

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
1	<p>There are proposed to be two waste storage buildings and two waste process buildings (one for each nuclear island) and one waste treatment building (as part of Unit 2) which is a shared facility.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the two waste process buildings were omitted from Table 2.1 in error; however, they are described in ES Volume 2 Chapter 2, 2.4.8 and have the same maximum height as the waste storage buildings (27m (AOD)), and have been assessed accordingly.</p>	<p>Please consider amending the draft DCO to clarify that there will be two waste storage buildings and two waste process buildings with one waste treatment unit.</p>	<p>The Applicant has noticed that its previous response to this question was incorrect. There is in fact proposed to be one waste storage building, one waste process building and one waste treatment building. As such, the draft DCO is correct and so no updates will be made to Work 1A (ix), (x) and (xi).</p>
2	<p>It is acknowledged that the ES notes that there are two different types of water discharge weir buildings but there is consistency between the ES and draft DCO in terms of the number of these buildings that are proposed (i.e. total of four). It is therefore not considered necessary to amend the draft DCO.</p>	<p>The ES suggests the fact they are two different types of buildings should be reflected in the draft DCO. If there is a reason not to do this, please will the Applicant explain.</p>	<p>There are two types of cooling water discharge weir buildings (type 1 and type 2), two of each type. Each reactor unit has one of each type. The Applicant will update the draft DCO to make this clearer.</p>
3	<p>Confirmed. The key plant items mentioned in 2.4.33 of the ES Volume 2, Chapter 2 are listed in Work No. 1A at (b)(iii)-(vii).</p>	<p>Noted. But can the Applicant confirm that Work No.1A (b)(iii) is in fact listed at para 2.4.32, not 2.4.33?</p>	<p>Confirmed.</p>
6	<p>In relation to the 'intermediate level waste store' and 'interim spent fuel store', it is noted that there is a discrepancy between the terminology in Table 2.1 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 2 and Work No. 1A(f) and (g) (namely, the omission of reference to associated structures and plant) but Work No. 1A(f) and (g) have been assessed to include associated structures and plant in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7.</p>	<p>Please will the Applicant explain fully and clearly how the "structures and plant" and "associated structures and plant" which appear in Work No.1A(f) and (g) respectively after the word "including" are described in Chapter 7 and thus have been subject to</p>	<p>The Applicant will remove the wording “, including structures and plant” and “, including associated structures and plant” from Work No.1A(f) and (g).</p>

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
		assessment in the other chapters of the ES assessing the main site. Please specify the chapters, paragraphs and page numbers of the ES where this has been done. The alternative would appear to be to remove those words from the draft DCO.	
8(1)	In relation to Work No. 1A(w), temporary and permanent access roads are detailed throughout ES Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 3. For example, at 3.4.194 reference is made to new vehicular accesses onto Valley Road, Lover's Lane and King George's Avenue including temporary accesses into LEEIE, and at 2.4.80 reference is made to access roads serving the ancillary buildings.	<p>Work No.1A(w). The ExA notes also the Applicant's response [AS-0061] para 4.7 to the question about temporary construction works accesses in PD1 [PD-0051] in particular that the temporary construction works accesses are shown on the construction parameter plans [APP-0221].</p> <p>The ExA also notes that Art 19(1)(a) of the draft DCO [APP-0591] allows accesses shown on the ROW plans to be created. However looking for example at the accesses to the LEEIE shown on the Access and Rights of Way Plans [APP-0131] Sheet 3 of 27 there is one more access (A1/5) than is shown on sheet 3 of 4 of the construction parameters plans [APP-0221]. In addition, when the Access and Rights of Way Plans [APP-0131] sheet 3/27 is compared with the Works Plans [APP-0111] Sheet</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the ExA's comments in relation to apparent inconsistencies between the accesses shown on the Rights of Way Plans, Works Plans and Construction Parameter Plans. The Applicant will undertake a review of all plans that show accesses to ensure that all plans are consistent. The Applicant also notes the ExA's comments in relation to the role that the numbering plays, and will consider whether the draft DCO should include express reference to the numbered accesses.</p> <p>The Work No 1A(w) access roads comprise the following, all of which have been assessed as part of the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the footpath from Valley Road to the caravan park, which is described in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, para. 3.4.201; • other temporary access routes, which are described in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, paras 3.4.156 - 3.4.159 (main accesses), 3.4.194-3.4.196 (LEEIE) and 3.4.205 (Sizewell Gap); and

