

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

PART 1 OF 6

- G. 1 [General and Cross-topic Questions](#)
- Ag.1 [Agriculture and soils](#)
- AQ.1 [Air Quality](#)
- Al.1 [Alternatives](#)
- AR.1 [Amenity and recreation](#)

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1	General and Cross-topic Questions	
G.1.0	The Applicant	<p>Limits of deviation</p> <p>As drafted the DCO has no limitation on the depth to which works could be undertaken. Please explain how this aligns with the assessment carried out within the ES.</p> <p>In order to reflect the assessment within the ES does the DCO not require a maximum depth of excavation – with a potential for a limit of deviation? If this is not considered to be necessary, please explain how the ES has assessed the potential effects of unlimited excavation.</p>
G.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Plans</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Plate 3.2, identifies the nominated site area for Sizewell C from NPS EN-6. Please provide a set of the Figures from the original Government Appraisal of Sustainability for the site, and an overlay of the DCO Application site highlighting any additional land included or excluded from that assessed including identification of the temporary construction area.</p>
G.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Plans</p> <p>On an appropriately scaled ordnance survey plan show the land within the DCO for the main development site and the lines of latitude and longitude referred to in paragraph C.8.88 of NPS-6 Vol II.</p>
G.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Local and Parish Council Boundaries</p> <p>A number of local and parish councils have made Relevant Representations. To assist in a full understanding of their relationship to the sites, provide a plan showing the geographical boundaries of County, District, Town and Parish Councils that have made Relevant Representations.</p>
G.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, section 1.7, provides a summary of the Applicant’s approach to legislation and policy. Section 3 sets out those matters in more detail. Please provide an update to and/or expansion of that approach including reference to any subsequent Government responses or publications and the changes made to the original application.</p>
G.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Policy approach</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.9.11, identifies matters identified in the NPSs as not relevant for the decision-maker, principally because they have already been considered by the Government or because they are subject to control through other regimes. Please explain further why those matters should not be regarded as relevant considerations?
G.1.6	The Applicant	Policy approach The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.9.13, states that: " <i>The principle of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell, therefore, has been accepted and that acceptance is important and relevant and continues to carry significant weight.</i> " Please explain further why that 'in principle' acceptance and the overall policy approach of the NPSs should continue to carry significant weight?
G.1.7	The Applicant	Policy approach The Planning Statement, paragraph 11.1.5, makes reference to the consideration of alternative energy sources and sites by Government in developing national policy and states that they do not need to be considered again in the determination of this application. Please provide an update to include reference to the National Infrastructure Strategy (NIS) and National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) Government response statements.
G.1.8	The Applicant	Policy approach The CCC's 6 th Carbon Budget December 2020, recommended pathway requires a 78% reduction in UK territorial emissions between 1990 and 2035 and sets out a number of key recommendations including for electricity generation and in relation for uncertainties that need to be resolved. Please comment on the implications of that report for the proposed development and the role of nuclear in electricity generation generally.
G.1.9	The Applicant	Policy approach The Government recently provided a Response to the CCC's 2020 Progress Report to Parliament and also announced a 10 point plan for a 'Green Industrial Revolution'. Please comment on that response and announcement with particular reference to the role of nuclear power generation of the type proposed by the scheme as part of that plan?
G.1.10	The Applicant	Policy approach

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Planning Statement, section 3.8, considers whether there has been a change in circumstances since the EN-6 site specific assessment. Please identify and list all changes to the site area/circumstances for the Sizewell C Project application compared to what was considered by EN-6.
