The Planning Inspectorate

Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 21 April 2021
Responses are due by Deadline 2: Wednesday 2 June 2021

ExQ1 Part 5 of 6

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ma.1 Marine water quality and sediment **In the following questions, unless otherwise stated, paragraph numbers are to [APP-314] with section references drawn from [AS-034] (A.b.b and so on)**		
Ma.1.0	The Applicant, MMO, EA	Para 21.2.8 Section D, eel management plans. Please explain further the importance in legal and policy terms, of the relevant plan, any non-compliance arising from the Proposed Development, and what is in place should the Proposed Development be non-compliant.
Ma.1.1	The Applicant	Para 21.3.109 Section G.b.b; is the ExA to understand that all of scenarios A, D, D1 and E have been assessed?
Ma.1.2	The Applicant	Para 21.3.17, section D. This para states that the influence of marine water quality is considered "in conjunction" with the Shadow HRA. As pointed out elsewhere in these ExQs, the HRA operates on different regulations and criteria. Is it intended that any of the material including conclusions of that document are imported and necessary for the understanding and conclusions of the Chapter? If this chapter of the ES is incorporating parts of the Shadow HRA, please succinctly but adequately summarise them in terms applicable to the ES, giving cross-references and EL numbers.
Ma.1.3	The Applicant	Para 21.6.122, section C.d.b, on cooling water discharges. (i) Please will the Applicant explain this paragraph carefully. It discusses thermal values and uplifts of over a certain amount (e.g. absolutes of >23°C or uplifts of >2°C respectively) as a 98th percentile. Given that a percentile is a figure NOT exceeded, what is being described and discussed here? (ii) Where the para refers to absolute values >23°C the normal meaning of the sentences suggests that includes >28°C. But there is a WFD standard referred to in the previous paragraph of >28°C. The position is similar for uplifts. Please will the Applicant explain what is the intention. (iii) This issue carries through into table 21.19 a couple of paragraphs later. In para 26.1.120 it is said that the WFD maximum uplift figure for 98th percentile "good" is "2.C < Uplift</= 3.C". But in Table 21.19 it is said it is >2 which would include >3. This applies to both Sizewell B only, C only and B and C together.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ma.1.4	The Applicant	Para 21.6.126 Section C.d.b states that effects of future climate change and warming sea temperatures re: thermal discharges are considered further. Please state where.
Ma.1.5	The Applicant	Para 21.6.129 Section C.d.b Please would the Applicant expand this paragraph to spell out: (i) what are the standards to which it refers, giving the figures and the publications in which they are found, (ii) the actual exceedance areas (presumably the figures in Table 21.19) (iii) the likely time periods of exceedance (iv) comparators which have been used to conclude that the above threshold period is "relatively short". In the case of the exceedance of the Habitats Directive standards, please give the cross-references to where these exceedances are considered elsewhere in the ES or in the HRA assessment and explain how they affect the appropriate assessment, IROPI, compensation and conclusions of the HRA assessment.
Ma.1.6	The Applicant	Para 21.6.137, (or 21.6.138 in [AS-034] section C.d.c states that the thermal uplift was applied to "this contemporary annual baseline". Please can the Applicant explain what is meant by contemporary baseline within the Chapter?' Does it mean "present day"? The word "contemporary" is used several times in this section on the effect of climate change on cooling water discharges..
Ma.1.7	The Applicant	Paras 21.6.132 – 144 Section C.d.c (Effect of climate change on cooling water discharges: Temperature changes) as a whole. What is the conclusion of this section as to whether there will be major, moderate, minor or negligible significant effects?
Ma.1.8	The Applicant	Para 21.6.166, Section C.d.d.b. The PNEC (Predicted No Effect Concentration) for bromoform is 5µg/l as a 95th percentile (para 21.6.160). The average concentration from 10 power stations is 16.3 µg/l, with range of 1-43 µg/l (para 21.6.164). How does the ES conclude that discharges which are on average four times the PNEC and up to almost nine times are minor adverse, not significant?
Ma.1.9	The Applicant	Para 21.6.243 of [APP-314] (21.6.244 of AS-034]), section C.f.c. (i) "*The level of total ammonia discharged including current background levels is low and represents an increase of ca.30% of the present mean background total ammonia*" be

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		better written "*The level of ammonia discharged represents an increase of ca.30% of the present mean background total ammonia but the total of discharge and background levels is low*". Please will the Applicant clarify the sentence. (ii) It is apparent that an extra paragraph has crept in to [AS-034] or that the numbering has jumped by one. Please will the Applicant clarify what has happened.
Ma.1.10	The Applicant	Para 21.7.7, Section B (Monitoring). "… monitoring may be extended…". Please explain enforceable criteria and action, together with the dispute resolution procedure.
Ma.1.11	The Applicant, EA	Tables 21.22 and 23 – summary of effects for the construction and commissioning phase (22) and operation (23). In many places, these tables identify the need for additional mitigation in the form of WDA permits and the monitoring set out in those permits. The Environment Agency has indicated that it is not able to issue Letters of No Impediment (which presumably will relate to these permits, amongst others) prior to the end of the examination. (i) Please will the Environment Agency say whether it considers that the mitigation will be appropriate? (ii) Please will the Applicant and the Environment Agency set out how the absence of Letters of No Impediment will affect (a) the conclusions in relation to residual effects and (b) the assessment in this Chapter 21.
MN.1	**Marine Navigation**	
In the following questions, unless otherwise stated, paragraph numbers are to [APP-337]		
MN.1.0	The Applicant	Para 24.3.18 – assessment methodology – marine developments under construction have been taken into account. What account has been taken of the EAOne and Two windfarm NSIPs currently in examination?
MN.1.1	The Applicant	Para 24.3.19 – assumptions and limitations. The reader is referred to Vol 1 Appx 6T (which is [APP-171] pages 811 and ff). Have any of the assumptions and limitations changed?
MN.1.2	The Applicant	Para 24.5.6 – tertiary mitigation, construction phase.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The mitigation measures set out in paragraph 24.5.6 are stated to be secured via conditions of the marine licence listed in Schedule 20 of the DCO however, not all of the activities listed are secured here. Can the Applicant clarify this discrepancy? (i) Please explain how these measures are secured in the DCO or elsewhere. The delivery and logistics plan for AILs for example does not obviously appear to be tertiary mitigation. (ii) What is the role and power of the Fisheries Liaison Officer?
