, legal, commercial agreements and any land transfer, easement etc. needed to go through Network Rail’s clearance process and other rail industry processes.
- 1.36.2 Network Rail saw several risks with the rail-led strategy and restated their feedback from Stage 3. Discussions about potential impacts to infrastructure, including level crossings, with SZC Co. were needed as well as consideration of increased usage of the crossings and impact of HGVs.

1.37 NHS Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group

- 1.37.1 The Clinical Commissioning Group suggested their previous responses to the Stage 3 consultation and the EIA were not superseded by this response

to Stage 4 and welcomed ongoing engagement with SZC Co. with regards to the health aspects of the proposals.

1.37.2 The Clinical Commissioning Group commented that despite the estimates of peak workforce increasing from 5,600 to 7,900, no justification was provided for why this estimate had increased, or how they would be accommodated since there had been no updates to either the accommodation campus or caravan site. They stated that they would welcome further discussions with SZC Co. on how this would affect the health care system and they requested further information on the Community Fund as they saw this as essential to mitigating impacts. They felt unable to support the application based on this concern but were happy to work with SZC Co. and other health partners to obtain the best outcomes for Suffolk.

1.38 Nuclear Decommissioning Authority

1.38.1 The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) requested engagement regarding power/water supply, site access, and impacts on environment, security, supply chain, economy and communities.

1.38.2 The NDA stated that further detail was needed regarding transport plans and exploration of collaborative access/transport solutions prior to the submission of the DCO application. They requested clarification of the BLF's location and sea defences and concern was raised about the impact of construction on the decommissioning of Sizewell A.

1.38.3 The NDA requested engagement about security/emergency management to understand potential impacts and mitigating actions, and to identify opportunities that were mutually beneficial to both sites and the wider community.

1.38.4 NDA asked about plans to acquire land, to ensure that these did not affect their land, prior to the DCO application. Clarification and a timeline showing how land issues would be resolved was felt to be needed. They noted opportunities for strategic reuse of NDA land and to prevent unnecessary development on previously undeveloped land.

1.38.5 The NDA requested dialogue to agree protective provisions and potentially include them in the DCO on application. The NDA stated that without agreement, they would propose protective provisions through submission of representations during the DCO process.

1.39 Peasenhall Parish Council

1.39.1 The council noted much of Peasenhall was located alongside the A1120 and the impact of increased traffic on the A1120 was felt to be severe. The council commented on pollution and the number of HGV movements and felt these would affect the impact on quality of life for residents and damage old buildings.

1.39.2 They favoured the rail-led strategy or an integrated approach that utilised as much rail as possible. The need for works at the Yoxford roundabout was questioned and they supported construction of the Sizewell link road. Use of a freight management system was noted, and they requested a monitoring sensor to ensure vehicles did not pass through the town. The council also stated that HGVs would not be permitted on the A1120.

1.39.3 The council commented that mitigation measures to alleviate the use of LGVs were needed and they disputed the view that there would only be a minor increase in private car use on the A1120. They requested a speed camera or traffic lights to be installed at the junctions of Oak Hill and Church Street and the A1120. They felt noise attenuation measures should also be funded, and air pollution monitors should be installed. Concern about the eco-system at the Minsmere Nature Reserve was also raised.

1.40 Public Health England

1.40.1 Public Health England reiterated their response to previous stages. They re-emphasised that pollutants from road traffic were non-threshold, thus likely to cause harm, and so supported plans to minimise or mitigate public exposure.

1.40.2 They looked forward to the radiological impact assessment and commented that the combined impact of historical, current and prospective discharges and direct radiation from all relevant sites on humans and non-human biota would need to be included, as would the radiological impact of any solid waste storage and disposal. They urged SZC Co. to read the Environment Agency's guidance on decommissioning, and noted that the process of considering radiological impact of major accidents and disasters was a new requirement.

1.40.3 They suggested that health and wellbeing be evaluated in the following areas: access, traffic, transport, socioeconomic and land use. Public Health England welcomed SZC Co.'s recognition that there might be cumulative negative effects on the environment and local population due to other infrastructure projects in the region.

1.41 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

1.41.1 The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) reiterated their response to Stage 3 and stated that they would welcome future opportunities to engage with SZC Co.. They were concerned about transport routes that went through countryside stewardship scheme areas and night trains disturbing wildlife in the Minsmere-Walberswick SSSI, Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site. They felt further assessments should be carried out and existing assessments updated.

1.41.2 The RSPB welcomed the reduction in SSSI loss but queried the temporary aspect of the plan described in section 5.3.2 of the consultation document. They requested habitat assessments for the land required west of the main platform and mitigation or compensation for any losses. The impact of the fifth pylon on the SSSI corridor was also raised and they questioned whether the bridge or walkway at Aldherst Farm would affect habitat.

1.41.3 The RSPB recommended that the suitability of the marsh harrier mitigation areas be assessed, questioned current assessments and asked for further details to be released. They stated that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) required these measures to be referred to as mitigation not compensation.

1.41.4 Whilst welcoming the planned compensation areas for loss of SSSI fen meadow habitat they requested an ecological assessment of those areas. They further stated that long-term monitoring would be needed as well as assessments of the construction work and proposed hydrological changes on the sites and conservation areas adjacent/nearby. They noted fen meadow compensation site 1, south of Benhall, was close to sewage works, amenities and at risk of flooding, but suggested the opportunity to link to Manor Farm Meadows county wildlife site (CWS) should be explored. They raised concern that fen meadow compensation site 2, east of Halesworth, might impact public access for walkers.

1.42 Rendlesham Parish Council

1.42.1 The council were concerned that the marine-led strategy had been dropped and the reasons not published. The need for pylons was disputed and they claimed they were unnecessary and contrary to the stated design limits.

1.42.2 The council felt that commercial factors had taken precedence over external stakeholder views. The integrated strategy was believed to be an attempt to justify not using rail because of the risk associated with reliance on Network Rail. They commented that the integrated strategy was not much better than

the road-led strategy and was short-sighted due to a lack of legacy benefits. Concern about disruption to crossings such as Melton was also raised.

1.42.3 They asked how SZC Co. would manage multi-drop delivery vans and what steps would be taken to prevent fly parking. The potential use of former Bentwaters base was welcomed due to employment opportunities, but they continued to express concern about vehicle movements. They requested that these be managed and controlled within the overall planning conditions and asked SZC Co. to develop a ‘masterplan’ for this facility.

1.43 Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council

1.43.1 A rail-led strategy was preferred by the council as an environmentally friendly option that would minimise HGV movements and associated pollution. The council opposed the road-led strategy because it would exacerbate existing congestion in and around Ipswich. They further recommended that a BLF be developed.

1.44 Saxmundham Town Council

1.44.1 The council acknowledged the potential economic benefits but were concerned the main development site risked damage from coastal processes and climate change. Visual damage to the AONB, impact on Minsmere, the local wildlife and environment were also cited, alongside concerns about pollution. The loss of ‘dark skies’ around Darsham and Westleton was raised. They also favoured a bridge across the SSSI. Their Stage 3 feedback was reiterated, and they requested that cables be undergrounded. They wanted more information on how 2 million litres of potable water would be provided.

1.44.2 They were concerned by the lack of communication between SZC Co. and other energy projects and a perceived lack of long-term storage and disposal for nuclear waste. They also questioned the financial viability of the construction and SZC Co.’s finances.

1.44.3 The Council challenged the dropping of the marine-led strategy. The rail-led strategy was preferred by the council because it provided a legacy and lessened impact on A12 traffic. To mitigate passenger disruption, line upgrades, such as double-tracking or adding more passing loops between Ipswich and Saxmundham, were suggested. Concern was expressed about disturbance from overnight trains. They noted that planned housing construction would also increase traffic and urged SZC Co. to work with Saxmundham Town Council on mitigation.

1.44.4 A road-led strategy was opposed by the council because it would put pressure on the highway network. The integrated strategy was also opposed

by the council because it would cause disruption and would not include legacy improvements. The council retained its view on the Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass but urged consultation with communities affected. The council raised concern about air quality and requested modelling. A southern route was felt to help address some of these concerns and assist with other infrastructure projects. They supported the park and rides but raised concerns about the impact on local communities.

- 1.44.5 The council questioned why a Stage 4 consultation event was not held in Saxmundham and were disappointed by a lack of response to previous submissions and environmental assessments.

1.45 Scottish Power Renewables

- 1.45.1 Scottish Power Renewables believed there would be no impact on their planned projects, and they pledged to continue to engage with SZC Co.. They noted that land south of Sizewell Gap was to be included in Scottish Power Renewables' DCO order limits, and was subject to an option agreement in favour of SZC Co., but was not included within consultation. Scottish Power Renewables would liaise with SZC Co. and the landowner in order to secure a voluntary agreement to accommodate works of their projects.

- 1.45.2 They looked forward to discussions about the freight management strategy, interactions along Sizewell Gap and in the wider areas subject to highway improvements (A12/A1094 Friday Street Junction; Sizewell Gap/King George's Avenue; and the A1094/B1069 junction).