G.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.6.4, draws support from the Secretary of State's decision in respect of a DCO application for a new gas-fired power station at Drax:</p> <p>(i) Please provide an update in the light of the Court of Appeal judgment dated 21 January 2021 in the case of R (oao) Client Earth and Secretary of State BEIS (1) and Drax Power Ltd (2)?</p> <p>(ii) Please comment on what represents a realistic, and not an exaggerated, view of the weight to be given to 'considerations of need' in this particular case?</p>
G.1.12	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph, 3.9.2, states that it is appropriate to treat EN-1 and EN-6 as providing the primary policies relevant to the determination of the application. Likewise, section 3(10)(b), paragraph 3.10.2, refers to EN-1 (paragraph 4.1.6) as stating that other matters which the decision-maker may consider both important and relevant to its decision making include development plan documents or other documents in the local development framework. However, it goes on to say that in the event of a conflict between the NPS and local policy, the NPS prevails for the purposes of decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure:</p> <p>(i) Does that correctly reflect the position where both the NPS and the development plan fall within the scope of s105(2)(c)?</p> <p>(ii) Alternatively, in such a case, do NPS policies not "<i>sit alongside</i>" other national and local planning policies?</p> <p>(iii) How should the weight to be attributed to those matters and the question of primacy be assessed by the decision-maker in each case?</p>
G.1.13	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Applicant's Planning Statement, paragraph 3.10.13, sets out a number of regional or other policy documents which are relevant to the Sizewell C Project and have been considered within the ES technical assessments. The Applicant indicates that this is not a</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		complete list. Are there any other policy documents that should be drawn to the ExA's attention to at this stage?
G.1.14	SCC, ESC	Policy approach If not already provided, please submit complete copies of all relevant development plan and emerging policies and indicate in LIRs whether the status of any of those plans has changed.
G.1.15	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	Policy Approach The ESC Local Plan was adopted towards the end of 2020, please advise on the current position in respect of the policies that should now be considered and whether this change affects the assessment of policies set out by the Applicant.
G.1.16	The Applicant, ESC	Policy approach The Applicant's Planning Statement section 3.10(b), paragraph 3.10.8, states that where the strategies of the Local Plan relate to generic issues such as the protection of the environment, the relevant policy tests are those set out in the NPS. Likewise, paragraph 3.10.11 states that for Policy SP13 of the emerging local plan, which sets out a series of matters against which the Council believes that major infrastructure proposals should be considered, the NPSs would prevail in the event of any conflict with local and national policy: (i) Does that reflect the correct position and is the primacy of the NPSs agreed between ESC and the Applicant? (ii) If not, please identify and explain any areas of disagreement?
G.1.17	The Applicant, MMO	Policy approach The Planning Statement, section 3(10)(c), paragraph 3.10.19, refers to EN-1 (paragraph 4.1.6) which states that " <i>The IPC must have regard to the MPS and applicable marine plans in taking any decision which relates to the exercise of any function capable of affecting the whole or any part of the UK marine area. In the event of a conflict between any of these marine planning documents and an NPS, the NPS prevails for purposes of IPC decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure.</i> " Given that the decision in this case would be made pursuant to s105 PA 2008 and not s104 PA 2008, should the NPS still prevail in the event of a conflict or is the weight to be attributed to

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		those matters a question for the decision-maker to assess in the light of the particular circumstances of each case?
