

No.	ExA's questions (Annex A of [PD-005])	[AS-006] 16 Nov 2020- Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations (Annex A of [PD-005])	Applicant's response of 8 Jan 2021 to Annex A of [PD-005]	Questions following the Applicant's responses of 8 Jan 2020	Applicant Response
8(1)	<p>The ExA note that the following are listed in the draft DCO, Work No. 1A:</p> <p>"(q) one electricity transmission tower /pylon outside the power station's security fence, and associated transmission infrastructure including overhead line conductors";</p> <p>"(s) removal of an existing transmission tower / pylon and associated transmission infrastructure";</p> <p>"(w) temporary and permanent access roads";</p> <p>"(x) Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces"; and</p> <p>"(aa) temporary water resource storage area, associated structures and plant".</p> <p>However, it is not evident where these are included in the Project Description of the ES and therefore assessed within the ES. The Applicant is requested to provide clarification of the cross-referencing of such Works between the draft DCO and the ES project description and reference to relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Work No 1A(q) and (s) are described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2, 2.5.47 and assessed accordingly within this volume.</p> <p>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> <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>Work No 1A(aa) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.133.</p> <p>All works described above are assessed in Volume 2 of the ES.</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 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 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 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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant will undertake a review of all plans that show accesses to ensure that all plans are consistent. 2. 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. 3. The Work No 1A(w) access roads comprise the following, all of which have been assessed as part of the proposed development: <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 - the permanent access route from B1122 to the main development site, which is described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 4, para. 4.10.3. 4. 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>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 the ES.</p>	<p>The ExA has, in this table, numbered the parts of the Applicant's responses of 8 January 2021. .</p> <p>It would assist the ExA if the output could include a clear explanation of where each of the accesses has been assessed in the ES and also how all potential accesses under Reg 19 have been assessed.</p>	<p>The Applicant has carried out a thorough review of the Rights of Way Plans [AS-113 - AS-114] and can confirm that all temporary and permanent accesses are accurately identified in terms of their locations and the labels used (e.g. A1/1, A1/2 etc.). The Applicant has produced a Schedule of Accesses, which lists all those accesses identified on the Rights of Way Plans to which Article 19 refers. The Schedule of Accesses is provided to the ExA in Appendix B of the cover letter for information, and will be added substantially in this form to the next revision of the draft DCO and cross-referred to in Article 19 accordingly.</p> <p>Having undertaken the review of where accesses are shown and how they are secured, the Applicant has taken the decision to remove all accesses shown on the Works Plans (Doc Ref 2.3(B)). This is on the basis that: (1) Article 19 does not cross-refer to the Works Plans; and (2) regulation 5(i) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 does not require accesses to be shown on work plans. The Applicant has decided to retain the accesses shown on the Construction Parameter Plans (Doc Ref. 2.5(B)) but has added wording to the key to make clear that the locations are indicative only.</p> <p>As stated in its previous response dated 8 January 2021 [AS-049] 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 being that the accesses that can be constructed without street authority approval in the draft DCO are identified in the Rights of Way Plans whereas in the Southampton to London Pipeline DCO they are identified in separate work numbers. As stated previously, the Applicant does not propose to create new work numbers for each access. The Applicant trusts that the Schedule of Accesses that has been prepared provides the ExA with the required clarity as to which accesses could be laid out/improved without street authority approval pursuant to Article 19(1)(a).</p> <p>All works connected to the Main Development Site are described in Chapters 2 and 3 of Volume 2 of the ES respectively [APP-180 and APP-184], insofar as it is necessary to allow environmental impacts to be assessed. These chapters form the foundation of the Volume 2 assessment in this regard because all Volume 2 assessment chapters assess the impacts of the contents of Chapters 2 and 3, where it is relevant to that environmental topic. The Applicant therefore confirms that all temporary and permanent accesses have been environmentally assessed as part of the proposed development as a whole and that both any impacts and significant effects have been identified.</p>