- 1.45.3 Scottish Power Renewables suggested they had taken steps to avoid SZC Co.'s construction but felt the proposal now increased the proposed offshore development area so that it now overlapped with the boundary of Scottish Power Renewable's projects. They requested assurances that their ability to install offshore export cables and the integrity of the offshore export cables would not be compromised. They stated that they would also register their East Anglia TWO Limited and East Anglia ONE North Limited projects as Interested Parties.

1.46 Snape Parish Council

- 1.46.1 Snape Parish Council opposed the proposals and restated their Stage 3 position. They cited concerns about the visual and environmental impact on the AONB, and felt that current assessments were inadequate, failing to take account of other infrastructure projects in the region.

1.46.2 The council was concerned that increased congestion on the A12 would push other traffic onto roads in and around Snape, which would increase pollution. They were unconvinced by mitigation plans and requested more research and SZC Co. to fund legal action to mitigate fly parking. A perceived lack of traffic analysis over peak periods such as holidays or cultural events was highlighted and concern about the impact on residents raised. The council expressed concern that 2,250 vehicles per day might be diverted through Snape along the B1069. They believed current proposals for the planned southern park and ride did not include an increase in traffic through the village, or current congestion on junction B1069/A1094 at Church Common. They requested further consultation and analysis to mitigate these issues and for the rail-led strategy to be reassessed.

1.46.3 They disputed SZC Co.'s consultations' economic assessments which had omitted Snape from the analysis. Concern was raised that the influx of people would put pressure on public services such as policing and healthcare.

1.47 Sudbourne Parish Council

1.47.1 Sudbourne Parish Council restated concerns from Stage 3 and claimed the consultation was inadequate because evidence had been withheld or not provided in time. They raised concerns about the environmental impact on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, the two SSSIs and the Minsmere Reserve.

1.47.2 The council questioned the removal of the marine-led strategy and were concerned traffic would cause environmental, economic and health damages. They requested a marine/rail strategy to reduce these impacts and provide a legacy for the area. Previous concerns about pollution were reiterated and they requested publication of the EIA.

1.47.3 They expressed concern over pressure on tourist accommodation and facilities from the influx of workers and questioned whether there would be any benefit for the local economy. They reiterated their Stage 3 comments on SZC Co.'s assessments and added further concerns about the other infrastructure projects within the area. They requested SZC Co. to demonstrate how it had shown a Duty of Regard to the AONB.

1.48 Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council

1.48.1 The councils supported the proposals in theory but were concerned about traffic pollution and lack of progress on the rail-led strategy. They requested that SZC Co. and Network Rail share reports associated with the Governance for Railway Investment Projects 3 feasibility report, provide a

delivery programme and upgrade the East Suffolk line. The councils offered to engage with stakeholders and mediate between interested parties.

- 1.48.2 A marine and rail-based strategy was supported but the road-led strategy was rejected due to fears of an increase in HGVs and lack of legacy benefit. Clarification of work hours and HGV movements was requested due to concern about noise and vibrations. The councils suggested HGV controls and monitoring measures be included as part of the planning requirements. Assessment was also felt to be needed for surface water impacts of the green rail route and details were requested about rail holding points.
- 1.48.3 The councils required evidence about mitigation of night-time rail movements, and related impacts on pollution. Details regarding the quantity of abnormal indivisible loads (AILs), routeing and proportion of road use were also requested, as were details of the infrastructure provision, transport mitigation schemes and environmental impacts of each strategy.
- 1.48.4 They requested that the combined impacts from Scottish Power Renewables' projects and Sizewell C be considered in the traffic modelling. They felt that measures were needed to alleviate traffic on the B112 and the A12 in and north of Woodbridge. They disputed SZC Co.'s car-share models and asked for projected visitor numbers to be compared to Hinkley Point C. Concern was also raised about impact on the B1069 Tunstall, A12 Woodbridge, B1119 Saxmundham, and B1121 Saxmundham, suggesting mitigation would be needed for these routes. Concern regarding traffic on the A14 Seven Hills was also raised and they commented that HGVs should not use the A145 through Beccles. A Construction Workforce Transport Management Plan was suggested as a measure to reduce traffic at the B1122 Leiston. They also commented on how a Transport Assessment should measure junction capacity at peak hour and they requested clarification on SZC Co.'s claim that "additional congestion or delays" were unlikely, as well as examining the impact traffic would have during different phases.
- 1.48.5 The councils felt archaeological evaluations should be completed prior to any DCO application submission. They supported increasing the speed limit on the site access roundabout but wanted details about surface water drainage system for the roundabout and entrance hub, secondary site access and assessment of the terrestrial ecology.
- 1.48.6 The councils expressed concern that SSSI loss due to National Grid pylons would be permanent. They objected to increasing the height of pylons which they stated was unaccounted for in assessments. They requested a full landscape and visual impact assessment, evidence for territorial ecology and consideration of routing cables underground. If this was unfeasible, they felt

the impact should be reduced as much as possible. Assessments of wildlife and plans for mitigation and compensation were also requested.

- 1.48.7 They supported revisions to the LEEIE and preferred the option of a new rail spur. They felt that the plans, however, did not allow for ground-service water storage and underground storage was not seen as feasible. Further details about the park and ride and ‘logistics compound’ were requested due to concerns about traffic, access on Lovers’ Lane/Sizewell Gap Road and Leiston as well as environmental assessments of the impact of neighbouring uses such as the caravan site on properties and residents. They asked whether Valley Road was within the red line boundary of Figures 2.12 and why the area south of the railway bridge was included. They asked if alternatives had been considered and were disappointed by the lack of longer-term flood risk reduction. They welcomed consideration of the layout LEEIE and supported increasing the distance between construction activity and the dwellings on Valley Road. They requested post-construction considerations including biodiversity net gain.
- 1.48.8 The councils welcomed improvements to Bridleway 19 diversion routes, but suggested they should be in place prior to the closure of the England Coast Path. Additionally, they requested the red line boundary to extend along Eastbridge Road to north of Round House, to enable extension of the off-road bridleway to Eastbridge. Further justification and compensation was felt to be required for loss of habitats at Aldehurst Farm and that paths around Kenton Hills and Goose Hill should be PRoW. The councils felt that reassessment was needed of the temporary closure of the PRoW that crossed the rail spur west of the B1122. Adoption of the signalised pedestrian crossings (paragraph 5.6.6) into the public highway was felt to need further consideration. They suggested the plans were unclear and required discussion about the width of the alternative BW19 route, speed restrictions on the roads with signalised crossings and maintenance arrangements.
- 1.48.9 The councils welcomed the off-site sports facilities in Leiston but requested further archaeological evaluation, drainage proposals and sustainable transport to the facilities. They welcomed the inclusion of the Round House within the red line boundary. Improvements to the Kenton Hills car park were supported but this was felt to necessitate dedicated access to local amenities and consideration of non-motorised transport. They also asked for drainage, flood risk and environmental impacts to be investigated.
- 1.48.10 They supported the ecological mitigation and compensation areas for fen meadow and marsh harriers but were concerned about the site’s feasibility and the lack of information about current ecology. The councils commented that compensation should be provided prior to any impact and they requested biodiversity net gain that would necessitate a maximum amount of marsh

harrier compensatory habitat. The councils stated that it should be based on a worst-case scenario and account for the disturbance of PRow. They stated that further details were required to consider other impacts. The councils requested more information about the two sites proposed as fen meadows compensation and for them to be larger. The councils commented that SZC Co. should propose another approach within the DCO if the sites were inadequate. They requested more evidence about the need to lose the fen meadow within the SSSI. The councils were concerned that no mitigation or compensation for wet woodland was planned. The councils stated that greater information and assessment of archaeological impacts was required, and concern was expressed that habitat creation would impact the public footpath in Site 1.

- 1.48.11 The councils welcomed the flood compensation areas but requested details and comment from the Environment Agency. They requested more information about ecology, archaeology and SSSI impact. Assurances that it would not impact on the water level and use of FP20 were requested. The councils commented that SZC Co. needed to ensure that the bridleway to Site 2 remained available to the public.
- 1.48.12 The councils requested information about mitigation for the BLF and whether materials would be delivered along the length of the main development site. As well as clarity on the design and usage of water management zones, they asked for evidence that they were appropriately sized and located.
- 1.48.13 Further information was requested about the location of the Sizewell link road. The councils felt that there was a lack of evidence and questioned why route W/D2 was not viable. Potential legacy benefits of the Theberton Bypass were recognised, and they commented that if the B1122 were to be made less attractive for vehicles, the new link road could be the sole route for Leiston and Sizewell. Removal of the link road would restore landscape and return farmland to productive use, but evidence was needed. They welcomed the extension of the red line to enable flexibility in relocating the public footpaths but requested environmental assessments. They opposed use of culverts in favour of clear span bridges and stated that archaeological trench plans needed to include new red line boundary additions. A surface water drainage strategy was needed and pedestrian and cyclist access on Littlemore Road should be maintained. They requested evidence that access from the Sizewell link road into Fordley Road would not increase traffic, but Pretty Road bridge was acceptable subject to visual assessment and impact on rights of way. They required information about the cutting around Theberton but welcomed the reduction of speed and requested safe crossing points.