G.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.9.15, and Tables 3.2 and 3.3 provide an NPS tracker. The Applicant is requested to provide a more comprehensive NPS Accordance Table (NPS Tracker) for both EN-1 and EN-6 setting out the relevant NPS paragraph number, the requirement of the NPS, the compliance with the NPS by way of reference to submitted documentation and summary explanation, together with any subsequent update. The updated tracker to be submitted at each Examination deadline as specified in the Examination Timetable. This should record any changes and supplements to the Applicant's position on NPS compliance demonstrated by submissions during the Examination.</p>
G.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Need</p> <p>The Planning Statement, section 3.5, sets out why the Applicant considers that EN-1 and EN-6 establish an urgent need for new nuclear power generation in the UK. This is disputed by a number of IPs. For example, the relevant representations of Leiston Labour Party [RR-0678], Mark Hoare [RR-0752], Friends of the Earth Grassroots Nuclear Network [RR-0400], Stowarzyszenie 'Wspólna Ziemia' (Association Common Earth) [RR-1163], Swilland and Witnesham Grouped Parish Council [RR-1198], and Stop Sizewell C (Theberton & Eastbridge Action Group) [RR-1162] advocate the use of other technologies as being preferable. Likewise, Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) [RR-1231], contends that there is no NPS which establishes the "need" for a new nuclear power station post 2025, or the appropriateness of SZC for that purpose, when judged against the reasonable alternatives. The Applicant is requested to provide further justification and explanation in the light of these comments for its stance that the principle for the need for new nuclear plants such as Sizewell C is established in EN-1 and that significant weight should be attached to the statements of need set out in EN-1 and EN-6.</p>
G.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Need</p> <p>The Planning Statement, section 3.7, considers the EN-1, EN-6 site specific assessment and amongst other things, asserts that, in principle, Sizewell C is identified as a site suitable for the development of a new nuclear power station. The relevant representation of Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257] submits that this potential suitability is no longer</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		valid since it was based on an ability to use a sea-based transport strategy. Please provide a specific response to that matter in the light of the changes to the original application.
G.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Need</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.11, states that based on current grid intensity the operation of Sizewell C would displace the equivalent of its construction emissions within the first 6 years of operation. The representation of Ian Marshall [RR-0490], states that <i>"the carbon footprint of Sizewell C's construction will have an adverse impact on carbon targets; it cannot positively contribute to UK's carbon neutral timetable until 2040 at the earliest"</i>. Please comment on that assertion and set out the anticipated timetable for the displacement of construction emissions and the achievement of a positive contribution to the UK carbon neutral timetable.</p>
G.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Need</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.12, compares the lifecycle GHG emissions with lifecycle emissions from other sources. The representations of IPs such as East Suffolk Council on behalf of Green, Lib Dem & Independent Group [RR-034], assert that nuclear power compares unfavourably, in terms of GHG emissions, to wind power. Please explain further the derivation of the figure of 4.5g CO₂e/kWh for lifecycle GHG emissions for the scheme.</p>
G.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Need</p> <p>The Institute for Resource and Security Studies [RR-0499] states that it is untrue that Sizewell C's CO₂ equivalent emissions would be <i>"similar to wind and lower than solar"</i>. When the carbon footprint of its full uranium 'fuel chain' is considered - from uranium mining, milling, enrichment (which is highly energy intensive), fuel fabrication, irradiation, radioactive waste conditioning, storage, packaging to final disposal - nuclear power's CO₂ emissions are between 10 to 18 times greater than those from renewable energy technologies. Please comment on the criticisms made and indicate whether the comparisons made by the Applicant take account of the factors mentioned and, if not, why not?</p>
G.1.24	The Applicant, Relevant local planning authorities	<p>Benefits - Economic</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.18, states that home-based jobs generated by the project would equate to around 1% of all employment in Suffolk. This is regarded by the</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Applicant as a significant increase in employment and a major beneficial change to employment in the area:</p> <p>(i) What reliance can be placed upon the estimate that around 2,000 home based workers would be employed on the main development site at peak?</p> <p>(ii) What weight can be placed upon such relatively temporary employment benefits in the overall balancing exercise?</p>
G.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Benefits - Economic</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.20, states that the project would also create extensive supply chain opportunities:</p> <p>(i) What reliance can be placed upon the experience of development at Hinkley Point C by way of a comparator for such opportunities given the different location and circumstances of the Sizewell site?</p> <p>(ii) What is the likelihood of a similar level of spending on the regional supply chain at Sizewell C taking place and how would that be secured?</p>
G.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Benefits - Education, Jobs and skills</p> <p>Please provide further explanation and details to support the claim set out in the Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.33, that the economic effects of Sizewell C Project on skills, employment and the labour market would be substantial given the relatively short-term nature of many of those economic effects.</p>
G.1.27	The Applicant, Relevant local planning authorities	<p>Benefits – Tourism</p> <p>The Planning Statement, section 7.2 (e), explains the provision of the proposed Tourism Fund and what that is anticipated to achieve:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further why the provision of such a fund could be relied upon to mitigate the potential for adverse impacts on tourism as anticipated by the ES distinguishing between construction and operational impacts?</p> <p>(ii) Please list the locations of particular concern and explain how the provision of a Tourism Fund would specifically assist those particular aspects of the tourist economy most likely to suffer an adverse impact?</p>
G.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Indicative Construction Programme [APP-599]</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The early years assessment of traffic is done for an assumed year of 2023. On the indicative programme the years are not referenced. Annotate the years on the programme so it can be easily referenced to other submission documents.