8(2)	<p>(Original Q.8 in full is set out here)</p> <p>The ExA note that the following are listed in the draft DCO, Work No. 1A:</p> <p>"(q) one electricity transmission tower /pylon outside the power station's security fence, and associated transmission infrastructure including overhead line conductors";</p> <p>"(s) removal of an existing transmission tower / pylon and associated transmission infrastructure";</p> <p>"(w) temporary and permanent access roads";</p> <p>"(x) Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces"; and</p> <p>"(aa) temporary water resource storage area, associated structures and plant".</p> <p>However, it is not evident where these are included in the Project Description of the ES and therefore assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to provide clarification of the cross-referencing of such Works between the draft DCO and the ES project description and reference to relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Work No 1A(q) and (s) are described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2, 2.5.47 and assessed accordingly within this volume.</p> <p>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. Work No. 1A(x) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.155 under the sub-heading "Phase 2". Work No 1A(aa) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.133. All works described above are assessed in Volume 2 of the ES.</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> <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 when they are to be operational?</p> <p>A Requirement would secure compliance with the capacity and triggers.</p>	<p>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-S20100-XX-000-DRW-100050. 600 of the 1,370 spaces are to be allocated as Sizewell C outage car parking.</p> <p>Work No 1A(v), 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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Work No 1D(gg), 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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Work No 3(c)(i) and (ii), which are described as "surface vehicle parking area to provide up to 300 parking spaces" and "motorcycle and cycle 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>	<p>(1) Please will the Applicant overlay the location of the parking areas described in its response of 8th January 2021 onto the plans to which it refers.</p> <p>(2) In relation to work 1A(r) (a) Has this parking facility been mentioned in any of the answers given before to Qs 8-127 and (b) Please will the Applicant indicate where this is described and assessed in the ES?</p> <p>(3) In relation to Work No 1A(x), (Q.8 and Q.9, 1st t'ret of response) Thank you. Is this the area marked "laying out of construction roads and parking"?</p> <p>(4) In relation to Work No 1A(y), (Q.9, 6th t'ret of response). Thank you. The ExA cannot see any notation to that effect on either Fig 3.1 or 3.2 of [APP-186]. Does the Applicant mean the notation "Freight Management Facility Developed and Operational" on Fig 3.2 of [APP-186]?</p> <p>(5) In relation to Work No 1A(z) (Q.9, 5th t'ret of response) Thank you. Is that the "Park and Ride Developed and Operational" on Fig 3.2 of [APP-186]?</p> <p>(6) In relation to Work No.1D(gg) The answer to Q11 of [PD-005], the original question, was that operational car parking was 112 and outage was 576. However, the answer went on to say that (gg) – which is operational car parking – would be amended to say 576 and (hh) – outage – would be amended to 112. The ExA notes that the third revision of the DCO has 112 operational in (gg) and 576 outage in (hh) [In revision 3 (gg) has of course become (g) and (hh) has become (h)]. Please will the Applicant confirm that the third revision to the DCO has the correct numbers of spaces.</p> <p>(7) Also in relation to Work No.1D(gg), the Applicant refers the ExA to "ES Volume 2, Appendix 2A, Figure 3".</p> <p>However, this appears to be [APP-181] which is an outline drainage strategy for the Main Development Site. Please can the Applicant clarify this.</p> <p>(8) Again the ExA is finding difficulty in seeing these on Fig 3.1 of [APP-186] which is the Construction Parameter Plan. The ExA has not checked the Design and Access Statement referred to. The description in the ES is what is sought. As before, please will the Applicant specify where in the ES they are described and assessed</p> <p>(9) In all of the above cases, please will the Applicant indicate where each parking facility is described and assessed.</p> <p>(10) The ExA would appreciate it if Examination Library references could always be used, for documents in the library. This goes for the quotation of all documents throughout the Examination and pre-examination.</p>	<p>(1) The Applicant has produced Indicative Parking Plans showing for the construction and operational phases the indicative locations of the proposed parking areas along with details of the number of spaces proposed. The relevant work nos. are cross-referred to in the Indicative Parking Plans. It should be noted that the red line boundary shown in the Indicative Parking Plans reflects the order limits applied for as part of the Applicant's change request. Should any of the order limit changes not be accepted by the ExA, the Indicative Parking Plans will be revised accordingly. The Indicative Parking Plans are submitted as Appendix C of the Applicant's response to the ExA's fifth procedural decision (PD-010).