MN.1.3	The Applicant	Para 24.7.3 – Mitigation – buoyed construction zone and patrol launch to assist vessels in difficulty. How are these secured in the DCO or other documentation? How is the availability of the launch, its capacity and the frequency and range of it patrols specified and secured?
NV.1	**Noise and Vibration**	
NV.1.0	The Applicant, ESC (ii) only	**Methodology** The Council in their [RR-0342] raise concern that relying simply on a fixed sound level could underestimate the impact on a receptor. (i) How do you respond to this concern? (ii) What additional information do you (ESC) seek to improve the assessment of effect?
NV.1.1	ESC	**Methodology** In paragraph 1.9 of the RR it is indicated that using a noise level such as LOAEL or SOAEL may not be of sufficient sensitivity. (i) How does the Council wish this concern to be addressed? (ii) Would this be a specific assessment for each receptor or noise generating activity or would a broad approach be considered appropriate? (iii) What parameters is the Council looking to define such that ongoing monitoring could be undertaken to ensure that any obligations/requirements are achieved? In responding to the above please support the answer with reference to relevant guidance or precedents.
NV.1.2	ESC	**Rochdale Envelope**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In light of the comments you make in paragraph 1.11 of your RR can ESC explain what justification is required to acknowledge that the Proposed Development is not abusing the flexibility of the Rochdale Envelope in line with case law?
NV.1.3	ESC	**DCO Requirement** Is the Council seeking a requirement within the DCO to ensure there is a commitment to ongoing monitoring and provision of mitigation if appropriate as set out in [RR-0342]? Please provide a draft of such a requirement if this is what is being sought.
NV.1.4	ESC	**Underestimate of Effects** Paragraph 1.14- 1.19 of [RR-0342] suggests that that the ESC have concerns about the noise assessment and whether effects could have been underestimated. Are there particular areas that this concern refers to? Please clarify the position.
NV.1.5	ESC	**Tranquillity** A tranquillity assessment has been undertaken [APP-270] [Volume 2, Chapter 15, APPENDIX 15E] (i) Does this not achieve what you are asking for? (ii) What additional work would you expect to be carried out?
NV.1.6	The Applicant, ESC (part iii only)	**LOAEL and SOAEL** (i) Please explain why the noise from new road schemes differentiates the measurement from free field during the day to facade level during the night? [Table 11.13 APP-202] (ii) The Day period overlaps with the night period 23:00 – 24:00 – in the event noise is generated during this period – which level would apply as a trigger? [Table 11.13 APP-202] (iii) Are the Council content that this approach would give them appropriate methods of monitoring and enforcement? (iv) In light of the range of SOAEL levels for construction work set out in Table 11.11 [APP-202] and the different levels road traffic noise in Table 11.13, please explain which level would apply where a receptor was subject to both noise sources and how this could be monitored and enforced. (v) Where a receptor is subject to noise from construction, road and rail traffic which SOAEL and LOAEL levels would apply?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
NV.1.7	ESC	**Setting of LOAEL and SOAEL** (i) What LOAEL/SOAEL levels would you consider appropriate for the assessment of night time noise arising from the different elements of the proposed development? (ii) On what would this be based?
NV.1.8	The Applicant	**Requirements** Do you agree the requirement suggested by ESC at 1.33 of their RR is appropriate? If not please explain your position.
NV.1.9	The Applicant	**Code of Construction Practice** [APP-615] CoCP Part C para 1.1.6 – "avoid use of noisy works" This term is imprecise and would be difficult to enforce – and in this respect it is hard to see what mitigation the CoCP would provide. The NPS EN1 advises that a standard should be provided to ensure appropriate mitigation is achieved. Please provide the details of the standards which should be achieved to avoid significant adverse effects.
NV.1.10	The Applicant	**Combined Heat and Power Plant** (i) How would the DCO ensure that the final CHP, Air Source Heat Pump system and / or back-up generator did not exceed 35dB LAr, for 15 minutes? (ii) If this were to be measured outside the nearest residential receptor whilst this might be satisfactory in protecting residential amenity, what standard or safeguard would it achieve for tranquillity within the AONB?
NV.1.11	The Applicant	**Rail Noise** The assessment [APP-546] does not appear to make clear how the mitigation of speed restriction, and stopping of trains at certain points along the line will be delivered through the DCO. (i) Please clarify how this would be achieved/delivered through the DCO. (ii) A train pulling 20 trucks is suggested to be what is likely to be used. Is this due to a physical constraint on site/on the line? If not, what controls would be in place to ensure this were the maximum size of train? (iii) What would the implications be if the train were to be longer? Has this been assessed? (iv) A train travelling at 20mph with 20 trucks would take how long to pass a single point?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(v) How will the restriction on the number of trains and the timetable they are to operate to be adhered to/delivered through the DCO? (vi) Please describe how you envisage a typical timetable for delivery and departure of trains to and from the site would occur, so the effect on the site and the receptors along the rail routes can be fully understood. It may be helpful to support this with a plan indicating the locations and times the trains would be expected to be at each location.
NV.1.12	The Applicant, Network Rail(part iii only)	**Rail Noise** (i) The mitigation proposed appears to rely upon welds not being within a certain distance of sensitive receptors. What distance is required between receptor and the track to achieve the LOAEL and SOAEL levels? (ii) Please clarify where the measurements are taken from and to. (iii) How would this be delivered through the DCO?
NV.1.13	The Applicant, Network Rail part iii only)	**Rail Noise** (i) The placement of matting under the ballast would appear to be required for all locations where a sensitive receptor is within 20m of the centreline of the railway, and this matting should extend 10m beyond the end of the receptor building. How would this be delivered through the DCO? (ii) Does this require a specific standard of matting to be provided and method of laying of the matting and the ballast to meet the minimum noise absorption required and therefore is a specific minimum specification required? If so, how is this to be secured? (iii) Do Network Rail agree to this method of installation?
NV.1.14	The Applicant	**Rail Noise/Freight Management** (i) The information provided in support of the train noise assessment indicates [APP 545] that a typical truck has the capacity to carry 77.9t of cargo. Assuming this to be the case a train with 20 trucks would have a payload of 1,558t. Please explain why this figure exceeds the quantum of material said to be imported per train as set out in the Freight Management Strategy? (ii) Assuming trains were loaded to full capacity what implications would this have for the noise assessment?