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
		<p>3 of 27 an additional access is shown on the Works Plans (A1/7) and the numbering of the other four accesses changes (A1/5 becomes A1/14; A1/6 becomes A1/8; A1/8 becomes A1/9). There are other instances of similar discrepancies on other plans. It is also not clear what role is played by the numbering; it is not used in the draft DCO so far as the ExA can see.</p> <p>The ExA also notes that the Applicant's response in para 4.7 of [AS-006] referred to above that it recognises that construction accesses are not yet confirmed for the associated development sites.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to question 8 in Annex A of [PD-005] is also noted in relation to Work No. 1A(w).</p> <p>Please will the Applicant submit a list of all the accesses and access roads comprised in Work No 1A(w) with, for each of them, the paragraphs in the chapters of the ES which show how they have been listed in the Project Description and assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant also submit a list of all other accesses and access roads</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the permanent access route from B1122 to the main development site, which is described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 4, para. 4.10.3. <p>Once the review exercise described above has been carried out, the Applicant will provide the ExA with a list of all accesses and access roads comprised in the authorised development, as well as the new set of plans showing all such accesses (as requested by the ExA).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that Article 19 of the draft DCO is drafted in substantially the same way as Article 15 of the Southampton to London Pipeline DCO. The only difference between the two is that the accesses that can be constructed without street authority approval are identified in the Rights of Way Plans in the draft DCO whereas in the Southampton to London Pipeline DCO they are identified in separate work numbers. The Applicant does not propose to add new standalone work numbers for each proposed access. However, the Applicant will carry out a review of the plans that identify accesses, and will provide any updates to the drafting of Article 19 once this exercise has been carried out. For the avoidance of doubt, any updates to the draft DCO in this regard will not be reflected in the updated version that is submitted to the ExA on 11 January as this review exercise will not have been completed by then.</p>

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
		<p>comprised in the “authorised development “ (as defined in Article 2 of the draft DCO) with, for each of them, the paragraphs in the chapters of the ES which show how they have been listed in the Project Description and assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant submit a set of plans showing each and every temporary construction access and each and every permanent access. The planned accesses should be referenced clearly in the list requested above.</p> <p>The ExA seeks clarity and consistency on these matters as between plans, descriptions, the draft DCO and what has been assessed in the ES.</p> <p>The ExA suggests that the effect of Article 19 of the DCO is that the accesses shown could be permitted under it without further consent. They should only be accesses which have been assessed and are in accordance with the parameters plans. For associated development sites where there are no parameters plans, the range of locations or areas assessed should be shown. For such accesses, the</p>	

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
		<p>approval of the street authority after consultation with the highway authority would be necessary. Article 19 would appear to require some redrafting.</p> <p>The Applicant's attention is drawn to Article 15 of the draft DCO for the Southampton – London Pipeline NSIP which may be a useful example.</p>	
8(2)	<p>Work No. 1A(x) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.155 under the sub-heading 'Phase 2'.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response at [AS-006] to question 8 in Annex A of [PD-005] is also noted in relation to Work No. 1A(x) and also its response to questions 9 – 12 on where various parking facilities are assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant supply a list of the vehicle parks it lists in its response to show which park listed is which Work No in the draft DCO.</p> <p>In the interest of clarity of what has been assessed and simpler enforcement of the DCO would it not be helpful to have in the draft DCO a list of all the parking facilities which are listed, with their Work No., location, a name, number of spaces to be provided for different modes of transport and the triggers by</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work No 1A(r), which is described as "Approximately 1,370 permanent parking spaces", relates to the permanent power station parking shown on operational parameter plan SZC-SZ0100-XX-000-DRW-100050. 600 of the 1,370 spaces are to be allocated as Sizewell C outage car parking. • Work No 1A(x), which is described as "Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces", relates to temporary parking in the temporary construction area near the main site access road (see ES Volume 2, Figure 3.2). • Work No 1A(y), which is described as "Temporary freight management facility, approximately 80 HGV parking spaces and associated infrastructure", relates to HGV parking on LEEIE in the early years of construction (see ES Volume 2, Figures 3.1 and 3.2).

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
		when they are to be operational? A Requirement would secure compliance with the capacity and triggers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work No 1A(z), which is described as “Temporary park and ride facility, approximately 600 associated car parking spaces, approximately 20 bus spaces, a terminal area and associated infrastructure”, relates to parking on LEEIE in the early years of construction (see ES Volume 2, Figures 3.1 and 3.2). • Work No 1D(gg)¹, which is described as “up to 688 operational car parking spaces and access roads”, relates to Sizewell B Relocated Facilities operational parking (112 spaces) and outage parking (576 spaces)² (see ES Volume 2, Appendix 2A, Figure 3). • Work No 3(b), which is described as “multi-storey parking area to provide up to 1,300 vehicle parking spaces approximately 60 blue badge parking spaces, drop off areas, associated structures and plant”, relates to the temporary accommodation campus multi-storey parking (see ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1 and Design and Access Statement, Figure A.17). • Work No 3(c)(ii) and (iii), which are described as “surface vehicle parking area to provide up to 300 parking spaces” and “motorcycle and cycle

¹ Note that the automatic numbering in the submission dDCO was incorrect for this Work No; this incorrect numbering is retained in version 2 of the draft DCO but will be corrected when version 3 of the draft DCO is submitted to the ExA on 11 January.