</p> <p>(2) Yes, the Applicant referred to Work 1A(r) (being the permanent operational power station parking) in its response to question 8 on 16 November 2020 [AS-006] and its response to question 8(2) on 8 January 2021 [AS-049].</p> <p>(3) Yes.</p> <p>(4) Yes.</p> <p>(5) Yes.</p> <p>(6) To confirm, the third revision of the draft DCO [AS-143] is correct - the Applicant's response to question 11 on 16 November 2020 referred to (gg) and (hh) the wrong way round.</p> <p>(7) The Applicant's reference to "ES Volume 2, Appendix 2A, Figure 3" was in error. The Applicant should have referred the ExA to "ES Volume 1, Appendix 2A, Figure 3" [APP-163 - APP-166]. This figure shows the location of the outage car park (DTS spaces) and the location of the operational car park (112 spaces), which is noted on the figure as replacement car parking.</p> <p>(8) Please see the Indicative Parking Plan (construction phase) presented in Part 1 of Appendix C of the Applicant's response to the ExA's fifth procedural decision (PD-010).</p> <p>(9) The ExA is referred to the Applicant's response to question 9 on 16 November 2020 [AS-006].</p> <p>(10) Noted - the Applicant has included Examination Library references in these responses.</p>

No.	ExA's questions (Annex A of [PD-005])	[AS-006] 16 Nov 2020- Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations (Annex A of [PD-005])	Applicant's response of 8 Jan 2021 to Annex A of [PD-005]	Questions following the Applicant's responses of 8 Jan 2020	Applicant Response	
8(3)	<p>(Original Q.8 in full is set out here)</p> <p>The ExA note that the following are listed in the draft DCO, Work No.1A:</p> <p>"(q) one electricity transmission tower / pylon outside the power station's security fence, and associated transmission infrastructure including overhead line conductors";</p> <p>"(s) removal of an existing transmission tower / pylon and associated transmission</p> <p>"(w) temporary and permanent access roads";</p> <p>infrastructure";</p> <p>"(x) Approximately 1,000 temporary parking spaces"; and</p> <p>"(aa) temporary water resource storage area, associated structures and plant".</p> <p>However, it is not evident where these are included in the Project Description of the ES and therefore assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to provide clarification of the cross-referencing of such Works between the draft DCO and the ES project description and reference to relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Work No 1A(aa) is referred to in ES Volume 2 Chapter 3, 3.4.133.</p>	<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>(1) The location of the temporary water resource storage area is shown in the ES, Volume 2, Chapter 3, Figure 3.2.</p> <p>(2) 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>(3) 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>(4) 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>	<p>(1) The ExA cannot see any track change version of ES Vol 2 Ch 3 as part of the change request. Please will the Applicant clarify this.</p> <p>(2) Please will the Applicant give greater clarity on what parameters have been assessed and clarify how and "approximate" or "expected" parameter is appropriate.</p>	<p>(1) The track change version of ES Volume 2, Chapter 3 [APP-184] is Appendix 2.2.B of the ES Addendum [AS-202].</p> <p>(2) The parameters that have been assessed for the water resource storage area in its original location are set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 3, paragraphs 3.4.172-3.4.178 [APP-184]. The parameters that have been assessed for the proposed new location of the water resource storage area are set out in ES Addendum, paragraphs 3.4.172 – 3.4.173 [APP-184]. The original location of the water resource storage area would, if the proposed changes are accepted, now contain a proposed flood mitigation area. The parameters for the proposed flood mitigation area are set out in ES Addendum, paragraphs 3.4.175 – 3.4.178 [APP-184]. The description of the water resource storage area and the flood mitigation area reflect the flexibility necessarily sought due to the level of detail of this element of the project that is available at this stage. The Applicant considers that the descriptions provide sufficient certainty to enable any likely significant environmental effects to be assessed.</p>	