NV.1.15	The Applicant	**Rail Noise**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Part of the mitigation proposed is to hold trains on the branch line and only allow them to enter Leiston after 07:00 in the morning.[AS-258] Please explain why it is considered appropriate Leiston should benefit from this protection, but other areas along the proposed freight rail route should not.
NV.1.16	The Applicant	**Rail Noise** In undertaking the noise assessment, a test train was run in August 2020, it is understood this was unladen. (i) How representative of the noise of a fully loaded train would this be? (ii) Please explain what differences in acoustic terms you could expect for acceleration and breaking, relative to a fully laden train.
NV.1.17	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Rail** [APP-558] makes reference to trains travelling at 25mph para 8.6.45, this would appear to conflict with the speed restriction of 20mph, please clarify the position.
NV.1.18	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	**Rail SOAEL and LOAEL** The SOAEL and LOAEL is based at least in part on the assessment for HS2, and the justification of a higher rating appears to be based on the quantum and speed of rail traffic associated with HS2 as opposed to here. (i) Do the Councils agree this is a reasonable position to take in setting the SOAEL and LOAEL for rail noise? (ii) In the event the Councils do not agree, what method would be considered would provide a reasonable approach in the circumstances of this case?
NV.1.19	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, PHE	**Rail SOAEL and LOAEL** As currently assessed, the LOAEL would be exceeded at receptors within 42m of the line with trains travelling at 10mph and within 50m of the line for trains travelling at 20mph. In light of the need to protect human health from noise, and length of construction period should not the potential for noise mitigation be made available to all receptors where the LOAEL would be exceeded?
NV.1.20	The Applicant. Network Rail	**Rail Freight Option**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		What controls are there over when trains would run, what engines would be used, and therefore how realistic is the assessment that has been carried out?
NV.1.21	The Applicant	**Rail Freight Locomotive type** (i) A preference for a type 66 locomotive is expressed [AS-258] what is the reasoning for this? (ii) This preference would not appear to be a commitment but be dependent upon what the freight companies have available – is this correct? (iii) Is the type 66 locomotive a 'conservative' locomotive in terms of noise profile? (iv) Are quieter trains available, if so why has this eventuality not been put forward as a potential mitigation?
NV.1.22	The Applicant	**Rail** It is asserted that to operate trains on a rail line is not development. Consequently, this would not be directly authorised by the DCO but is one of the methods to facilitate the NSIP development. If this is the case, what controls can the ExA rely upon to ensure that rail activity associated with the construction of the development is carried out in a way which minimises harm to residents and other sensitive receptors?
NV.1.23	The Applicant	**Rail Noise** There are a series of cottages along the branch line which are in close proximity to the line and therefore are susceptible to significant disturbance. (i) It is suggested that due to the historic association with the railway line those properties built with the railway could/should expect a degree of noise and disturbance from railway activity. What guidance or other precedence is available to sustain this position? (ii) Please provide information evidencing when these properties would have last been subject to rail activities, and as such whether the historic association could still be regarded as a material consideration and this position justified.
NV.1.24	The Applicant	**Rail Noise** ESC have indicated in the [RR-0324] that significant concern remains in respect of the potential significant adverse effects that could occur from night-time rail operations. The Council do not consider this concern would be fully addressed by limiting speeds to

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		20mph, or that the assessment fully reflects the distance from the rail line that properties would experience adverse effects. Please respond to these concerns.
NV.1.25	The Applicant	**Rail Noise** In light of the length of time that the construction period would last, would not occupiers of properties within close proximity of the rail line need to be rehoused for the duration to avoid being subject to regular significant disturbance? (Currently the ES suggests that the SOAEL would be exceeded at a distance of 5m at 10mph but this would not yet appear to be an agreed position.) The s106 agreement [PDB-004] explains on pg 77 that the Noise Mitigation Scheme will either be secured through the DCO or the s106 agreement, but this is still under consideration please explain the latest position on how this mitigation would be secured
NV.1.26	The Applicant, Network Rail, ESC, SCC	**Rail Noise** In order to minimise disturbance to receptors in close proximity to the rail line, particularly at night, would a period excluding train operations be reasonable and or enforceable?
NV.1.27	ESC, SCC	**Rail Noise** In the Additional information supplied by the Applicant in [AS 257] an assessment of sleep disturbance has been set out. Do the Councils agree the methodology of assessment and the subsequent justification for the setting of the LOAEL and SOAEL in this respect?
NV.1.28	ESC, SCC, PHE	**Rail Noise** It would appear that the ES recognises a significant harm to between 100 and 110 properties. Would this accord with NPS EN1 Policy to avoid harm to human health, or the aims of the Noise Policy Statement for England? Do the Councils or PHE consider the approach justified in seeking to set a SOAEL at a higher level than the significant level identified through the ES assessment?
NV.1.29	ESC	**Rail Noise** The Applicant concludes [APP 545] that up to 460 properties would be subject to noise above the L_{Amax} based LOAEL. Do you agree that the secondary mitigation offered would minimise the adverse effects on health and quality of life?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
NV.1.30	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Saxmundham Points System** (i) Has it been confirmed that the automatic points system at Saxmundham can be implemented to avoid trains stopping and starting? (ii) How is this to be secured?
NV.1.31	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Rail Noise Mitigation Scheme** [APP-545] – makes reference to mitigation that 'could' include selection of alternative plant, working methods, barrier screening and or stand off margins. (i) Are Network Rail satisfied that there is the space to accommodate barrier screening, or increase stand off margins? (ii) In the event neither of these are possible, what are the implications for receptors?
NV.1.32	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Level Crossing Warning Alarms** [APP-545] indicates that warning alarms would need to be limited to a maximum of 70dB at night measured at 1m. It is also indicated that alarms should be set a minimum of 4m from noise sensitive receptors. How are these two methods of mitigation to be delivered?
NV.1.33	The Applicant	**Main Development Site** (i) Piling is potentially a significant noise source; please provide a schedule of piling for the development at the main development site. It would be helpful to understand which elements of the project include piling and therefore please provide the breakdown setting out the information, so this is understood? (ii) Within the schedule set out an approximate time frame for such activities for each location and over what period this anticipated to take place?
NV.1.34	The Applicant	**Main Development Site** (i) In trying to understand the possible effects on Crown Lodge and the area near the LEEIE, please confirm where the drop off and collection point for the proposed buses serving the LEEIE is proposed to be. (ii) Has a plan been provided indicating the location, turning and routing for the buses, if so please advise where this can be found. (iii) If no such plan has been provided, how will the final arrangements be secured?