G.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Construction Phases</p> <p>Figures 2.2.34 to 2.2.38 in [AS-191] show Construction Phases 1 to 5. They do not appear to relate to the Implementation Plan provided in [APP-599]. Provide:</p> <p>(i) Information on other construction phases, given temporary access and haul roads are still in place in Phase 5; and</p> <p>(ii) Cross reference these documents so that the construction phases can be identified in the Implementation Plan.</p>
G.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Main Platform - Underground Construction</p> <p>Provide long and cross sections of the main development platform showing the cut-off wall extent and also any deep excavations proposed, including marine tunnelling shafts.</p>
G.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Main Platform - Underground Construction</p> <p>Explain how dewatering will be undertaken for the revised marine tunnelling area outside of the cut off wall.</p>
G.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>In paragraphs 2.2.135 and 2.2.136 of [AS-181] the crossing bridge is said to be 30m long and 45m wide, in paragraphs 2.7.7 and 2.7.9 of [AS-202] the crossing bridge is said to be approximately 40m long and 40m wide and in paragraph 3.2.3 of the FRA Addendum [AS-157] the bridge is said to be 30m wide. In the plan SZC-SZ0100-XX-000-DRW-100205 [PDA-005] it is 40m long and 30m wide. Confirm the following:</p> <p>(i) The length of the proposed bridge (north /south); and</p> <p>(ii) The width of the proposed bridge at soffit level (east/west).</p> <p>Please update the plans to record the conclusion.</p>
G.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>Explain in detail why the width of the crossing needs to be around 40m at crest level given only the permanent access road will remain at operation.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>A number of IP's have referred to a crossing option of a three span bridge, that was considered at Stage 2 consultation. This is outlined in Appendix D7 [APP-072]. In Table 7.2 of that document it sets out the relative merits of a number of options including a three span bridge. This three span bridge option is stated to have the least land take from the SSSI and also has the least width of 35.5m, which includes the temporary bridge that would be ultimately removed. The current proposal has a final footprint width of 70m. This width is greater than any option in that previous consultation and presumably has a higher land take from the SSSI especially as there would be no removal of temporary incursion into the SSSI. Provide:</p> <p>(i) Explanation in detail why the three span bridge approach in the Stage 2 consultation is no longer being proposed, given the implications for the SSSI set out in Table 7.2 and Table 7.3; and</p> <p>(ii) The estimated land take of the current single span bridge proposal.</p>
G.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>Paragraph 2.7.8 of [AS-202] states "<i>The carriageway would have an approximate width of 12m and require approximately 3m high safety barriers on either side.</i>" Explain the following:</p> <p>(i) Whether the carriageway width of 12m is in its usual meaning the vehicle running width or includes the width of the footways on either side; and</p> <p>(ii) Why there is a requirement for a safety barrier of 3m high on either side of the carriageway.</p>
G.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>Figure 2.2.16 in [AS-190] seems to show that the carriageway and the top of the embankment crossfall towards the sea. The road level in paragraph 3.3.4 is stated to be 7.3m AOD. Is this proposed level at the lowest point of the road, which in the plate would be the seaward side? Is this interpretation correct?</p>
G.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing – Adaptive Sea Defence</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.134 of [AS-181] states that by 2090 the maximum crest height of the SSSI crossing is likely to need to be increased to 10.5m AOD. Provide:</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) A section similar to the adaptive design shown in Figure 2.2.25 in [AS-190] showing how the adaptive design may be constructed on the SSSI crossing; (ii) An explanation of the monitoring process to ensure the adaptive defence is delivered when required and how this process is secured within the DCO; (ii) A description of how the works required to deliver the adaptive defences are secured within the DCO; and (iv) An explanation as to whether consideration has been given to construct the SSSI crossing at the 10.5m AOD height at the start of the project.