- 1.48.14 The councils were concerned about the environmental impacts of the two village bypass, asked for mitigation plans and commented on the floodplain grazing marsh. They suggested a viaduct or alternative that reduced the need for flood storage compensation at the River Alde crossing, commenting that conclusions were premature without the landscape and visual impact assessment. Concern was raised about deeper cutting and non-motorised users of the bridge near Farnham Hall as well as deeper cutting at Foxborrow Wood. They noted a discrepancy between the red line and the recorded legal alignment of the public footpath (paragraph 6.5.4) which needed discussing.
- 1.48.15 The councils were unconvinced by some of the water drainage proposals, such as the lack of basin on one side of the River Alde crossing, the Friday Street roundabout basin, and the feasibility of infiltration within the cutting. The councils commented that a safe route, crossing point and links to Stratford St Andrew were needed for cycle route 41. They also stated that approved archaeological trench plans for the two village bypass needed to include new red line boundary additions and the bypass should be constructed before substantial numbers of HGVs went through Stratford St Andrew. They reiterated Stage 3 concerns about the alternative alignment around Foxborrow Wood.
- 1.48.16 The councils commented that further design work was required for the northern park and ride, including ensuring there was space for pedestrians and cycle connectivity between the park and ride and Yoxford. The councils supported the southern park and ride, but commented that the new red line boundary areas needed to be scoped in for post-DCO archaeological evaluation and mitigation. They commented that no details were provided for the Wickham Market congestion mitigation approach. They welcomed changes to the red line boundary at the Seven Hills FMF but asked for further details about impacts on the A14, Operation Stack and Dock Spur and Trimley junctions. They further noted that surface water drainage infrastructure was not included, and sustainable drainage systems should be prioritised.
- 1.48.17 Yoxford roundabout amendments were welcomed by the councils as was removal of Roadside Nature Reserve 197 from the red line boundary. The councils supported taking the roundabout off-line but were concerned about associated disruption to the A12 and B1122. Justification of the size and location of the Yoxford roundabout basin and water treatment was required. They accepted the plans for highway improvements but were concerned about large vehicles exiting the A144 to the southbound A12. They requested consideration of the cumulative impact of other local developments and were felt that their Stage 3 concerns had not been addressed.

1.48.18 The councils welcomed the benefits for educational and business organisations. They applauded plans to improve diversity and provide apprenticeships but wanted confirmation that this carried the same status as other aspects of the plans. They requested that SZC Co. work with them to define the local within home based target and asked for a greater commitment to maximise it. They restated feedback from Stage 3 and requested details about how the impact on infrastructure would be mitigated, questioned the availability and displacement of workforce and how opportunities for locals would be provided. The Community Fund was supported but the councils commented that further action was needed to alleviate the pressure from the increased workforce on housing and tourism.

1.49 Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB

1.49.1 The Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB maintained their position in Stage 3 which they felt had not been responded to. They felt that the consultation did not consider the purposes of the AONB and had not measured the impacts against this or special qualities criteria. For example, they suggested the summary consultation document did not refer to the site's location within a nationally designated landscape.

1.49.2 Concern was raised about the visual harm caused to the area. They asked why underground cables would be problematic given that the construction would be located within a nationally designated landscape and there are statutory requirements to avoid harm. They requested that SZC Co. work with National Grid to underground existing pylons as mitigation for new pylons, or for compensation of equal value to the damage. They acknowledged the work done to alleviate the impacts of accommodation and transport but maintained their views from Stage 3.

1.49.3 The loss of Bridleway 19 and parts of the permissive footpath was considered unacceptable and they raised concerns about the loss of amenity during the construction. They requested the expansion of permanent access rights to ensure protected species and designated sites were not compromised. The compensation for the temporary loss of the Suffolk Coast Path and impact on the England Coast was considered inadequate.

1.49.4 The Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB requested that SZC Co. acknowledge the decommissioning time element in its mitigation proposals and explain what it would offer as compensation. They requested impact assessments regarding AONB tourism and clarity about the mitigation plans. They felt that the proposals would have a significant adverse impact on the AONB and were not appropriate.

1.50 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

1.50.1 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service encouraged modelling of the flood compensation areas taking account of climate change and associated flood risks. They supported the joint council response regarding pylons and requested a reduction in height and number if cables could not be undergrounded.

1.50.2 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services requested more transport modelling and suggested HGV management measures if the FMF at Innocence Farm was used to ensure vehicles joined the A14 through the agreed route. They raised concerns about blue light response times and continued to support a marine-led strategy to reduce the impact on the road and rail network and health of residents. The rail-led strategy was the next preference and concerns were raised that both other strategies would impact response time. They supported the SCC responses on road transport, improvements and park and rides. They opposed the option of an overhead conveyer and supported either a new rail siding or a new rail spur, but raised concerns about pollution from the latter.

1.51 The Office of the Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner

1.51.1 The Commissioner requested that any impact on policing be acknowledged, mitigated and not borne by Suffolk taxpayers. The Commissioner felt that uncertainty over which options were being pursued made it difficult to assess the impact. They restated the continued validity of their Stage 3 response and requested a speed limit of 40mph for the main development site roundabout.

1.51.2 They requested more information about AILs and solutions that required additional staff resources were suggested to be identified in time to recruit and train them. They felt that a rail-led strategy would decrease risk and congestion on the roads, but they were aware it might be unfeasible. They requested a commitment to arranging AIL and HGV movements at stated times, commenting that a relaxation could require more police resources overnight. The Commissioner felt that any times stipulated for HGV and AIL operations should indicate if the time stated is the time the load would arrive at the main development site or the time it would be on the roads themselves.

1.51.3 They were concerned that the integrated strategy would significantly impact roads. Enforcement technology and/or engineering measures were felt to be necessary to ensure compliance with speed limits. They asked for any rail option to be modelled and discussed.

1.52 Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council

1.52.1 Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council were disappointed that environmental studies (it was not specified which) proposed at Stage 1 had not been carried out and so there remained little information on the impact Sizewell C construction would have on the environment. They also felt that information about the proposed Sizewell link road and the Sizewell C Project in general was inadequate. They were concerned about the impact on the two SSSIs and splitting of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. They commented that the proposals for the marsh harrier foraging sites lacked evidence and would close a local campsite which would impact tourism and farming. They were concerned that fen meadow compensation land would not be functional before the loss of the land at Sizewell and there were no proposals for potential loss of wet woodland.

1.52.2 The council raised concerns about HGVs, particularly on the B1122 at the site entrance roundabout. The Theberton bypass and Sizewell link road proposals were felt to be in the wrong location and they commented that these would cause disruption for residents, road users and close PRow. They opposed extended hours operation and were concerned about the impact on residents close to the A12/14 junction. The council commented that a relief road should be constructed prior to the development to avoid the B1122 being used as the primary route. They suggested an underpass or bridge to be used at Fordley road to avoid closing it to local traffic travelling to Middleton and Middleton Moor.

1.52.3 The council expressed concerns about the impact on the local housing market from non-local workers. In addition to requesting more information to be released they stated that they lacked faith in the consultation process. They believed that the site was too small for two reactors and that reducing the construction to a single reactor would allow for underground cables, adequate coastal defences and lessen the impact on the AONB.

1.53 The Environment Agency

1.53.1 The Environment Agency requested information regarding mitigation under the HRA. They stated that evidence needed to be updated to account for new sites and case law. They additionally commented on the need for SZC Co.'s Water Framework Directive to consider worst-case and cumulative impacts. The Environment Agency also suggested the 'water bodies' review should include the Theberton bypass, Sizewell link road and flood risk compensation. They also suggested loss of habitat assessments were required.

- 1.53.2 The Environment Agency offered assistance to achieve environmental net gain but cautioned against missed opportunities. They felt there was a lack of hydrodynamic, sediment transport, and fluvial and coastal models and requested that flood risk assessments include mitigation and compensation measures. They commented that climate change allowances and predictions also needed to be based on latest UK Climate Projections 2018 and UK Climate Projections local data.
- 1.53.3 They were concerned about contamination that required assessments and groundwater remediation strategies that should influence drainage plans. A waste management strategy should assess waste rise and a sustainable strategy was necessary. The Environment Agency stated that consideration of sensitive receptors and habitats should account for erosion and wind-blown material from stockpiles, surface water run-off and pollution prevention. They stated that a surface water drainage strategy should protect the water environment and sensitive designated habitats. Concern was also raised about invasive non-native species.
- 1.53.4 The Environment Agency reiterated the comments they made in their Stage 3 response and opposed culvert watercourse crossings due to concerns about flood risk and ecology. They commented that flood compensation proposals might be ineffective and recommended that they be hydraulically and hydrologically linked to the fluvial floodplain. Further review of Flood Zones 2 and 3 was felt to be needed.
- 1.53.5 They requested a finalised flood risk assessment (FRA), evaluation of impacts to wildlife and proposed mitigation of these impacts. They were concerned about the loss of SSSI land and requested further compensation for loss of fen meadow, wet woodland, bat habitat and marsh harrier foraging areas. The fen meadow and marsh harrier compensation land required a flood risk assessment as did both National Grid and Sizewell pylons. They requested more information about the fen meadow compensation and a contingency fund. Concern was raised that further investigation might reduce the site's capacity for relocated species and required contingency sites once the capacity at Aldhurst Farm had been met.
- 1.53.6 The Environment Agency also commented that the green rail route, two village bypass, Yoxford roundabout and highway improvements were vulnerable to flooding and could impact protected species. They suggested many of the proposed watercourse crossings required flood risk activity permits from the Environment Agency. They felt there was insufficient information to grant permits and their views must be included in the DCO submission.