NV.1.35	The Applicant	**Upper Abbey**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Within the ES Chapter on Noise (para 11.3.9) of [APP-202] Upper Abbey is not assessed for noise impacts as it is advised it would not be occupied during construction. (i) To which property(ies) does this refer? (ii) How will it be ensured the properties would not be occupied throughout the period of construction?
NV.1.36	The Applicant	**Accommodation Campus** In the Design and Access Statement 'Accommodation Campus Design Principles' the description indicates that a reasonable standard of internal and external acoustic amenity would be achieved. Please explain what standard BS 8223 would achieve for both internal and external spaces and how this is to be secured?
NV.1.37	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** It would appear from the conclusions in Table 4.21 and 4.23 of Vol 6 Ch 4 significant adverse effects would occur at several properties both during construction and subsequently during operation. Please advise how you consider the scheme achieves the noise policy aims of the NPSE and para 5.11.9 of NPS for Energy (EN-1). • avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life; • mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life; and • where possible, contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life.
NV.1.38	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** In the Community Impact Report [APP-156] Table 5.6 appears to list different properties that would be adversely affected and the terminology used is not entirely consistent to the terms used in Vol 6 Ch 4 Table 4.21 [APP-415] please clarify and confirm which terminology correctly reflects the effects assessed within the ES and which properties are considered to be adversely affected.
NV.1.39	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In light of the fact the road you are proposing is an associated scheme to the main NSIP proposal and would not be forthcoming without the NSIP, is it reasonable to assess effects only in respect of the noise from the traffic associated with the NSIP development?
NV.1.40	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** How would the noise from the traffic associated with the development be differentiated from other traffic noise?
NV.1.41	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** In assessing the benefits where they occur from diverting existing traffic from current routes, should this be disregarded in the balance of assessment of harms versus benefits, if the consequential harm that arises elsewhere is not to be taken into account?
NV.1.42	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** In identifying Farnham Hall as a receptor, several RRs confirm this is a series of properties. ([RR-109, RR-110, RR-112, RR-113, RR-114, RR-115, RR-116, RR-117]) (i) Please advise of the addresses and number of properties in this location and describe how each might be affected. (ii) In understanding the effects in this location; as the properties would be at different distances and orientated in different directions how has the specific affect been assessed? (iii) Can the details of the effects for each as currently set out be regarded as conservative? (iv) As there are several properties which are potentially significantly adversely affected, should this weigh more heavily against the scheme in considering the planning balance?
NV.1.43	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** Paragraph 4.5.4 [APP-415] indicates that one of the primary mitigations is having the road in a cutting. This does not appear to be an accurate description when viewing the plans included which suggest a good portion of the proposed road is either at grade or elevated above current ground levels. (i) What mitigation is proposed to be delivered for those sections of road not in cutting? (ii) In undertaking the noise assessment what information for proposed levels has been used to inform the assessment?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
NV.1.44	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** (i) What acoustic benefit is achieved for the section of the road in cutting? (ii) Where is this set out within the ES? (iii) Has the Noise Assessment been based on specific plan and as a consequence the relative height of the receptor to the noise source? (iv) Assuming a plan was used, is it in the list of approved plans within the DCO?
NV.1.45	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** In light of the above has an acoustic barrier been considered for those sections of road either at grade or elevated above ground, or either side of the proposed bridge? In the event this has not been considered in light of the acknowledged adverse effects, please clarify why this has not been considered or it has been ruled out.
NV.1.46	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** (i) The ES [APP-415] identifies that during the first year of operation 2034 significant adverse effects would remain at Hill Farm, Pond Barn Cottages, Farnham Hall, Farnham Hall Farmhouse and Walk Barn Farm. This significant adverse effect would appear from Table 4.23 to remain following the implementation of the Noise Mitigation Scheme. Please confirm this understanding is correct. (ii) This being the case there would appear to remain a significant adverse effect in the long term. Is this understanding correct? (iii) Please explain how this is considered to accord with the NPS EN1 and NPSE approach which aims to avoid such occurrences. (iv) Receptor 13 would appear to have been chosen as a representative location for properties in this vicinity – how many properties might be significantly adversely affected in this location?
NV.1.47	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** [APP-415] para 4.6.14 should this reference be to Appendix 11H? please clarify the position.
NV.1.48	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass/Sizewell Link Road** No mention of the potential for quieter road surfacing has been suggested, or additional acoustic barriers as referred to above. Please explain whether this has been assessed to

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		improve the environment for receptors indicated to be adversely affected by traffic using the road particularly in light of the advice in the NPS EN1 that noise insulation is a valid form of mitigation " **only** when **all** other forms of noise mitigation have been exhausted"(our emphasis). Or explain why this has been discounted and where this is explained within the ES?
NV.1.49	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	**Two Village Bypass** In light of the recognised significant adverse effects that would arise from the use of the two village bypass during operation, can this be regarded as sustainable development?
NV.1.50	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** (i) Could the TVB be designed to achieve a noise level at night during operation as recommended by the WHO NNG of 40dB Lnight? (ii) What mitigation would this require? (iii) Has this been considered? (iv) Please advise where this assessment can be found?
NV.1.51	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road** (i) The ES identifies that during the first year of operation 2034 significant adverse effects would remain at Fordley Hall, Trust Farm, Theberton Grange, Oak House and Hawthorn Cottages. This significant adverse effect would appear from Table 4.23 of [APP-451] to remain following the implementation of the Noise Mitigation Scheme. Please confirm this understanding is correct. (ii) This being the case there would appear to remain a significant adverse effect in the long term. Is this understanding correct? (iii) Please explain how this is considered to accord with the NPS EN1 and NPSE approach which aims to avoid such occurrences.
NV.1.52	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road** Preparation phase – significant adverse effects are identified at Fir Tree Farm, Rosetta, Dovehouse Farm, Church Farm, Rookery Farm and Keepers Cottage. Please explain how these effects would be mitigated to comply with NPS EN1 and NPSE policy.
NV.1.53	Marlesford Parish Council	**Southern Park and Ride**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please advise which noise receptors you consider should have been included in the assessment which have not been.