² Note that version 2 of the draft DCO will show updates reflecting the split of outage and operational car parking.

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
			<p>parking spaces", relate to the temporary accommodation campus surface parking (see ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1 and Design and Access Statement, Figure A.17).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the ExA's suggestion of a Requirement to secure compliance with capacities and triggers. The capacities are approximate and the ES assumes parking delivery by phase, which is considered to be acceptable.</p>
8(3)	Work No 1A(aa) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.133.	<p>The Examining Authority is not clear where the ES states the location of the temporary water resource storage it has assessed.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant indicate where to find this, and also where to find it in any change to its location in the material change proposal currently out for consultation?</p> <p>Please will the Applicant also point to where the parameters for this facility are to be found in the application documents and, in due course, in the material change request?</p>	<p>The location of the temporary water resource storage area is shown in the ES, Volume 2, Chapter 3, Figure 3.2.</p> <p>The proposed change to the location of the temporary water resource storage area is shown on Figure 4.7 of the proposed changes Consultation Document.</p> <p>The description of the temporary water resource storage area is set out in the ES, Volume 2, Chapter 3, paragraphs 3.4.133-3.4.138. This section provides details of, amongst other things, the water resource storage area's approximate height and expected volume.</p> <p>The proposed revised details will be located in the track change version of ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, which will be submitted with the change request on 11 January 2021.</p>

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
9, 10, 11 and 12		Please see question 8(2) above	
18	The list of works in Work No. 1D includes "administrative buildings" (jj) and "welfare facilities" (kk) – the workshop, civils store and general store are considered to fall under the broad category of "administrative buildings" and the changing facilities are considered to fall under the broad category of "welfare facilities".	Is there any reason why the description in Work No 1D (kk) should not be aligned with the list in para 2.5.5. of the description of the permanent development [APP-180]?	The parameters for the Sizewell B relocated facilities, which are set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2, Table 2.2, list "offices, canteen and welfare facilities" as one set of buildings which all fall within Parameter Zone 1H. The draft DCO is consistent with the wording in Table 2.2, so it is not considered necessary to break down the description of development in the draft DCO any further. This reflects the outline, parameter-based approach to this element of the Sizewell B relocated facilities development.
21	The 'western access road' is included in the description of Work No. 1D(gg). As stated above, the Applicant agrees to review and update the draft DCO in relation to the car parking numbers and will more generally review Work No 1D to ensure consistency in use of terminology and use of categories of sub-works between the draft DCO and the ES description of development.	Noted. The Examining Authority's current thinking is that Work No. 1D(gg) is somewhat imprecise as it refers to "roads". The ExA welcomes the Applicant's commitment to review Work No 1D for consistency with the ES.	Noted. Updates to Work No 1D will be made by the Applicant.
Parts B to F		The ExA welcomes the Applicant's commitments to review Works 9-13 in the draft DCO.	Work Nos 9-13 will be updated in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work No. 9 – While the Applicant has made the change to this Work description to refer to the number of car parking spaces, it does not consider it to be appropriate to add reference to the potential diversion of the 11KV electric line. Should this work be required, it would be undertaken by

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
			<p>the relevant electricity undertaker under their own powers, rather than by the Applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work No. 10 - While the Applicant has made the change to this Work description to refer to the number of car parking spaces and to the traffic incident management area, it does not consider it to be appropriate to add reference to the potential diversion of the 11KV electric line. Should this work be required, it would be undertaken by the relevant electricity undertaker under their own powers, rather than by the Applicant. • Work No. 11 – The Applicant does not consider there is a need to refer to the flood compensation land development, as this would be authorised by Part 2 (a) and (b) of Schedule 1 • Work No 12 – The Applicant considers the description of Work No. 12 provides a suitable description of the works that will be undertaken. The description is clear about what is being proposed, but reflects the flexibility that is allowed for through the limits of deviation and the requirements. The Applicant does not propose to raise the East Suffolk railway line by 2m. The description of development in the environmental statement does not refer to this, but simply confirms that <i>“The proposed Sizewell link road</i>