1.54 Trinity House

1.54.1 Trinity House welcomed proposed further discussions concerning the risk mitigation measures in connection with works that were to be carried out below the high-water mark.

1.55 Ufford Parish Council

1.55.1 The council requested a sustainable transport strategy to reduce the impact of congestion and they believed rail and marine transport should be utilised. They felt East Suffolk should gain some legacy benefits from the build, such as improvements to the rail network and reiterated that their response to Stage 3 was still valid.

1.56 Walberswick Parish Council

1.56.1 The council was dissatisfied with the consultation and felt their previous responses had been ignored. They restated their views from Stage 3 and were concerned by a lack of information regarding the impact of development on the AONB and neighbouring communities.

1.57 Waldringfield Parish Council

1.57.1 The council commented that the plans should form part of a national energy policy debate, and disputed the need for nuclear power as well as its value for money. Concern was raised that the main development site was too small and would have a significant negative impact on the AONB, SSSIs and Minsmere Reserve. The council requested the release of the EIA and commented on potential loss of habitats and biodiversity from construction. They felt changes to Sizewell Marsh and Minsmere Levels water levels would damage these ecosystems. The council raised concern that the proposed ‘town’ for workers and spoil heaps would disturb the visual environment and cause air, light and noise pollution.

1.57.2 Long-term storage and decommissioning was also raised, and the council commented on the lack of geological underground waste storage. They questioned how the waste would be transported and commented on the environmental and security risks inherent in dealing with nuclear waste.

1.57.3 The council was concerned about damage to the tourist economy. They cited a lack of affordable accommodation and were disappointed that this was not addressed. The council also expressed concern that the campus would negatively impact residents.

1.57.4 They commented that the integrated strategy was too reliant on roads and would cause disruption to communities. They expressed opposition to the relief route because it was too close to homes and listed buildings, the two village bypass because of its impact on Yoxford and Middleton and supported the four villages-bypass as a better solution to A12 congestion.

1.58 Wickham Market Parish Council

1.58.1 The council commented that SZC Co.'s claim that the council worked with the Neighbourhood Plan Committee was incorrect and requested a public apology. They opposed the overall proposals due to concerns regarding traffic, highway, landscape and environmental impacts. They reiterated their Stage 3 concerns and felt these had not been addressed.

1.58.2 The council felt that impacts from the siting and size of the southern park and ride were unaddressed but increasing parking at the Martlesham park and ride could mitigate this. They were concerned by the dropping of the marine-led strategy and preferred use of rail over road. The integrated strategy was felt to be too reliant on roads. Concern was raised about the lack of detail regarding sea defences, climate change threats and coastline instability.

1.58.3 They disputed the traffic data produced for Wickham Market and offered their own traffic survey results to SZC Co.. The council commented on existing problems about pedestrian safety, parked cars, and narrow streets that were unsuitable for large vehicles.

1.58.4 They also were concerned that the park and ride was close to special landscape areas and the Marlesford conservation area, and that the visual impact and light pollution remained unaddressed. They felt the landscape and visual impact assessment needed to identify improvements and mitigation prior to the DCO application submission. They stated that details about perimeters and buffer zones were unclear, as was the inclusion of the Whin Belt. They also raised concern about the impact of the development on bridleways and the environment in general.

1.58.5 The council requested a reduction of the park and ride site, 15-20m buffer zones, management of woodlands abutting the site and improvements to rights of way and cycleways. Additionally, they asked for details of bridleway highway crossing restoration, planting of hedgerows and woodland on site boundaries and spoil mounds. They also suggested further information was needed about surface water drainage, designs to mitigate visual impact and supporting local nurseries' commencement of early propagation of local provenance plant species.

1.59 Woodbridge Town Council

1.59.1 The council was concerned that train movements would disturb residents living close to the East Suffolk Line and vibrations would damage historic buildings. They also commented on the risk from air and noise pollution for residents living near the A12. They opposed the proposals and reiterated their response to Stage 3.

1.60 Yoxford Parish Council

1.60.1 Yoxford Parish Council wished to see more information about impacts on tourism, the socio-economic strategy and environmental assessments. They expressed disappointment and repeated requests for information made at Stage 3.

1.60.2 The proposed construction was felt to be too large for the Main Development Site and they suggested it would damage the AONB. They believed that SZC Co. was unwilling to make necessary enhancements to transport infrastructure. The council opposed SZC Co.'s dismissal of the marine-led strategy and were concerned about traffic and disruption. Concerns were also expressed about tourism, the local economy and that the influx of workers could not be accommodated by existing housing.

1.60.3 The council wanted cables to be undergrounded and opposed both options presented at Stage 4. Concern was also expressed that Yoxford would be impacted by the combination of HGVs, buses and LGVs. They believed the Sizewell link road was needed to decrease pressure on the A12/B1122 regardless of which transport strategy was pursued. They supported the planned Yoxford roundabout but wanted it to be smaller in order to use less land. Concern was also expressed about the lack of mitigation for the B1122 due to impact from traffic from the park and ride, freight coming from the north and from the accommodation campus. The council reiterated its **preference for Route D2/W for the link road.**

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

2.1 Overall Proposals

General

2.1.1 Some section 42(1)(d) consultees (referred to throughout this report as persons with an interest in land or PILs) objected to the proposals to locate a new nuclear power station at Sizewell. Others expressed their support, commenting that nuclear power provides a stable, sustainable energy

source. Some did not wish to comment on the need for the Sizewell C Project in principle.

- 2.1.2 Some PILs suggested there should be a focus on renewable energy generation instead of a nuclear power, as they believed renewable energy is cheaper and better for the environment. Some specifically suggested wind power or solar power, whilst others suggested a series of smaller nuclear power stations instead.
- 2.1.3 Some PILs commented on reported delays and budget overruns to Hinkley Point C, with some referring to other SZC Co. constructions such as Flamanville, suggesting this could be the case with Sizewell C as well. Some questioned the plans for financing the Sizewell C Project, particularly the Regulated Asset Base system. Others commented that the development would not be financially viable given the cost of energy produced for the consumer.
- 2.1.4 Some PILs also expressed concern about the involvement of China General Nuclear in the development. Some PILs commented that they are not a reliable partner and have been ‘blacklisted’ by the US over security concerns.
- 2.1.5 Some PILs also suggested that SZC Co. had failed to meet the more stringent site selection criteria proposed for the NPS new nuclear above 1 gigawatt post-2025. They felt there was a lack of government oversight and co-ordinated planning for all energy projects. They suggested that cost savings had been SZC Co.’s priority for the development plans and felt more detailed surveys should be completed and more information about impacts should be provided before the DCO application submission.
- 2.1.6 Some PILs commented on the proposed site boundary infringing on their land. Some PILs commented on the personal financial expense at having to find legal and other professional representations to enter into discussion with SZC Co. regarding property rights. Some PILs felt that this kind of representation was out of reach for some residents.

a) **Site Suitability**

- 2.1.7 PILs were divided over the suitability of Sizewell C as a site for development, with some supporting the location and others opposing, without going into detail as to why.
- 2.1.8 Some PILs also commented on the proposals for other energy projects in the area including Scottish Power’s offshore windfarm, commenting that the

cumulative impacts of these projects will be severely adverse. It was also commented that there are other non-energy projects such as future housing developments and the Ipswich Northern Relief Road, and that SZC Co. need to consider these projects as part of Sizewell C proposals.

b) Safety

- 2.1.9 Some PILs questioned the lack of a long-term strategy for nuclear waste storage and raised concerns about the storage of nuclear waste on site, suggesting that this would be problematic and dangerous for future generations. Others expressed concern about the possibility of a nuclear disaster.
- 2.1.10 Some PILs felt that the technology for the proposed nuclear power station is outdated and unproven outside of China. Some added that European Pressurised Reactors (EPRs™) have had technical faults, raising concerns about potential safety issues caused by the proposed use of an EPR at Sizewell C.

c) Socioeconomics

- 2.1.11 Some PILs felt that the benefits of the Sizewell C Project had not been proven to outweigh the disadvantages including the perceived damage to communities, businesses and the environment.
- 2.1.12 Others questioned the assumptions made by SZC Co. about the benefits of the Sizewell C Project to the local economy. Some PILs commented that Sizewell C construction workers would not bring benefits to the East Suffolk economy, whilst others stated that the quoted net benefit of £100 million per annum had not taken into account disruption caused during the construction process.
- 2.1.13 Some PILs commented that the majority of construction jobs would not go to local people, with some adding that SZC Co. planned to use the workforce currently employed at Hinkley Point C in order to cut costs.
- 2.1.14 Some PILs expressed concern about the potential for anti-social behaviour from Sizewell C construction workers such as drug dealing, alcohol abuse and prostitution, referring to experiences during the construction of Sizewell B.
- 2.1.15 Some PILs commented on the negative impact of the proposed development on local communities without providing further explanation. Others believed the scale of the development and the “influx” of workers would be too large for the local community, with impacts such potential distortion to the rental

property market. Some felt the impacts would force residents to leave the area with very few new residents moving in.