9	<p>Can the Applicant clarify the number of (a) car parks and (b) parking spaces which are being provided at each in relation to the Works described in the ES?</p>	<p>ES Volume 2 Chapter 3 (construction):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase 2 – on-site car parking providing 1000 spaces (up from 300 spaces in Phase 1) (3.4.155) - Accommodation campus parking providing 1300 spaces, 60 disabled spaces, 120 motorbike spaces and 120 pedal bike spaces (3.4.178) - Kenton Hills parking upgrade providing 15 additional spaces (3.4.181) - 400 parking spaces associated with caravan park pitches (3.4.198) - 600 car parking spaces and 20 bus parking spaces for use during the early years only at LEEIE (3.4.204) - 80 HGV parking spaces for use during early years only at LEEIE (3.4.205) ES Volume 2 Chapter 2 (permanent development) - 112 replacement car parking spaces and 576 outage car parking spaces relating to Sizewell B Relocated Facilities (2.2.2(g), 2.5.26, 2.5.38) 	<p>Please see question 8(2) above</p>		<p>Whilst trets 1, 5, 6, and 7 have been addressed in the answers to Q8(2), trets 3, and 4 appear to be outstanding. Please will the Applicant respond to them.</p> <p>The intention is to bring all these into the list suggested in Q8(2) of [PD-009] and again with this PD.</p> <p>In relation to the 2nd tret, what has happened to the 120 pedal bike spaces?</p>	<p>Tret 2 - the Applicant accepts that Work No 3(c)(iii) should include the number of cycle spaces (i.e. 120 motorcycle spaces and 120 cycle parking spaces) so that it aligns with the description in the ES, Volume 2, Chapter 3, paragraph 3.4.178 [APP-184]. The Applicant commits to adding this detail to the next revision of the draft DCO.</p> <p>Tret 3 (Kenton Hills Car Park) - this was added as new Work No. 1A(cc) and is described as "improvement works to Kenton Hills Car Park". Please refer to revision 3 of the draft DCO [AS-143].</p> <p>Tret 4 (400 parking spaces associated with caravan park pitches) - the Applicant accepts that this should be added as an additional sub-work within Work No. 1A and will add this to the next revision of the draft DCO.</p>	
10	<p>Can the Applicant clarify the Work in the draft DCO to which ES Paragraph 2.5.26 'Sizewell Replacement car Park' relates?</p>	<p>The replacement car parking described in ES Volume 2, Chapter 2 2.5.26 is the same as the parking described in Work No. 1D(gg).</p>	<p>Please see question 8(2) above</p>			N/A	
11	<p>An Outage car park of 576 spaces is listed in ES Paragraph 2.5.38.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that this is Work No. 1D(hh) in the draft DCO, and if not, clarify which Work the outage car park relates?</p> <p>The ExA notes that draft DCO does not specify a limit on spaces to be provided and therefore the link is not clear.</p> <p>Furthermore, the ExA request that the draft DCO be</p>	<p>The proposed Sizewell B outage car park assessed in the ES has 576 spaces, as described in Volume 2 Chapter 2, 2.5.38. The replacement Sizewell B operational car parking assessed in the ES amounts to 112 spaces. The combined number of spaces therefore is 688. The 688 limit is specified in Work No. 1D(gg).</p> <p>We agree that this is an error and will amend the draft DCO accordingly so that 1D(gg) specifies 576 spaces and 1D(hh) specifies 112 spaces.</p>	<p>Please see question 8(2) above</p>			N/A	
12	<p>The draft DCO at Work No. 1D(gg) lists an 'up to 688 space car park'.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant clarify where this is captured as part of the description of the Proposed Development in the ES?</p>	<p>See response to query 11 above.</p>	<p>Please see question 8(2) above</p>			N/A	
13	<p>Work No. 1A includes a number of the listed works which are plural in their content which leads to ambiguity for the draft DCO in terms of what permission is being sought for.</p> <p>Furthermore, this raises issues in relation to the EIA undertaken in understanding the Project Description and ensuring that all Works have been fully assessed.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to consider this in the next draft DCO and ensure that such Works are limited to being within the envelope of assessment undertaken in the ES.</p>				<p>In its response [AS-006] of 16 November 2020 the Applicant stated "Noted."</p> <p>The Applicant will consider this and amend the draft DCO as necessary.</p> <p>* The second and third revisions of the DCO (submitted on 8 and 12 January 2021) do not appear to have any amendments to address this question.</p> <p>The ExA would be grateful if the Applicant would make the amendments in the next</p>	<p>The Applicant has now completed its review of plurals in the description of works in the draft DCO and will incorporate in the next revision specific numbers of plant items/buildings where this information is available.</p>	
21	<p>ES Paragraph 2.5.35 lists the 'western access road' leading to the laydown area however the ExA note that it is not clear where this is secured through the draft DCO or of which of the authorised Works it forms part of.</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify this and revise the documentation as necessary?</p>	<p>The 'western access road' is included in the description of Work No. 1D(gg).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Examining Authority's current thinking is that Work No. 1D(gg) is somewhat imprecise as it refers to "roads".</p> <p>The ExA welcomes the Applicant's commitment to review Work No 1D for consistency with the ES.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Updates to Work No 1D will be made by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The description of Work 1D(gg) has been amended for DCO revisions 3.1(A) and 3.1(b).</p> <p>Please will the Applicant explain where the Western Access Road is tied into that Work and referred to in the DCO.</p>	<p>The Western Access Road forms part of Work No 1D(d) and 1E(d) (see reference to "access roads") in revision 3 of the draft DCO [AS-143].</p>	