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
			<p><i>would rise up on a 2.5m embankment, and cross the railway via the bridge, to provide sufficient headroom as required by Network Rail”.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work No 13 – The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to make changes to the description of this Work. The level of detail is consistent with the drafting of the two park and ride sites. As with other elements of the proposals, the development authorised by this description is controlled by the relevant plans and requirements, and it would be unnecessarily restrictive to list the number, floor area and purpose of all buildings. The description refers to 'amenity, welfare and security buildings', which the Applicant considers adequate and appropriate.
Part G			
Q1		<p>CHP and back-up plant</p> <p>The documentation appears to refer to a series of alternatives,</p> <p>1 Combined Heat and Power Plant, draft DCO description “Work No. 3 I (vi) combined heat and power plant”.</p> <p>2 Emergency Equipment Store back up generator, draft DCO description “Work No. 1A</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms in relation to the environmental assessment that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work No. 3(c)(vi) is assessed in the ES as part of the proposed development, and is described in Volume 2, Chapter 3, para. 3.4.180 (second bullet point). 2. Work No. 1A(i) is assessed in the ES as part of the proposed development, and is described in Volume 2, Chapter 2, para. 2.7 and Table 2.7.

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
		<p>(i) emergency equipment store, associated structures, back up generator and other plant”.</p> <p>3 Emergency response energy centre, draft DCO description “Work No. 1A (h) (v) emergency response centre”</p> <p>Please will the Applicant clarify for the ExA where the ES has assessed these elements of the draft DCO in respect of noise, air quality and landscape effects for both the construction and subsequent operational periods and how each element is intended to function.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant also clarify the flue heights and their relation to the parameters plans.</p>	<p>3. Work No. 1A(h)(v) is assessed in the ES as part of the proposed development, and is described in Volume 2, Chapter 2, Tables 2.1 and 2.4.</p> <p>The CHP Plant, if progressed over the air source heat pump option, would serve the daily needs of the accommodation campus and would only be in use during the construction phase. During the operational phase, the CHP Plant would be retained as the emergency equipment store back-up generator, which would be used only when there is a loss of off-site power to the emergency equipment store. So, Work No 3(c)(vi) (CHP Plant) and part of 1A(i) (back-up generator) relate to the same piece of plant albeit used in different phases of the development and for different purposes hence their different treatment in the ES. The Applicant can confirm that the CHP Plant/ back-up generator has one stack, which is described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2 Table 2.7 and Chapter 3, para. 3.4.180 respectively. The back-up generator is within parameter zone 1M.</p> <p>The primary function of the emergency response energy centre is to host power distribution plant (back-up diesel generator, HV ring main unit and transformer, switchboards) and fuel to run the backup diesel generator and the on-site emergency response facilities and equipment. The emergency response</p>

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
			energy centre is unrelated to the CHP/back-up generator. The Emergency Response Energy Centre does not have any stacks.
Q2		<p>Alde Valley Academy Leiston</p> <p>The draft DCO describes the Sports facilities at Work No. 5 as <i>“Landscape works including open space, sports facilities and associated structures and plant. The location of the above works is shown on sheet no. 11 of the Works Plans.”</i></p> <p>However, this does not appear to correspond with either of the descriptions in the ES Vol 2 Ch 2 [APP-180] Description of permanent development para 2.9.1 or ES Vol 2 Ch 3 [APP-184] Description of Construction para 3.4.222.</p> <p>Please clarify what has been assessed in the ES and make clear where the details of the floodlights, illumination plans, and acoustic barriers can be found.</p>	<p>The Applicant will update the draft DCO to more closely align Work No 5 with the description of development in the ES.</p> <p>ES Volume 2, Chapter 9 (noise and vibration) assumes a permanent 2m acoustic fence at para. 11.6.178.</p> <p>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13 (landscape and visual) recognises at Appendix 13G that the sports pitch would be floodlit and screens out an assessment of the pitches as it would not result in significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The Applicant will be proposing an additional Requirement to submit reserved matters for details of the layout, scale and external appearance of the buildings and landscape works comprised in Work No 5. This additional Requirement will be included in the updated draft DCO submitted on 11 January 2021.</p>
Q3		<p>In Part 3 of the Design and Access Statement [APP-587] there are several references to a former sand pit, its ecological interest and survey (e.g. paras A.14.2 and following, and A.23.5). Please will the</p>	<p>Please refer to The “SANDPITS – TARGETED SURVEYS SEPTEMBER 2019 TECHNICAL NOTE”, which was included in ES Volume 2, Annex 14A3, which is a standalone confidential ecology survey report for the sandpits.</p>

Number	Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations	Applicant's response
		Applicant point the ExA to where this is addressed in the ES.	The Applicant has not individually assessed the value of the sandpits in the ecological assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 14 of the ES. The sandpits form one small part of the habitats across the main development site and they are not recognised as an 'Important Ecological Feature' in their own right. However, where species were recorded in the sandpits (e.g. badgers, breeding birds), these are accounted for in the assessments of these species for the site as a whole in the ecological assessment.