- 2.1.16 Some PILs commented that the proposed development would impact the health and wellbeing of themselves, their families and construction workers. This included mental distress and illness caused by air and noise pollution.
- 2.1.17 Some PILs commented that SZC Co. had not adequately considered the disruption to residents' lives, the reduction in property values and the resulting stress caused to residents.
- 2.1.18 Some PILs commented on the impact of the proposals on local businesses and the economy. Some believed the profitability or even the survival of businesses such as farming businesses, campsites and pubs may be affected by pollution and changes to ecology, traffic causing delays, access issues and loss of customers due to impacts on the tourist industry.
- 2.1.19 Some PILs commented that effects on the tourist industry would be damaging to the local economy. They expressed concern that visitors would be driven away by air, noise, visual and light pollution, traffic congestion and the closure of beaches and footpaths. Some tourist rentals commented that the proposals would severely impact their business and damage their livelihoods.
- 2.1.20 Some PILs commented on the current inadequacy of potable water levels in Suffolk, saying that the proposed development would reduce the amount available. Others commented on the potential impact on local services such as medical facilities and healthcare due to the increase in people requiring access to these services. Some PILs also commented on the impact of traffic on ambulance services and the ability of ambulances to get patients to hospitals within target times.
- 2.1.21 Some PILs felt there had not been adequate assessment of health and community impacts and further information was requested about access to a temporary construction compound south of the Lime Kiln level crossing. Some PILs suggested that compensation should be given for a loss in earnings, damage to property and reductions in property values. The provision of a 'complaints procedure' was also suggested for complaints to be registered and investigated during construction and operation.
- 2.1.22 Some PILs expressed opposition to the proposed accommodation campus in Eastbridge due to the environmental impacts, land take, antisocial behaviour of workers, effects on residents' wellbeing, and the lack of legacy benefit. They believed the size and scale of the building would be inappropriate for the area, with some suggesting that it would be better

located in Leiston or as ‘split’ accommodation in urban areas as used for Hinkley Point C. Others suggested strict monitoring of accommodation and for the site to be restored to greenfield land after construction. Some opposed the caravan site due to the potential for traffic accidents and for social and environmental reasons in general.

2.1.23 Some PILs also questioned SZC Co.’s stated assumptions about accommodation, commenting that demand for accommodation could increase by up to 50% depending on peak workforce numbers and how many will commute.

d) **Transport (Overall Strategy)**

2.1.24 Some PILs challenged the assumptions used by SZC Co. in its traffic modelling and questioned the accuracy of its predictions. Others believed SZC Co. would prefer a road-led strategy and had not seriously consulted on a rail-led strategy.

2.1.25 Some PILs commented on the environmental impact of the transport strategy in general, such as damage to the landscape and countryside and carbon emissions resulting from HGV movements. Some expressed opposition to all footpath closures caused by railway improvements and road construction.

2.1.26 Some PILs raised concerns about the increase in construction traffic, particularly HGVs, on the local road network and resulting congestion, delays and accidents. Some mentioned the increase in cut-through driving currently reported to be experienced for Hinkley Point C, commenting that this could occur around Sizewell C. Others believed the ‘early years’ of construction would create unacceptable amounts of traffic, before the green rail route, relief roads and park and rides are complete. Some PILs also commented on potential safety issues caused by the increase of the speed limit at a roundabout from 30mph to 40mph.

2.1.27 Some PILs raised concern about the impact of the transport strategy in general on the local community. Some commented that the road infrastructure, especially the B1122, is unfit for purpose and unsuitable for large quantities of materials. Others felt the proposed traffic and road closures would prevent access to schools and work, making daily lives difficult for local people.

2.1.28 Some PILs made suggestions for all transport strategies. Specifically, that:

- overnight trains should be avoided;

- the Valley Road rail bridge and Friday Street junction should be upgraded;
- existing roads should be improved rather than building new roads;
- all new roads should be removed after construction;
- for the closure of the level crossing on Abbey Lane for half an hour before and after shift changes; and
- the 30mph and 40mph speed limits should be enforced along Lovers' Lane, Sizewell Gap Road and part of King George's Avenue, to reduce danger at the Lovers' Lane/King George's Avenue junction.

2.1.29 Some PILs requested that the marine-led strategy be given further consideration to reduce the impacts of the development on people, commenting that this strategy should not have been discounted as it would remove a substantial amount of construction traffic from the roads.

2.1.30 Some commented that they felt SZC Co. had produced inadequate information about traffic impacts, traffic management, total projected vehicle movements, emergency or alternative routes, projected total diesel miles, total vehicle pollutant output and they requested further clarification of the meaning of 'extended hours' of HGV movement. Others suggested that vehicle movements associated with Sizewell C such as 'white van' deliveries to the workforce should be included in the transport analysis.

2.1.31 Some PILs expressed opposition to the road-led strategy due to the high levels of road traffic predicted on the A12, A14, Sizewell Gap Road and other minor roads in East Suffolk, as well as knock-on effects to the rest of Suffolk and Norfolk.

2.1.32 Some PILs were supportive of the rail-led strategy, commenting that this strategy should be given the most consideration as it would have the smallest impact on road transport and air pollution and cause less damage to the landscape and wildlife.

2.1.33 However, some who were supportive believed the strategy would be unlikely to be taken forward due to the inability of Network Rail to complete the required upgrades on time. Others criticised SZC Co. for only proposing a maximum of five freight trains per day.

2.1.34 Some PILs opposed the rail-led strategy due to the reduction in access to property from changes to the East Suffolk Line. Others commented that a large amount of road traffic would still occur under this strategy and that naming it 'rail-led' was misleading.

- 2.1.35 Some PILs commented that the consultation document did not clarify how much land would be permanently or temporarily acquired under the rail-led strategy. Others commented that the environmental impact of building a new, temporary rail line for the rail-led strategy should be weighed against the impact of increased road movements for the road-led strategy.
- 2.1.36 Some PILs expressed support for the integrated strategy for having the least effect on local businesses and for the reduction in HGVs compared to the road-led strategy. Others opposed the strategy due to the reduction in access to property from changes to the East Suffolk line, or commented that the construction of the green rail route for the marginal gain of one train per day was not cost effective or environmentally sound.
- 2.1.37 Other concerns expressed by PILs regarding the integrated strategy were that it would not adequately reduce traffic flow compared to the road-led strategy, that it still contained proposals for a Sizewell link road and that the noise and vibration impacts from train movements would be severely adverse. Some commented on the effects on the environment including carbon emissions and wildlife habitats. Some believe the strategy was only proposed so that SZC Co. appeared to have responded to Stage 3 concerns.
- 2.1.38 Some PILs made comments about the park and ride proposals in general, such as that they would be too large, place too much traffic on the A12 and would not be worth the cost. Some PILs suggested that areas of grassland be maximised to mitigate the loss of skylark territories and that hedge, scrub and wildflower planting should be proposed around the perimeter of both sites.
- 2.1.39 Some PILs commented that the BLF was inadequate whereas others supported the facility, commenting that it should be used more. They also requested more information about how materials would be transported from the BLF to the main development site.

e) **Environment – General**

- 2.1.40 Some PILs commented on the potential impact of the overall proposals on the environment and countryside in general without specifying their concerns. Some expressed particular concern about the damage to designated areas, particularly to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve, as well as Minsmere-Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SSSI, the Sandlings SPA and the Suffolk Heritage Coast. Others emphasised the overall scale of the environmental impacts, with concerns that the damage caused may be irreparable.

- 2.1.41 Some raised concerns about the impacts of the proposals on wildlife and ecology, such as adverse impacts on bat species, rare birds and great crested newts. They commented that construction, noise and light pollution could damage fragile and biodiverse habitats, which some believed had been insufficiently assessed.
- 2.1.42 Other PILs expressed concern about the noise, vibration and air pollution impacts overall and the potential effect on people’s health and their enjoyment of the area. Additional comments were made about the CO₂ emissions during construction and the resultant effect on climate change, questioning the claim that Sizewell C would be zero carbon.
- 2.1.43 Some commented on the amount of freshwater required for Sizewell C and subsequent issues relating to surface water, groundwater, potable water and inland flooding. They also commented on the current water shortages experienced in the region and believed further assessment about the potential impacts was required.
- 2.1.44 Some PILs commented on the environmental mitigation proposals, with some commenting that the statement to take environmental best practice “into account” was inadequate. They commented that the mitigation proposals were not sufficient and that more should be done to protect the environment, such as ecological and diversity gain based on a 25-year Environmental Plan.
- 2.1.45 Other concerns included the overall impact of the proposed development on the landscape and the negative effect on heritage assets such as Grade II listed Theberton Hall.

f) [Consultation process](#)

- 2.1.46 Some PILs expressed negative comments about the Stage 4 consultation process, for example that SZC Co.’s attitude was “arrogant” and “cavalier” and the overall process was ineffective. Some felt that they should have been consulted more.
- 2.1.47 Other PILs challenged the consultation process for being undemocratic or even invalid because of the approach taken by SZC Co.. Their reasons included:
- that the consultation was only speculative as it had not been given approval;
 - the consultation did not provide different options for the road-led strategy;

- significant amount of detail had been left until the DCO application submission;
- SZC Co. had not been truthful or transparent about the development;
- response to previous consultations had not been made available to the public;
- the substantial changes made from Stages 1 and 2 to Stages 3 and 4 should be considered a new consultation;
- SZC Co. had refused to fund individual stakeholders to fully respond to proposals;
- SZC Co. had failed to properly consult with those identified under Section 42 and Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008; and
- SZC Co. had failed to adequately identify properties affected by the proposals.