G.1.38	The Applicant	Permanent BLF Paragraph 3.4.66 of Appendix 2.2B [AS-202]. Provide: (i) The approximate size of the ground beams; and (ii) The approximate size of the cross beams;
G.1.39	The Applicant	Permanent BLF Paragraph 3.4.68 of Appendix 2.2B [AS-202] states that the platform may require reinstallation following storm events or at the beginning of each summer period during construction use. In this scenario is it assumed that platform elements could be lost to the sea?
G.1.40	The Applicant	Permanent and Temporary BLF – Diversion of Coastal Paths Paragraph 15.5.11 to 15.5.20 [APP-267] sets out the potential implications for the Suffolk Coast Path, Sandlings Walk and the future route of the England Coast Path. Diversions are explained and shown in The Access and Rights of Way Strategy, Appendix 15I [APP-270]. The introduction of the new temporary beach landing facility is likely to affect the periods for which diversions would be in place. Set out the approximate length and frequency of closures associated with: (i) Construction of the permanent beach landing facility; (ii) Construction of the temporary beach landing facility; (iii) Operation of the permanent beach landing facility during construction; (iv) Operation of the temporary beach landing facility when conveyor belt is in use, if closure of path beneath is required; and

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(v) Operation of the permanent beach landing facility during operation.
G.1.41	The Applicant, Essex & Suffolk Water Company	<p>Water Supply</p> <p>In [AS 189] you indicate that the provision of the preferred pipeline may have adverse effects in respect of noise, air quality and terrestrial ecology.</p> <p>Please explain how mitigation could be secured for these operations when the pipeline would not appear to be part of the DCO application.</p>
G.1.42	The Applicant	<p>Draft DCO</p> <p>In [AS148] Table 2 refers to how Article 3 and 4(1)(a) set vertical limits to control the parameters of development.</p> <p>(i) Please explain how this would be achieved for each of the associated development sites where there are no parameters plans and are not specifically covered by these articles except for Work No. 4C, Work No. 11 and Work No. 12.</p> <p>(ii) Is it not fairer to say that there are no vertical limits of deviation in these locations as parameter plans have not been provided and as the DCO is currently drafted?</p> <p>As this document is intended to be a signposting document to aid the public's understanding of the DCO, is this a fair representation to them?</p>
G.1.43	The Applicant	<p>Vertical Limits of Deviation</p> <p>In [APP 451] SLR, Noise and Vibration para 4.6.40 the ES seeks to explain that a parameters approach has been adopted, and this is duplicated in para 4.6.37 of [APP 415] (TVB Noise and Vibration) . Both Chapters appear to rely on a limitation of vertical deviation of 1m. Please show where this is set out and secured in the DCO.</p>
G.1.44	The Applicant	<p>Park and Ride Sites (Parameters)</p> <p>In [APP 384 and APP 354] for the Southern and Northern Park and Rides respectively there appears to be no reference to any form of vertical limit of deviation or what parameters the development would be undertaken within. Are these two elements of the scheme to be treated differently from other aspects of the proposed development?</p>
G.1.45	The Applicant, All relevant local authorities, EA	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>The CoCP [AS 273] sub heading m) indicates SZC Co. would hope to lead on complaints.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please explain how this would be undertaken to respect privacy and comply with the GDPR as well as enforcing authorities' responsibilities to investigate complaints.