NV.1.54	ESC	**Yoxford Roundabout** Are the Council satisfied with the findings in respect of this part of the scheme and that the mitigation proposed to avoid the SOAEL being exceeded at Sunnypatch, The Old Barn, Rookery Cottages and Hopton Yard would achieve appropriate levels of mitigation to avoid harm to health and comply with the requirements of the NPS EN1 and NPSE.
NV.1.55	ESC	**Yoxford Roundabout** Delivery of screening and final working methodology is yet to be finalised. Are the Council satisfied that the method of mitigation is appropriately secured?
NV.1.56	The Applicant	**Community Impact Report** Community Impact Report [APP-156] at para 2.6.68 suggests "noise barriers have been designed": (i) Could you point out where the specification of these barriers is and what acoustic benefit they have been designed to achieve. (ii) How would this standard be secured through the DCO?
NV.1.57	The Applicant	**Community Impact Report** Community Impact Report [APP-156] Table 3.5 describes several areas. (i) Are the areas identified in the table shown on a single map/plan? Please advise if this is the case where this can be found. e.g. Darsham, Willow Marsh Lane etc., Users of public footpaths, local residents – between Rookery Park, Town Farm Lane (ii) Please identify on a plan the areas to which you refer and identify the residential properties you have identified would be affected and advise whether the adverse effects on these properties would be regarded as significant. (iii) Please advise where the details for these effects are set out in the ES.
NV.1.58	The Applicant	**Rail Noise** Para 4.6.41 Vol 9 Ch 4 [APP-545] appears to contradict para 4.6.40 and noise levels set out in Table 4.26 – Is it the case the SOAEL will be exceeded in these locations?
NV.1.59	The Applicant, ESC	**Night Time Noise**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) On the basis that a value of 40dB Lnight represents a level where adverse effects begin to occur in locations with a low background noise level at night on what basis has a level of 60dB been assessed to represent only a low impact? (ii) How has this figure been arrived at? (iii) Can this be reasonably argued to avoid adverse health effects when the WHO guidance recognises that adverse health effects are identified at night when levels exceed 40dB Lnight-outside.
NV.1.60	ESC	**Health Effects of Noise** (i) Do the Council agree that the method of assessment and standard against which effects should be measured is appropriate and would ensure adverse health effects are minimised? (ii) In the RR at para 1.8 you indicate that the SOAEL and LOAEL levels are not fully supported by either national guidance or best practice. In which circumstances/ locations do you consider the levels set are not appropriate? Please explain your reasoning.
NV.1.61	ESC	**Operational Noise** (i) Please clarify the ongoing concerns about the assessment of operational noise and the source data. (ii) What further evidence do you seek?
NV.1.62	The Applicant	**Operational Noise** ESC has expressed concern that some receptors could be the subject of ongoing adverse noise effects during the operation of the plant. (i) Do you agree to ongoing monitoring and subsequent mitigation as suggested? (ii) How could this be secured?
NV.1.63	The Applicant, ESC Part (iii) and (iv) only)	**Noise Mitigation Scheme (NMS)** Please explain how this scheme [APP-210] would operate to protect living standards for residents such that they were not significantly affected. (i) How would the mitigation offered protect gardens? (ii) How would the noise environment within properties be protected to an acceptable degree when windows were open? (iii) Do the Council consider the mitigation scheme as drafted sufficiently clear and enforceable such that receptors would be adequately protected? (iv) Do the Council consider this would be better secured through the DCO or S106?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
NV.1.64	The Applicant	**NMS** (i) How would it be ensured that those receptors that could be subject to noise in excess of the SOAEL had mitigation in place in advance of this occurring such that this level of harm would not materialise? (ii) How is this to be secured? (iii) Would the development be prevented from occurring in advance of the mitigation being in place?
NV.1.65	The Applicant	**Rail Noise Mitigation Scheme (RNMS)** (The draft RNMS [AS 258] as refers in different paragraphs to glazing and insulation, please clarify what would be offered to residents in the event that mitigation was appropriate.
NV.1.66	The Applicant	**Rail Noise Mitigation** If the current SOAEL and mitigation measures are accepted, the Sleep Disturbance Assessment [AS-257] suggests between 5-10 properties would qualify for mitigation. Why is there such a variation?
NV.1.67	ESC	**Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy** The Applicant proposes a Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy [AS-258] in consultation with Network Rail and the rail freight operator. Are you satisfied this gives sufficient control over noise to safeguard health and quality of life?
NV.1.68	The Applicant, ESC, PHE	**Rail Noise** In the event that having the SOAEL at a higher level than the significant adverse effect level identified from the ES Assessment was not considered to be justified, do the 100-110 properties identified as being potentially subject to such noise levels need to be subject to noise mitigation for the scheme to avoid adverse health effects and be compliant with NPSE and NPS EN1 policy?
NV.1.69	The Applicant	**Rail Noise** The Noise Mitigation Scheme in Appendix 11H[APP-210] refers to 69dB $L_{Aeq\ 16hrs}$ and 58dB $_{LAeq\ 8hrs}$ as the threshold to trigger mitigation this would appear to differ from the figures in the Sleep Disturbance Assessment [AS-257] which uses L_{AFMAX} as the measure, please

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		advise how the two measures correlate so that the method for assessment and the trigger level are fully understood.
NV.1.70	Applicant	**Groundborne Noise** Table 4.34 of [APP-545] confirms that after mitigation Residual Effects remain from groundborne noise for all receptors in Woodbridge, Melton, Campsea Ashe and Saxmundham within 5m of the operational tracks. How many properties does this effect?
NV.1.71	Applicant	**Groundborne Noise** Table 4.34 of [APP-545] confirms that all receptors beyond the locations listed in the previous question within 10m of the operational tracks on the East Suffolk line would be subject to a major adverse effect. How many properties would this effect?
NV.1.72	Applicant	**Groundborne Noise** Please explain why in Table 4.24 of [APP-545] properties within 50m of the tracks may have the additional protection of vibration isolating track support systems but this is not offered by way of mitigation for properties a similar distance from the main line.
NV.1.73	The Applicant	**Rail Operational Groundborne Noise** The assessment indicates that between 40-50 receptors along the East Suffolk main line would exceed the L_{Amax} SOAEL, but further assessments still need to be carried out. (i) What further measures could be provided to ensure the SOAEL did not arise? (ii) How would these be secured?