2.1.48 Some PILs believed their comments had not been listened to throughout any stage of consultation. They felt that the process had been a ‘tick box’ exercise in which SZC Co. did not adequately consider the responses or address concerns made, and continued to ignore solutions suggested by local councils and residents. Some believed the consultation had been a ‘PR exercise’ and that SZC Co. would choose its preferred options regardless of public opinion.

2.1.49 Some PILs also made comments about SZC Co.’s direct response to issues raised by landowners in close proximity to the red line boundary, commenting that its conduct was unprofessional and showed a lack of concern towards issues raised by residents. They also suggested SZC Co. officials showed a lack of meaningful engagement to resolve urgent situations.

2.1.50 Some PILs felt the information and materials provided for the Stage 4 consultation were inadequate. Some felt that the materials were too vague, with information about environmental, social and transport impacts unclear and sections on assessments and mitigation inadequate. They believed this lack of detail meant that the consultation was not satisfactory. Others believed the information presented in the documentation and at events was inaccurate, biased or purposefully misleading, such as understating the number of properties impacted by the proposals, reasons given for dismissing certain routes and the use of outdated maps. Some felt that the maps and legends were too small, unclear and difficult to decipher.

- 2.1.51 Some PILs criticised the lack of an EIA, often commenting that the Environment Agency had expressed concern about this. They suggested that this information should be made available before the DCO application submission.
- 2.1.52 Some commented that the consultation feedback did not include many important matters for consideration, such as different options for the Sizewell link road.
- 2.1.53 Some PILs made comments about the consultation events, stating their concern that several affected communities such as Theberton and Eastbridge were not visited. Others made complaints about staff at events, for example that they were unable to answer questions in detail and behaved patronisingly, unsympathetically or aggressively. Additionally, some PILs felt that some venues were inaccessible for people with disabilities.
- 2.1.54 Some PILs also believed the timescale of the consultation was too short to allow for a complete response and was inconvenient as it took place during the summer holidays. Comments were also made that very few people in areas affected by the proposals had received any information about the Stage 4 consultation.
- 2.1.55 Some PILs requested ongoing engagement with themselves about issues raised in the consultation, whilst others made more general suggestions such as providing better response to concerns and listening to residents' opinions.
- 2.1.56 Some PILs made positive comments about the consultation process, for example that staff at events were doing their best and that the documentation was clear.

2.2 Main Development Site

a) Site Suitability

- 2.2.1 Some PILs said that the proposed development would be too large for the intended site of 32 hectares (ha), since the government recommends around 30ha per nuclear reactor. Some simply commented that the area is unsuitable for the scale of the proposed development.
- 2.2.2 Some PILs raised concerns about the plans to relocate some Sizewell B facilities as this would negatively impact Coronation Wood and Pill Box Field.
- 2.2.3 Other comments were made regarding the proposed quarry pits and spoil heaps, with concerns about ecological damage, dust pollution and resultant health impacts, visual effects and the risk of pollutants leaking into the water

table. Some PILs also considered the estimate of 45,000 tonnes of fill to be an understatement.

- 2.2.4 Some PILs believed the site would be unsuitable due to its location next to a fragile stretch of coastline. They suggested that future sea level rise and unpredictable weather patterns presented a dangerous threat to a nuclear power plant. They suggested this issue had not received adequate consideration. Additionally, some PILs expressed concern that the proposed rock armour defence stops above the water line when it should go below it, as once the sacrificial dunes erode the sea would be able to undermine it.
- 2.2.5 Other PILs commented on issues with the proposed site access route, commenting that the use of a causeway would damage the Sizewell Marshes SSSI by restricting wildlife movement and impeding the marshes drainage. They also requested figures for the estimated number of vehicle movements at the site entrance roundabout.
- 2.2.6 Some PILs expressed concern about the inclusion of a helicopter landing facility in the AONB and requested more information about the potential impacts on sensitive areas or suggested relocating it to industrialised land.
- 2.2.7 Some PILs expressed concern that PRow including country lanes, bridleways and footpaths would be lost around the main development site, such as Sandling Walk through Kenton Hills. Some stressed that Bridleway 28 opposite Lovers' Lane should not be used as a vehicle short-cut from the caravan site to the leisure facilities.
- 2.2.8 Some PILs requested more information about certain aspects of the proposals, such as:
- how the site would be accessed early in the construction phase;
 - the location of a sewage plant, its disposal route and final discharge point for Sizewell C;
 - the disposal point for dewatering; and
 - the planned use for a strip of land on the southern side of Sandy Lane.
- b) Environment – General
- 2.2.9 Some PILs welcomed the inclusion of mitigation schemes such as the marsh harrier compensation land and noted the benefits of proving wetland habitats, if designed sensitively. Some considered that it was unlikely that the full extent of all three sites would be required.

- 2.2.10 Some PILs expressed concern that efforts to mitigate and avoid impacts had not been demonstrated in the proposals, which moved straight to compensation measures. They also stated that without details of the condition of the new habitats and the impacts expected for existing habitats it could not be determined whether the compensation proposals were adequate.
- 2.2.11 Some PILs said that, in general, the compensation proposals at this stage were inadequate. They were sceptical about the ability to replace the richness of existing rare habitat and believed it was unrealistic to expect shy and rare wildlife to relocate to the proposed sites. It was also suggested that the compensation described was impossible and the proposals would be ineffective.
- 2.2.12 Concern was expressed about the proximity of the proposed site to designated areas. Some PILs disputed the claim that losses would be temporary and “not significant”, even with successful fen meadow habitat creation, commenting that impacts affecting the functionality, groundwater and surface levels of the SSSI would be greater than currently considered. Some claimed the decimation of the AONB could threaten to compromise the designation of the AONB itself.
- 2.2.13 Some PILs suggested that the green line at the beach frontage, as agreed for Sizewell B, would not be adhered to as the berm is too far forward.
- 2.2.14 Some PILs requested more information and assessment of the environmental impacts of the main development site, including:
- assessment of potential bat roosts;
 - greater detail about the use of marsh harrier compensation land for flood attenuation;
 - where the spoil generated by construction would be processed;
 - further information about sites 1 and 2 for the fen meadow compensation land; and
 - details of fish entrainment at the cooling water intakes.
- c) **Ecology**
- 2.2.15 Other concerns raised about potential ecological effects of the construction of the main development site included:

- impacts on wet woodland habitat, which some PILs felt had not been adequately considered;
- impacts on bat roosts from tree removal for Kenton Hills car park; and
- impacts on the Sandlings, which some PILs commented is 1% of total lowland heaths left in the world.

2.2.16 Some PILs requested planting of mixed species hedging and scrub at the off-site sports facilities.

d) **Groundwater and Surface Water**

2.2.17 Some PILs commented that elements of construction would damage the fragile hydrology of the Minsmere Levels, Sizewell Marshes and Minsmere Sluice. Some expressed concerns about the potential for significant and unmanageable changes to water levels and the water chemistry of the SSSI. They also raised concerns that the proposed sheet piling, cut-off wall and realignment of the Sizewell drain would adversely change its hydrological conditions.

2.2.18 Some PILS expressed concern over the location and quantum of wet woodland and the effects of construction impacts of noise, lighting on nearby habitats and on landscape character.

2.2.19 Some PILS also commented on the suitability and effectiveness of mitigation for specific species (bats, marsh harrier).

2.2.20 Some PILS requested additional information to understand impacts on groundwater and surface water.

2.2.21 Some PILS questioned whether the development achieves biodiversity net gain.

e) **Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics**

2.2.22 Some PILs believed the proposed development and aspects of its infrastructure such as the cooling pipes could affect coastal processes, potentially accelerating erosion at Thorpeness and Minsmere. Others commented that raising the Sizewell C platform above that of Sizewell B would increase the flood risk to Sizewell B. Some felt that insufficient evaluation of coastal effects had been undertaken.

2.3 Pylon Options

a) General

2.3.1 Some PILs were supportive of pylons as long as they were used as part of projects for low carbon energy, such as nuclear.

2.3.2 Some PILs suggested that instead of pylons, the electricity cables should be installed underground to prevent adverse impact to the AONB landscape. Some mentioned that this would be possible with a larger site area. Others questioned the justification for pylons, referring to the response of the AONB partnership.

b) Site suitability

2.3.3 As well as having an unacceptable impact on the AONB, some PILs commented on the unsuitability of locating pylons at the proposed site due to the impact on wildlife and ecology including areas of sensitive fen habitat.

2.3.4 Some PILs expressed a preference for option 1 as they believed four pylons would have less of a visual impact than five.

2.3.5 Other PILs were concerned that option 2 would encroach on SSSI land. Some requested that the option chosen should be the least damaging to the SSSI.