G.1.46	The Applicant, Network Rail	<p>Green Rail Route and Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE)</p> <p>(i) In the event the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line is modified as proposed and both the LEEIE and Green Rail Route are established could they both be operational at the same time?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain whether this is possible and if not what would be in place to prevent it?</p> <p>(iii) Has the ES assessed the possibility of both operating together? -</p>
G.1.47	The Applicant	<p>Main Development Site</p> <p>Please will the Applicant confirm that the Main Development Site as defined in the ES glossary [APP-005] is exactly the same as the Main Development Site as defined in the dDCO (both the original [APP-059] and the current version). The wording is different. If there are differences, please supply plans setting them out and an explanation.</p>
G.1.48	The Applicant	<p>Main Development Site</p> <p>Please will the Applicant state whether or not the Works numbers 2, 3 and 4 are wholly located on the Main Development Site as defined in the dDCO and that the only works to be carried out on the Main Development Site as defined in the dDCO are Works No.s 1-4.</p>
G.1.49	The Applicant	<p>Plans</p> <p>The Main Development Site Temporary Construction Area – General Arrangement Sheet 4 of 4 indicates the eastern extent of the proposed green rail route, this however, extends beyond the area defined in the Works Plans as Work No. 4B. Please clarify the position or provide corrected plans.</p>
G.1.50	The Applicant	<p>Flood Defences</p> <p>In Table 2.3 Parameters for other development on the main platform. You specify the maximum height of the sea defence as 14.2m AOD. This is explained in the subsequent paragraphs 2.4.6 and 2.4.7.</p> <p>(i) Is the intention to construct the flood defence to the greater height from the outset?</p> <p>(ii) If not, when would you anticipate this would be done and how would this be secured?</p>
G.1.51	The Applicant, Network Rail	Freight Trains

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Please advise of the stages to go through to confirm that freight trains could begin to deliver materials to both Land East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) and the Main Development Site (MDS) using the Green Rail Route.</p> <p>(ii) Please set out what you consider to be a realistic time frame for the delivery and facilitation of both options in the event the DCO were to be granted.</p>
G.1.52	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>(i) Please provide a plan showing how the site would be laid out within the Land to the East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate which demonstrates that the 400 caravans you propose can be accommodated and facilitate appropriate separation and circulation spaces as required.</p> <p>(ii) Please advise what within the DCO triggers the delivery of and secures the provision of the caravan site.</p>
G.1.53	ESC, SCC, EA, Natural England	<p>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</p> <p>The CoCP would be an important part of the mitigation strategy for dealing with and controlling potentially adverse effects from the various construction activities. Do you consider that as drafted it is sufficiently robust and precise and consequently enforceable?</p>
G.1.54	The Applicant	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>Draft DCO Requirement 8 says that the work to be undertaken should be in general accord with the Construction Method Statement (CMS) - but this document is not referenced in the Mitigation Route Map - so it is not clear where the CMS fits in respect of the mitigation or the Code of Construction Practice.</p> <p>Please explain how the various documents are intended to operate together and how the different controls within them are secured.</p> <p>In addition the ExA notes that [APP-184] is updated by appendix 2.2.B of [AS-202]. Should the CMS as defined in the dDCO refer to [AS-202] section 3.4 and not [APP-184] if the change request is accepted?</p>
G.1.55	The Applicant	<p>Construction Shift Patterns</p> <p>(i) Please provide a breakdown of the numbers of staff anticipated to be arriving and leaving the site during each of the construction phases of the project. Linking this</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>information to the indicative working patterns identified in Table 3.1[APP-184] would assist in the understanding of movements on and off the site.</p> <p>(ii) Please include the mode of travel you have assumed for them to arrive and leave by with assumed numbers by each mode.</p> <p>(iii) How does the DCO secure the shift pattern assumed?</p>