NV.1.74	The Applicant, ESC (Part (iii) only)	**Mitigation Assessment** [APP 545] para 4.7.5 (i) How will the assessment be made where a balance needs to be struck between acoustic benefit and visual harm? (ii) Who would be the decision maker? (iii) Do you agree this is an appropriate method of assessing this planning balance?
NV.1.75	The Applicant ESC (part iv)	**Precedents from previous DCO and legal cases** Reference is made to two previous projects (Thames Tideway Tunnel and Heathrow) in order to justify setting a SOAEL at a different level from the level that might be regarded as having a significant adverse effect.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Please explain how the two cases referred to are similar to this DCO such that this approach could reasonably be justified in this case. (ii) Please provide copies of the decisions and point out from each the explanation and justification provided in those cases. (iii) The Cranford Case would not appear to be a NSIP Case but a S78 appeal against the specific requirements of the 'Cranford Agreement'. Please explain how you consider those circumstances comparable to the current scheme. (iv) Do the Council agree that setting the SOAEL at a different level from that regarded as significant in the ES is justified?
NV.1.76	The Applicant	**Vibration effects on Heritage Assets** (i) A number of RRs including [RR 512, 627, 822, 1138] have expressed concern that either construction activities or increased HGV traffic could damage listed buildings by way of vibration. Please respond to these concerns. (ii) Would any preconstruction surveys be undertaken, or monitoring be proposed to assess any effects?
NV.1.77	The Applicant	**Early Years** B1122 Action Group [RR-0124] express concern that the level of traffic generated during the early years creates an unreasonable burden on the local community in terms of traffic, noise and air quality. Please address this particular concern and explain how the effects during early years could be considered reasonable in light of the recognised need to mitigate for similar levels of traffic later.
NV.1.78	ESC	**Working Hours** Can the Council please explain more fully what is meant by 'in particular the usual permitted working hours for construction' as referenced in paragraph 2.267 of the RR
NV.1.79	The Applicant	**Working Hours** Is there a single document which clearly sets out the proposed working times for the main development site and the associated development sites? If not, could one be provided and incorporated into the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) so the times agreed are clearly secured and capable of being enforced?
NV.1.80	The Applicant, ESC	**Residential Amenity**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In the respective chapters of the ES there are various locations which recognise that noise levels would exceed the SOAEL or be above the LOAEL. In each location the internal environment of residential receptors has been sought to be protected by mitigation when the appropriate threshold is exceeded. (i) In the locations where the SOAEL is exceeded in a residential garden how can this be said to meet the aims of the Noise Policy Statement for England in avoiding significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from environmental …noise? (ii) In light of the length of the construction period for the main development site what noise level would be regarded as appropriate and what mitigation is offered to protect residential gardens to ensure this level is not breached?
NV.1.81	ESC, SCC, Natural England, MMO	**Conveyor on BLF** The Applicant has introduced reference to a conveyor system for the BLF. Do you consider the assessment of this in respect of noise is adequate?
NV.1.82	The Applicant	**Conveyor on BLF** (i) Please explain what system of conveyor you have assessed and where this is set out within the ES. (ii) How would the provision and operation of this system be secured through the DCO?
NV.1.83	The Applicant	**Conveyor on BLF** The additional information indicates that the conveyor would be enclosed. (i) Please provide a visualisation of such a form of enclosure. (ii) Has an assessment been made of the degree of noise benefit this may provide? (iii) How do you intend to secure this through the DCO?
NV.1.84	The Applicant	**BLF** [APP-190] paragraph 6.2.98 indicates that the beach landing facility had been discounted and could not be progressed. This appears to be further emphasised in [APP 175] paragraph 4.3.66. Please explain what has changed that would now lead to a different conclusion from that which was previously made.
NV.1.85	The Applicant	**BLF**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide details of where the piling assessment for the BLF is set out, and what mitigation is proposed to minimise any adverse noise or vibration effects on the users of the beach or on marine mammals.
NV.1.86	Natural England, MMO	**Noise Effects on Marine Mammals** (i) Do you agree that the Applicant's assessment of noise effects from the additional piling on porpoise and other marine mammals can be regarded as not significant? (ii) Are you satisfied with the mitigation proposed and how this would be secured through the DCO? (iii) Do you consider the monitoring throughout the construction period would provide adequate safeguards?
NV.1.87	The Applicant	**Additional Freight by Rail** It is suggested that by adding freight trains would have no additional effect in terms of noise and vibration for receptors. While it is reasonably understood that each event would be similar, how is this position justified when it is recognised elsewhere that part of the assessment is influenced by the number of events?
NV.1.88	The Applicant	**Additional Freight by Rail** (i) Until such time as a rail timetable is known, how can the degree of effect on individual receptors be fully understood? (ii) In the event that the timetable grouped train journeys together would this not have a materially different effect to them being spread apart?
NV.1.89	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Additional Freight by Rail** A number of the responses received look to have no rail activities on a given night of the week over the weekend: (i) Is this likely to be achieved? (ii) How would it be secured?
NV.1.90	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Additional Freight by Rail** Please explain what effect if any this might have on passenger services on the Ipswich to Lowestoft line.
NV.1.91	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Level Crossing Sirens**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Will all level crossings on the route require sirens to meet the appropriate safety standards? (ii) If this is not the case, please explain the differing standards and what would be expected to be provided at each level crossing.
NV.1.92	The Applicant, ESC (part (ii) and (iii))	**Rail Noise Assessment** In light of the comments from Saxmundham Town Council, (i) please advise on whether additional properties at Beech Road, Holly Way and Oak Close have been assessed in terms of any noise affects. (ii) Are there any other recently built or planned developments along the rail route which the ExA should be aware of? (iii) Has a list of such agreed developments been provided to the Applicant?
NV.1.93	The Applicant, (ESC part (ii) only)	**Night-time Rail Noise** Campsea Ashe Parish Council, Woodbridge Town Council and ESC all express concern that the assessment of effects from the night-time rail operation as proposed has not been adequately assessed or those effects on residents properly mitigated. (i) Please respond to the concerns and set out how the assessment has been undertaken and how the mitigation offered would work in practice. (ii) Do the Council agree with these concerns?
NV.1.94	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Night-time Rail Noise** (i) Please explain the limiting factors for daytime deliveries. (ii) In understanding what these are, what alternatives have been considered that could overcome these limitations? (iii) How has the assessment of effects from night-time noise been assessed against these alternatives?