2.4 Northern Park and Ride at Darsham

a) Site Suitability

2.4.1 Some PILs commented on potential access issues as a result of the northern park and ride proposals. This included the use of Willowmarsh Lane for worker vehicles which could affect resident and farm vehicle access. The impact of the new roundabout on the main access for Darsham Village was also mentioned. Others commented generally on the impact of the proposals on traffic in the area, with the potential to create congestion on the A12.

2.4.2 Some PILs suggested the northern park and ride would be too close to buildings and residences in Darsham, including Darsham Cottage, Moat Hall and to a 500-year old listed building.

2.4.3 Some PILs made specific suggestions relating to the park and ride, this included:

- a new crossing facility for pedestrian access from the railway station;

- a 40mph speed limit north to the A144 junction to allow residents north of the access roundabout to access the road; and
- maintenance of the footpath along the A12 to retain pedestrian access to Darsham.

b) **Environment – General**

2.4.4 Some PILs expressed concern about the potential impact of light pollution from the park and ride on Darsham’s dark sky designation. Other PILs commented on potential disturbance to residents from noise pollution caused by the park and ride. Some PILs asked if planting would be sufficient to reduce noise and light pollution to properties, and whether lights would be turned off when the park and ride was not in use.

2.4.5 Some PILs also commented that the increase in vehicles could present a danger to red deer during their spring and autumn crossings of the A12.

2.4.6 Some PILs suggested that lighting should be low-glare and directional to avoid light spill.

2.5 **Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market**

2.5.1 Some PILs opposed the southern park and ride for being too “controversial” whilst others supported it due to its connection to the A12 and because most workers would be travelling from the south. Some PILs also felt that the proposed changes to the mitigation measures would still be problematic and did not address the previous issues raised.

2.6 **Sizewell Link Road/Theberton Bypass**

a) **General**

2.6.1 Some PILs expressed opposition to the proposals for the Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass without going into detail as to why.

2.6.2 Some were concerned that the proposed routes would fail to ease congestion on the A12. Others commented that the B1122 would be inadequate to take any amount of construction traffic, especially during the first two years of construction before the relief roads were built.

2.6.3 Some PILs challenged the proposed location of the Sizewell link road. They commented that the route would require substantial embankments, cuttings, and road and footpath closures and was too far north considering 85% of traffic will originate from the south. Some PILs also challenged the removal

of some land from within the red line boundary, commenting that this was only done to exclude obligations for SZC Co. to compulsorily purchase their land.

2.6.4 Others believed SZC Co. had failed to provide justification for choosing Route Z and felt that consultation regarding the route choice should have been carried out to allow stakeholders to inform the development of the proposals. Some challenged the route for not taking into account other energy developments and East Suffolk Council's Local Plan. They requested in-depth analysis of the costs, benefits and impacts of each of the route options.

2.6.5 Some PILs commented that the proposed Sizewell link road would be of very little long-term use for residents once the power station was built as the route runs parallel to the existing B1122. They believed the lack of legacy benefit was proven by the proposal to remove the link road after construction.

2.6.6 Some PILs made requests for further assessment of the impacts of the Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass, specifically:

- full ecological assessment including protected species surveys and proposals for mitigation and compensation;
- further traffic modelling for affected roads, not based solely on desktop studies;
- landscape and visual assessments, an archaeology evaluation and surface and floodwater assessments;
- a capacity assessment of the junction with the A12 and a road safety audit; and
- noise and vibration surveys and an air quality assessment.

2.6.7 With regards to the proposals to remove the Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass following the construction phase, some PILs were supportive of returning the land to its original state. Others opposed restoration and felt it would be a waste of time and money whilst creating further disruption for residents during its removal.

2.6.8 Some PILs made specific suggestions about the construction of the Sizewell link road or Theberton bypass, including the following:

- the Pretty Road bridge should serve motor traffic as well as non-motorised users;

- roads should be completed before construction on the main development site begins;
- SZC Co. should acquire and compensate significantly affected properties and publish an ‘exceptional hardship’ scheme;
- the Sizewell link road construction compound should be relocated due to the presence of bats and great crested newts;
- access to properties via principal access routes must be maintained; and
- a traffic management plan should be introduced for the B1122 including crossing points and speed monitoring.

b) **Site Suitability**

2.6.9 Some PILs suggested the use of an alternative route located further south on the A12, namely Route W, or the ‘D2’ route. They believed SZC Co. had not given this route adequate consideration and felt that it would have several significant benefits over the proposed route. This included:

- legacy benefits for Saxmundham, Leiston, Yoxford and surrounding villages once construction is over;
- the B1122 could be used by residents and tourists during construction;
- serve multiple energy projects as well as Sizewell C;
- provide a safer emergency route in case of an emergency;
- lower fuel costs for construction vehicles by reducing journey length;
- reduce air pollution impacts on residents;
- destroy less wildlife habitat and impact fewer heritage sites; and
- encourage new businesses.

2.6.10 Some PILs believed SZC Co. had chosen Route Z instead of alternative routes because of cost. They commented that this should not be the reason for a route choice.

2.6.11 Some PILs were concerned that the proposed routes would increase the risk of accidents because of large amounts of heavy traffic. They suggested residents and farm vehicles turning right onto the A12 would struggle to do so with the increased traffic flow and it would be dangerous for vehicles

making this turn. Other traffic safety risks included the detrimental impact on emergency service access and the lack of a sufficient emergency route in case of a nuclear accident. Some felt that the proposed speed limit of 60mph was too high.

- 2.6.12 Some PILs expressed concern that even with the proposed bypass and link road, traffic through communities such as Middleton and Theberton would increase and cut-through driving will occur, creating a disturbance for residents. They also felt that a continuous flow of traffic along the A12 and B1122 would inhibit access to these roads for local people going about their day to day lives, especially during the ‘early years’ of construction. Some commented that a link road with the A12 would alleviate congestion through Leiston and prevent cut-through driving on minor roads.

c) Environment – General

- 2.6.13 Some PILs commented on the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Sizewell link road and Theberton bypass on residents and wildlife by air, dust, noise, vibration and light pollution from construction and HGVs. Some PILs were specifically concerned about the risk of contaminants leaking into soil and water. Others commented on the darkness and tranquillity currently experienced in the area, commenting that light and noise pollution would ruin their way of life.
- 2.6.14 Some PILs commented that the use of embankments and culverts to cross watercourses would negatively impact ecology, drainage and water quality. Other PILs raised concerns about the potential impact on eight heritage assets within 375 metres of the Sizewell Link Road, as well as Grade II listed buildings and a Grade II listed monument.
- 2.6.15 Some PILs believed the proposals would turn large amounts of greenfield land into brownfield and would scar the landscape. Some suggested that existing roads should be improved to avoid unnecessary loss of land.
- 2.6.16 Some PILs expressed concern about the impact of the proposed routes including the construction compound on wildlife and ecology, such as damage to species-rich hedges, bat habitat, great crested newt ponds, broad-leaved woodland, fields containing marsh harriers and other rare bird species, red deer, reptiles and invertebrates, badgers, hedgehogs and grass snakes.
- 2.6.17 Some PILs made environmental suggestions, these included:

- proposals for mitigation and planting seeking to achieve net gain, for example for the severance of a woodland/scrub belt northeast of Dovehouse Farm;
- noise and air quality monitoring at least eight weeks prior to construction; and
- mitigation to minimise the impacts of noise, vibration, smell, fumes and light to properties and wildlife.

d) **Community impact**

2.6.18 Some PILs believed the route would break up communities. Some said more thought should have been given to patterns of travel when designing the route, in particular for the Moat Road and Pretty Lane crossings. They said that connectivity to Saxmundham would be inhibited, severing their access to amenities such as supermarkets, the railway station and doctors. PRow and minor roads would be cut off, isolating some residences from the rest of their village. Some PILs suggested that as a result, the proposals would be disruptive to their quality of life and adversely affect their thriving community.

2.6.19 Some commented that by cutting through agricultural land, the route would affect the viability of farms, blighting the livelihoods of farmers. Others commented that it would prevent customers and visitors staying in local campsites from being able to access businesses such as pubs and minimise passing trade to businesses in Theberton. They also felt traffic and fumes would reduce the ability to let holiday accommodation, such as Mile Hill Barn.

2.6.20 Some PILs were concerned that the proposals would reduce the value of properties and make selling impossible, blighting residents' lives. Some disputed statements from SZC Co. that compensation will be provided and believed they had a legitimate claim for compensation and/or damages. They also suggested the consultation documentation failed to list the full extent of properties located in close proximity to the proposed route.

2.6.21 In relation to health, some PILs felt that light and noise pollution could affect mental health and dust pollution would exacerbate allergies. Some expressed concern that those living near traffic heavy roads would be at increased risk of cancer and strokes.

2.6.22 Some stated that the Pretty Road footbridge would completely restrict access to their property's principal drive, the only route suitable for large vehicles which required access to the property.

2.7 Two Village Bypass

a) General

2.7.1 Some PILs expressed support for a two village bypass to reduce congestion, noise and air pollution on the A12 through Farnham. No PILs expressed outright opposition to a two village bypass, but some were opposed to the route selection.

b) Site suitability

2.7.2 Some PILs expressed opposition to the proposed route of the two village bypass to the west of Foxborrow Wood as they believed it would run too close to residences in Farnham. They suggested that SZC Co. changed its proposals to route the bypass to the east of Foxborrow Wood, a plan they claimed was supported by the majority of residents and the parish council.