No.	ExA's questions (Annex A of [PD-005])	[AS-006] 16 Nov 2020- Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations (Annex A of [PD-009])	Applicant's response of 8 Jan 2021 to Annex A of [PD-009]	Questions following the Applicant's responses of 8 Jan 2020	Applicant Response	
Parts B to F	<p>B. SZC Bk6 ES V3 Ch2 Northern Park and Ride Description of Development.</p> <p>1. The Northern Park and Ride, Work No.9 in the draft DCO, does not reference the creation of car parking spaces (over 1250 are anticipated by the ES), nor the diversion of a 11kV overhead power line. Can the Applicant review Work No.9 against the ES and where appropriate, amend the draft DCO to include the upper limit on the car parking spaces to be provided and ensure that the draft DCO includes the power line diversion, or explain why those amendments would not be appropriate?</p> <p>C. SZC Bk6 ES V4 Ch2 Southern Park and Ride Description of Development.</p> <p>1. Noting the issues raised in relation to the Northern Park and Ride above, can the Applicant also review this component of the Southern Park and Ride. In addition to those points noted above, the ExA notes the omission of reference in the draft DCO to</p> <p>the traffic incident management area. Can the Applicant review the draft DCO against the ES and where appropriate, amend the draft DCO to include the upper limit on the car parking spaces to be provided and ensure that the draft DCO includes the power line diversion and traffic incident management area, or explain why those amendments would not be appropriate?</p> <p>D. SZC Bk6 V5 Ch2 Description of Two Village Bypass</p> <p>1. The ExA notes that Work No. 11 "Two Village Bypass" in the draft DCO does not specifically list the flood compensation land development. Can the Applicant either justify this approach or amend the draft DCO as appropriate?</p> <p>E. SZC Bk6 V6 Ch2 Description of Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>1. The ExA notes that Work No. 12 as currently drafted in the draft DCO is very generic. The ExA also notes that the ES provides a further description of some larger</p> <p>components including, but not limited to, raising a railway by 2m and then building a bridge over it. Such detail is not included in the draft DCO. Can the Applicant review the Proposed Development of the Sizewell Link Road and the drafting of Work No. 12 and either justify this approach or amend the draft DCO as appropriate? F. SZC Bk6 V8 Ch2 Description of the Freight Management Facility 1. The ExA notes that Work No. 13 stipulates the number of car parking spaces however information relating to the number, floor area and purpose of buildings to be erected is omitted. The ExA request that the Applicant review this and ensure that parameters are secured in the draft DCO.</p>		<p>The ExA welcomes the Applicant's commitments to review Works 9-13 in the draft DCO.</p>	<p>Work Nos 9-13 will be updated in the following ways</p> <p>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 the relevant electricity undertaker under their own powers, rather than by the Applicant.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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 "The proposed Sizewell link road would rise up on a 2.5m embankment, and cross the railway via the bridge, to provide sufficient headroom as required by Network Rail".</p> <p>Work No 13 - The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to make changes to the description of this Work.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Work No.11 - please will the Applicant note that the ExA will expect a commitment to its delivery and effective triggers / and restrictions to ensure it is provided. Please can the Applicant point to where these are to be found.</p> <p>Work No 12 - Thank you and noted. Please will the Applicant direct the ExA to the parameters for the SLR and where they are secured by the DCO.</p> <p>Work No.13 - the ExA notes that in fact the number of spaces at the PMF is not currently specified in this Work. Please will the Applicant rectify this in the next revision?</p>	<p>Work No.11: As explained in paragraph 4.4.6 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-062] submitted with the Application, the Applicant does not consider that the flood compensation land is necessary for the proposed development, however it is being put forward as part of the Application in case the Secretary of State disagrees with this position and takes the view that it is in fact required. There are ongoing discussions between the Applicant, relevant landowners and the Environment Agency regarding the flood compensation land. An update on those discussions will be provided to the Examining Authority in due course, together with details of the proposed mechanism for securing the delivery of that land if the Secretary of State considers it to be required.</p> <p>Work No. 12: The vertical limits of deviation are set out in Article 4 and secured by Requirement 22 of the draft DCO [AS-143]. The horizontal limits of deviation are secured via the Works Plans for Work No. 12 (Sheets 19 to 22) [AS-112]. The Works Plans are approved plans as listed in Schedule 7 of the draft DCO. Requirement 22 requires Work No. 12 to be carried out in accordance with the relevant plans in Schedule 7 and in general accordance with the Associated Development Design Principles [APP-58], save to the extent that alternative plans or details relating to siting, scale or appearance are submitted by the undertaker and approved by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Work No. 13: The Applicant will include the number of parking spaces in the next revision of the draft DCO.</p>	