NV.1.95	The Applicant, Natural England (part (ii) only)	**Night-time noise** The RSPB indicate that the assessment of effects from night-time noise on bats and other sensitive creatures has not been adequately assessed and consider additional noise modelling would need to be carried out. (i) Please respond to this concern. (ii) Do you agree with the concerns expressed by the RSPB
NV.1.96	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Ipswich to Lowestoft Main Line**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Please explain the current method of line construction for the main line between Ipswich and Saxmundham. (ii) Please confirm whether the joints between the sections of the track are located in a way as to minimise noise effects on receptors. (iii) It is understood from the assessment that the welds of joints for the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line are proposed to be undertaken in a certain way to minimise noise effects – please confirm whether this approach has been undertaken on the main line and if this is not the case please advise what the differences would be for receptors on the main line as opposed to those on the branch line.
NV.1.97	ESC	**Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** Table 3.2 of the CoCP sets a series of noise thresholds for the works at the main development site. (i) Do you consider these thresholds appropriate? (ii) Are you content with the monitoring as proposed to oversee that these levels are achieved?
NV.1.98	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	**CoCP** Advance Notice of works is specified as a method of mitigation for receptors. (i) What period of advance notice is expected to be provided? (ii) Has this been agreed and or secured as a commitment?
NV.1.99	The Applicant, Pro Corda School Trust	**Pro Corda School** What progress has been made with securing a S106 in respect of the Pro Corda School?
NV.1.100	The Applicant	**Whitearch Residential Park** [RR-1265] expresses concern regarding night time noise from trains. This would appear to be a residential park based on 'park homes' where construction would not appear to be traditional bricks and mortar. Please advise if this would affect the capacity to offer mitigation if this was regarded as appropriate.
R.1	**Radiological considerations**	
R.1.0	The Applicant	It is understood that the NPS EN6 makes clear where other regimes are in place to control processes, emissions and discharges this should not be duplicated through the planning process. Nevertheless, in the light of the status of EN1 and EN6 the ExA expects clear

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		responses, even in the event that in doing so it is made clear under what licensing regime the necessary control would be in place to cover the question identified.
R.1.1	The Applicant, ONR	**Low Level Waste (LLW)** (i) It is recognised that the current LLW Repository has a lifespan less than that of the proposed development. What provision is in place on site or elsewhere to safely deal with this waste over the lifetime of the plant? (ii) It is advised that "It is assumed that ultimately new disposal facilities will be provided by the NDA" (para 7.7.20)[APP-192] Have letters of assurance or similar been received from the NDA? (iii) Has one been sought? Please provide copies for the Examination as appropriate.
R.1.2	The Applicant, ONR	**Waste Acceptance Criteria** Para 7.7.27 [APP-192] refers to WAC – this does not appear in the Glossary of Terms. (i) Please confirm that this means 'Waste Acceptance Criteria' - or if not what it does relate to. (ii) It is understood that the UK has not formally adopted these criteria for dealing with High Level Waste or for spent fuel – does this have any implications in respect of the information provided?
R.1.3	The Applicant ONR	**Intermediate Level Waste (ILW)** Please give the latest update in respect of the letter of compliance process referred to in para 7.7.43 [APP-192]
R.1.4	The Applicant (EA, ONR iv only)	**Intermediate Level Waste (ILW)** (i) What capacity for the onsite storage of ILW has been assessed within the ES? The documents appear to make reference to two periods for the prospective operation of the plant 60 years [Table 7.8 Vol 2 Ch 7 APP-192] and upto 76 years [para 22.6.244 of APP 317] (ii) Do the parameters include capacity for the extended lifespan of the power stations and any contingency? (iii) Currently it is not clear as 2.5 Main Development Site Main Platform Proposed General Arrangement (Operational) Plans for Approval [APP-017] indicates this is for approval later. Please clarify the situation

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iv) The plans do not provide detailed drawings of the Interim Spent Fuel Store or Intermediate Level Waste Store, how is it intended that the details of these would be progressed and approved in the event the DCO were to be granted?
R.1.5	The Applicant	**Intermediate Level Waste (ILW)** Table 7.8 of Vol 2 Chapter 7 sets out the quantities of ILW expected to be generated per annum and for the 60 year lifetime of the plant. (i) What quantities of the waste falls into the 'decay storage' category? (ii) As this will need to be stored while the level of radioactivity reduces over time, prior to becoming low level waste, what capacity is required within the proposed interim storage facility? (iii) In light of the preceding question what are the implications for the extension of the operating life of the plant?
R.1.6	The Applicant	**Waste Storage** Para 7.7.70 [APP-192] refers to 60 metres of vault length required for each reactor. Should this be a volume? If not please explain the measurement.
R.1.7	The Applicant	**Spent Fuel** There appears to be an error in the calculation at para 7.7.73. [APP-192] 60 years divided by 18 months = 40 planned outages. 90 spent fuel assemblies are proposed to be removed on each occasion from each reactor. 90*40= 3,600 not 3,400 as set out. (i) Has the paragraph correctly set out the estimated number of assemblies to be removed? If so please explain how this has been calculated. (ii) In the event there is an error: a) Please explain whether the interim store as designed for 7378 assemblies has sufficient capacity + contingency + the additional 16 years of operation referred to previously; b) if not, how will the additional capacity be catered for? c) If an increase is necessary, can this be accommodated within the building parameters as shown? Explain whether the correct figures have been used in undertaking the ES?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
R.1.8	The Applicant	**Spent Fuel** Para 7.7.74 [APP-192] does not appear to include the likely additional number of spent fuel assemblies you have assessed as a contingency. In addition, neither calculation includes the possible extension of the life of the plant for a further 16 years as referenced in other documents within the ES (para 22.6.244 of APP-317). In considering your response please take account of your answer to R.1.4 above to fully explain the capacity required for storage and the total inventory you would expect at the end of generation.
R.1.9	The Applicant	**Spent Fuel** Does any of the above have any knock on effects to the other calculations made within the documentation? If so please explain what effects this would have and whether this has been addressed within the ES.
R.1.10	The Applicant, ONR	**Spent Fuel** (i) Please confirm that the current proposal does not include the encapsulation facility referred to at para 7.7.95. (ii) Assuming this to be correct, are you able at this stage to confirm there would be sufficient space within the DCO site to accommodate such a facility? (iii) Do the ONR agree that there would be sufficient space?