2.7.3 Some PILs believed the reasons for dismissing the ‘eastern’ route presented in the consultation documentation were inaccurate and misleading, and rebutted each of the arguments made by SZC Co. for choosing the ‘western’ alignment:

- Some PILs claimed that the stretch of woodland that the western route aims to avoid, which connects Palant’s Grove to Foxborrow Wood and which was said by SZC Co. to be ‘ancient woodland’, was in fact poor quality woodland. They claimed that SZC Co. ignored the 1994 report by Anthony Walker and Partners which concluded that the first record of Palant’s Grove was in 1800, and that the western route would mean felling ancient oaks between Pond Wood and Foxborrow Wood.
- Some PILs believed that the statement that the bypass had been routed as far away from residential properties as possible was false because it would run closer than 200m to 20 properties.
- Some PILs commented that the claim that the eastern route would be too close to Walk Barn Farm was biased, as they believed that properties in Farnham Hall would be adversely affected by the proximity to the western route. They commented that Walk Barn Farm was rarely occupied and the views of this residence should not outweigh those of the majority of residents and the parish council.
- Some PILs commented that the eastern route would only be 400 metres longer than the western route, and that SZC Co.’s claim that drivers would avoid using the bypass because of this could not be proven.

- Some PILs referred to SZC Co.'s claim that there was not enough room on the east side of the wood to build the road. The PILs felt that this had not been proven.
- 2.7.4 Some PILs commented that SZC Co. had already heavily invested in scoping the western route of the bypass and believed this was its reason for discounting the eastern route. They felt that SZC Co.'s refusal to meet or engage with the parish council regarding the route choice was unjustified.
- 2.7.5 Some PILs expressed concern about traffic and congestion as a result of the two village bypass without explaining their comments further. Others explained that although it may relieve traffic through the villages of Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham, it would not reduce congestion through Marlesford and Little Glemham and would continue to eject traffic to the main bottlenecks at Yoxford and the B1122 and A1120 junctions. Some PILs felt that it may increase the risk of road accidents occurring.
- 2.7.6 Some PILs commented that the route of the bypass would shift the current problem of noise, pollution and disruption from properties along the A12 to properties in Farnham Hall. They felt the proposals would devalue their properties (some of which the bypass would be located on two sides), cause blight and destroy residents' enjoyment of their homes. Additionally, some raised concern about heritage impact from damage to Grade II listed buildings at Farnham Hall.
- 2.7.7 Some PILs also referred to the mitigation proposals. They commented that the proposed walkway would directly overlook properties, invading their privacy. The deciduous tree mitigation, they commented, would defoliate for six months per year, rendering them insufficient. Some commented that without irrigation the planting was unlikely to survive. Other PILs believed the proposals would not mitigate the loss of ecological functionality and the proposed cutting may negatively alter the hydrology of the area.
- 2.7.8 Some PILs expressed concern about the future of local businesses on the current A12 such as a petrol station and a caravan business, which they believed could close with the lack of passing trade. Some commented that other holiday let businesses would be blighted by the proposed route, for which they felt no real mitigation or compensation had been proposed.
- 2.7.9 Some PILs felt that the proposals would severely impact the lives of the community by harming their enjoyment of their property, surroundings and recreational amenity. They said that the possibility of the proposed route and threat to their quality of life had affected their wellbeing for years.
- 2.7.10 Some PILs also raised specific concerns about access issues, including:

- septic tank drainage, for which they requested a new soak away;
- horseriding access through Blaxhall Forest during construction; and
- interruption of access to Farnham Hall Farmhouse and the PRow network serving Foxborrow Wood.

2.7.11 Some PILs made specific suggestions for mitigation measures, such as:

- traffic management on the current A12 through Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew and for businesses that rely on passing trade;
- the road should be built prior to construction work on the main development site; and
- compensation should be provided for those who would be severely blighted.

2.7.12 Other PILs requested further assessment or information:

- a cost/benefit analysis of the eastern and western routes, including compensation costs;
- a timetable of construction works, including working hours; and
- more information about the expected air and noise pollution and impacts on health.

c) **Environment – General**

2.7.13 Some PILs expressed concern about the impacts of the proposals on woodland due to the proximity of the route to Foxborrow Wood, the felling of ancient oaks, the severing of the natural corridor between Pond Wood and Foxborrow Wood and the impact of a drop in the water table on ancient oak trees on their properties.

2.7.14 In respect to impacts on wildlife and ecology, some PILs raised concerns about loss of ecological connectivity along the river corridor, requesting more detail about this and the ecological finding for Palant's Grove. They also suggested further mitigation for mammal passes. They commented that brown hares, skylarks, nightingales, grass snakes, newts, sparrow hawks, deer, owls, buzzards, kestrels and bat roosts may be affected.

2.7.15 Some expressed concern about the noise impact from traffic, especially if the roads are wet. They commented that prevailing winds come from the west, and would carry noise and air pollution to residents and into Foxborrow

Wood. Some felt that as the bypass would be raised, it would be extremely visible especially during winter, causing serious damage to residential and visual amenity. In addition, some PILs believed air quality would be impacted by the proposed roundabout at Parkgate farm, due to many HGVs climbing a steep gradient, producing a large amount of pollution.

2.7.16 Some PILs made suggestions for environmental mitigation or requested further environmental impact information, such as:

- habitat surveys and protected species surveys prior to drainage infiltration basin works and these should be designed for net gain opportunities;
- a green bridge to retain connectivity of several locally important hedge lines;
- land to be purchased to ameliorate the landscape effect of the road, in particular for tree planting;
- more information about the effect on hydrology and what would happen to drainage systems that would be severed by the new route, provisions for potential flooding; and
- an ecological survey of the narrow strip of woodland SZC Co. is seeking to avoid with the western route.

2.8 Yoxford Roundabout

a) General

2.8.1 Some PILs supported the Yoxford roundabout proposals to improve the flow of traffic on the A12. Others expressed concern that a roundabout on the A12/B1122 would not relieve problems at the A12/A1120 junction and that the roundabout would not prevent Yoxford becoming a blackspot for congestion. Some mentioned that it would increase the flow of traffic directly outside their house.

2.8.2 Some PILs made suggestions for the Yoxford roundabout, such as:

- that the infiltration pond should be designed sensitively to maximise wildlife value and grassland should be planted with wildflowers to benefit pollinators; and
- that a traffic management plan for Yoxford should be undertaken in cooperation with Yoxford Parish Council.

2.9 Freight Management Facility

2.9.1 Some PILs supported the proposals for a FMF whereas others felt the changes did not address their concerns from previous consultations. Some PILs expressed concern that both locations would be too close to existing properties. Others thought that traffic from the Seven Hills site could impinge on the nearby crematorium or expressed concern that the facility could negatively affect traffic on the A12.

2.10 Rail Improvements

a) Green rail route

2.10.1 Some PILs expressed support for the green rail route proposals without providing further information. Others commented on the potential noise impact and disturbance to residents and visitors, or the effect on Buckle's Wood CWS and its ancient woodland, bat populations and badgers. Some PILs requested full protected species surveys with evaluation of the impact on functionality of wildlife corridors.

2.10.2 Some felt insufficient consideration had been given to the impacts on local businesses, for example the closure of two public footpaths would hinder the ability of customers of local visitor accommodation to walk their dogs. Others strongly objected to the closure of Buckleswood Road to vehicles as part of the proposals.

2.10.3 Suggestions for the green rail route included:

- a footbridge over the railway line for one of the closed footpaths;
- for trains to be run during the day to reduce disturbance at night; and
- that a level crossing should be used to ensure Buckleswood Road remains open.

b) East Suffolk Line

2.10.4 There was support for the upgrades to the East Suffolk line proposed under the rail-led strategy from PILs. However, some believed changes to the level crossings would be inappropriate. Others commented on the lack of information about how access to certain residences would be provided should the Lime Kiln Quay level crossing be closed, or stated their opposition to options 2 and 3 of the alternative routes for the Melton Bromeswell level crossing closure.

- 2.10.5 Some PILs suggested alternative routing of the existing access to Robertsons Boat Yard to mitigate the impact of changes to the Lime Kiln Quay level crossing.
- 2.10.6 Some PILs expressed concern that access to their property would be directly impacted by the proposals for the Saxmundham crossover as part of the rail-led and integrated strategies. They suggested that the proposals should be altered so as to not affect their access, or that a new suitable access route should be created.
- 2.11 **Sizewell Halt**
- 2.11.1 Some PILs felt that none of the proposed options were acceptable. They felt that passenger services may be impacted by the changes, potentially along with effects on noise, dust and light pollution and industrialisation of greenfield land.
- 2.11.2 Some commented that in order to assess the options, further evidence and assessment was needed, particularly input from National Rail, as well as protected species surveys.
- 2.11.3 When comparing the different options available, PILs were most supportive of option 3, a new rail siding. Some stated that this option would have less disruption on homes and would prevent closure of the level crossing on King George's Avenue. However, other PILs believed option 3 would create unnecessary noise for residents and workers on the caravan site.
- 2.11.4 There was some support for option 2, a new rail spur, but without a justification as to why. Some PILS considered the option of an overhead conveyer was deemed inappropriate and dangerous.