Part G Q1			<p>CHP and back-up plant</p> <p>The documentation appears to refer to a series of alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Combined Heat and Power Plant, draft DCO description "Work No. 3 (v) combined heat and power plant". 2. Emergency Equipment Store back up generator, draft DCO description "Work No. 1A (i) emergency equipment store, associated structures, back up generator and other plant". 3. Emergency response energy centre, draft DCO description "Work No. 1A (h) (v) emergency response centre" <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>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 2.7.3. 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>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. 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.</p> <p>The emergency response energy centre is unrelated to the CHP/back-up generator. The Emergency Response Energy Centre does not have any stacks.</p>	<p>The ExA thanks the Applicant for this explanation. However, the ExA is unclear what height is proposed and has been assessed.</p> <p>The response states 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 ExA observes that the parameters in Table 2.7 of Chapter 2 (Description of Permanent Development)[APP-180]and para 3.4.180 of Chapter 3 (Description of Construction)[APP-184]are different. Table 2.7 gives a maximum height of 36 m (plus a 3.5m tall stack). Para 3.4.180 gives a building height of approximately 10m with a CHP stack of approximately 4m. Also, if the maximum parameter is 36m plus 3.5m tall stack this would exceed the maximum parameter as detailed for construction in Zone CA3 (APP-022).</p> <p>Please will the Applicant (a) state what heights have actually been assessed (b) demonstrate that the correct heights have been assessed (c) clarify the relationship with the maximum height in CA3 (d) 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.</p>	<p>The heights assessed are as referred to in the Applicant's response dated 8 January 2021 [AS-049]. For the avoidance of doubt, the assessed heights were approximately 10m tall building plus approximately 4m tall stack during the construction phase (i.e. Work No. 3(c)(vi) / CHP Plant) and maximum 36m AOD plus 3.5m tall stack during operation (i.e. Work No. 1A(i) back-up power generator). The Applicant acknowledges that the assessed heights of these facilities differ between the construction phase and operational phase, so the Applicant commits to reviewing both the ES descriptions and assessments and will provide further clarification to the ExA on this as necessary. The Applicant will provide an update on this matter by Deadline 1.</p>	

No.	ExA's questions (Annex A of [PD-005])	[AS-006] 16 Nov 2020- Applicant's response to Annex A of [PD-005]	ExA's observations (Annex A of [PD-009])	Applicant's response of 8 Jan 2021 to Annex A of [PD-009]	Questions following the Applicant's responses of 8 Jan 2020	Applicant Response	
Q2			<p>Aide Valley Academy Leiston</p> <p>The draft DCO describes the Sports facilities at Work No. 5 as "Landscape works including open space, sports facilities and associated structures and plant.</p> <p>The location of the above works is shown on sheet no. 11 of the Works Plans." 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. ES Volume 2, Chapter 9 (noise and vibration) assumes a permanent 2m acoustic fence at para. 11.6.178. 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>	<p>The amendment to the description of Work No. 5 in the DCO versions 3.1A and 3.1B is welcomed as is proposed requirement 12A in 3.1B. (In referring to 3.1B the ExA notes that 3.1B is part of the Material Change request on which no decision has yet been made. The amendment will need to be carried into the DCO whatever the outcome of the change request.)</p> <p>Please will the Applicant:</p> <p>(a) clarify how Work No 5 in its original and amended form has been assessed in the ES,</p> <p>(b) explain where the limits in drawing PDB17-033-06-02-P1 (which is referred to in proposed requirement 12A) have been assessed and regarded as limits (and state where in the Application documents that drawing is to be found),</p> <p>(c) explain the basis on which the floodlighting was scoped out,</p> <p>(d) define the number of lighting columns, expected type of construction e.g. monopole or lattice construction, and the luminosity/level of luminance, preferably giving an indication of</p>	<p>The Applicant commits to reviewing both the descriptions and the assessment accordingly, particularly in relation to lighting and limits as referenced by the ExA. The Applicant will provide an update on this matter by Deadline 1.</p>	