R.1.11	The Applicant, ONR, EA	**Length of Plant Life** Much of the documentation refers to the power stations operating for between 60-76years. The DCO would however if granted not be time limited, consent would in effect be in place for two nuclear power stations in perpetuity. Does this have any implications for the advice you provide to the ExA or of the assessments that have been undertaken?
R.1.12	ONR	**Design Acceptance Confirmation (DAC)** The Applicant's DAC would appear to expire on 13 December 2022. (i) Please explain how this regulatory system works and whether a further DAC would be required as the station would not be operational at this date. (ii) Are there any further implications if work has not commenced on site by this date?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Would you anticipate any reason why a further DAC would not be issued should a further application need to be made? (Iv) Are there any other implications the ExA should be aware of in respect of the limited time of the current DAC?
R.1.13	J Chanay [RR-509]	Please explain what you mean by the terms 'gross asymmetry' and 'no defensible justification on avoidable preference for SZC' in your representation so that your concerns can be fully understood.
R.1.14	The Applicant, ONR, EA, MMO	**Sea Defences** There is concern identified by a number of RRs e.g.(RR 0038) regarding the ongoing maintenance of the sea defences beyond the lifetime of the operation of the plant when it is reasonable to assume ILW, Spent Fuel and LLW may well continue to be stored on site. (i) What is proposed to be in place to ensure the integrity of the sea defences in the longer term? (ii) How should the integrity of the defences be monitored through the lifetime of the plant? (iii) How is this to be secured through the DCO process?
R.1.15	ONR, EA, MMO	**Sea Defences** In the event the power station operated beyond 60 years as referenced in a number of the ES documents what implications if any would this have?
R.1.16	ONR, Emergency Services, ESC, SCC	**Emergency Plans** Are you satisfied with the Emergency Plans that are set out and how they correlate with the existing nuclear sites at Sizewell A and B?
R.1.17	ONR, EA	**Transboundary Effects** A number of European governments and third parties have expressed concern about trans boundary effects particularly in the event of an accident beyond the design parameters of the power station e.g. see RR 802, RR 265, RR 155. (i) Are you satisfied this is adequately dealt with through the licensing regime? (ii) Does this assessment include the ancillary buildings such as the ISFS, and ILW storage?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
R.1.18	ONR, EA	**Spent Fuel Store/ILW Store** No details are provided to indicate at what depth the spent fuel or ILW would be stored. Are you satisfied the licensing arrangements would ensure appropriate and safe storage of these elements in the event of a flood event?
R.1.19	The Applicant	**Pressurised Water Reactor** Para 25.5.7 of [APP-340] refers to 'pressurised waste reactors' should this be pressurised water reactors? Please provide clarification
R.1.20	The Applicant, ONR, EA, PHE	**Spent Fuel Store/ ILW Store** (i) Does Appendix 25B when assessing radiological effects from the site include an assessment of effects from the ISFS and ongoing storage of spent fuel and ILW or is it just the operation of the power station? (ii) It would not appear to be explicit in the assessment. This would appear to be particularly important as paragraph 25.6.20 of [APP 340] indicates 'direct radiation from Sizewell C is therefore largely attributable to the Interim Spent Fuel and Intermediate Level Waste storage facilities on site.' Please clarify the position and advise what has been assessed under the ES. (iii) In light of the lack of detailed design for these facilities at this stage please explain how this assessment has been undertaken
R.1.21	ONR	**Semi Urban Criterion** (i) Has your advice been sort in respect of the relationship of the site to the local population? (ii) Are you satisfied that the proposals do not result in a radiological hazard being sited in an area which exceed the semi-urban criterion?
R.1.22	ESC, ONR	**Semi Urban Criterion** (i) Has additional residential development been undertaken within the area which influences the assessment of the semi urban criterion since the sustainability assessment was undertaken? (ii) Are there any future planned developments that might influence this assessment?
R.1.23	EA, ONR	**Sustainability Assessment**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) The NPS relies on an understanding of the science around climate change and the effect on sea levels from 2009, has the understanding of the effects of climate change and effect on sea levels changed since the sustainability assessment was carried out? (ii) If the knowledge has developed what implications does this have?
R.1.24	ONR, The Applicant	**Plant Life** The ES suggests the reactors may have their life extended to operate for up to 76 years. (i) As ILW and spent fuel would need to be stored on site beyond this time, what is the current best estimate of the date for the site to continue to store such radioactive materials?
R.1.25	EA, ONR	**Plant Life** The power stations and ongoing storage of ILW and spent fuel is likely to be on site beyond 2100 which was the date the NPS refers to as the date which had modelled climate change effects. What date can now be confidently forecast for such an assessment?
R.1.26	The Applicant	**NPS Status** In the event the site will continue to be used beyond 2100 what are your views of the status of the NPS in this respect and the weight that can be attributed to it?
R.1.27	EA	**EA Permits/Licences** Please advise on the latest position in respect of the assessment of the application for the permit under the Radiological Substances Permit Regulations and any other permits being sought from the Environment Agency in respect of this scheme. Do you consider there to be any impediment to the granting of any licenses for the site?
R.1.28	ONR	**ONR Permits/Licences** Please advise on the latest position in respect of the Applicant's position in respect of the Funded Decommissioning Programme (FDP) and the position in respect of any Licenses needed to be obtained from you. Do you consider there to be any impediment to the granting of any licenses for the site?
R.1.29	ONR, ESC, EA, The Applicant	**Public Health**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		PHE have indicated a series of shortcomings in their RR with regard to both radiological and air quality issues – please respond to each of the points that they have raised in so far as it relates to your responsibilities and explain whether you consider these issues could be overcome. In the event you consider the issues can be resolved please explain how the matters would be resolved and under which regime appropriate mitigation would be secured and operation monitored.
R.1.30	ONR, The Applicant	**Relationship to Current Operations at Sizewell** Please respond to the points raised by Magnox Ltd (RR-991) and Pinsent Masons (RR-992) and in particular the concern regarding the assertion that "the Sizewell C Nuclear Generating Station can be constructed and operated in accordance with the Applicant's application proposals in a manner which adequately ensures the safe, secure and environmentally sound decommissioning of the Sizewell A Nuclear Site."
R.1.31	The Applicant	**Planning Act** Please respond to the matters raised in [RR 509] in relation to the proposed radioactive waste storage facilities and whether they fall within section 14 of the Planning Act 2008.