G.1.56	The Applicant	<p>EQS</p> <p>There are many references, notably in the ecology parts of the ES, to EQSs. "EQS" is defined in the Glossary [APP-005] as "<i>Concentration of a specified contaminant considered to be none harmful to the environment, agreed at a European level under the Environmental Quality Standards Directive</i>". Please will the Applicant explain the legal and policy consequences of a breach of an EQS. Does it vary depending on the directive / law in which the EQS is being used? Please will the Applicant also clarify the definition. Should "none harmful" be "non-harmful"?</p>
G.1.57	The Applicant	<p>Legislation</p> <p>Section 3 of the Planning Statement [APP-590] entitled Legislative and Policy Context after a description of policy and some parts of the Planning Act 2008, then, in a paragraph entitled "Other legislative requirements", refers the reader to the Legislation and policy context sections of the ES at Chapter 1 of each volume for the relevant law, and to the Schedule of Other Licences, Consents and Agreements [APP-153]. In fact the ExA has found the lists near the opening of the chapters of the volumes, for example in section 7.2 of the main site terrestrial ecology chapter [APP-461]. They in turn refer the reader to Volume 1 Appendix 6 [APP-171].</p> <p>Whilst this is helpful to a point, the documentation does not spell out how the legislation applies and the steps the Secretary of State and the ExA are expected to take. For example, the ExA has been unable to find any reference to ss.28G and 28I of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the duties they contain. In contrast, there is a mention of the approach to ss.40 and 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, though the relevant parts of the Convention on Biodiversity 1992 are not referred to. Nor does, for example, Appendix 6J state how the various international conventions and treaties have been incorporated into the laws of England and Wales. Appendix 6R,</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>whilst it refers to the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, does not deal with the duties under ss.125 and 126.</p> <p>Returning to the topic chapters of the ES, having once listed the legislation they do not refer to it again.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant prepare a statement of the legislation and international obligations which apply, explaining the actions and steps which the ExA and SoS should take to comply with them.</p>
G.1.58	The Applicant	<p>The ES contains many statements and promises at various places that certain steps or actions or mitigation will be delivered. For example, at paragraph 14.7.46 of [APP-224] there is a reference to a Recreation and Amenity Strategy. The conclusion at para 14.7.67 relies on the delivery of embedded mitigation. Para 14.7.79 states that if monitoring indicates exceedance of a threshold, then additional mitigation measures would be adopted. At para 14.7.136 funding for alternative fen meadow compensation is referred to. At para 14.7.276 a management strategy is stated to be in place. There are many other examples in other chapters of the ES.</p> <p>However, the ES does not appear to the ExA to set out where these things are secured in the dDCO, by which Requirement, or under other documents regulating the development.</p> <p>How does the Applicant propose that the ExA can be assured that all these matters will have been secured properly in the dDCO and other documentation regulating the development, should the SoS decide to grant the Application?</p>
Ag.1	Agriculture and Soils	
Ag.1.0	ESC, Natural England	<p>Approach</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the overall assessment approach and findings in respect of Agriculture and Soils?</p>
Ag.1.1	The Applicant	Impact Assessment

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In chapters [APP-277], [APP-371], [APP-402], [APP-435], [APP-470], [APP-502], [APP-531] and [APP-563] a table is included titled 'Assessment of magnitude of impact on soils and agriculture' which defines high, medium, low and very low magnitudes of impact:</p> <p>(i) Please confirm whether each of the criteria listed in the table is to be met for the magnitude to be allocated?</p> <p>(ii) Please provide detailed justification for how the magnitude of impact of the loss of Best and Most Versatile land is determined. How is severance, whether temporary or permanent, taken into consideration, particularly associated with smaller agricultural holdings?</p> <p>(iii) How does the methodology assess smaller agricultural or other holdings for which a permanent or long-term loss or degradation of <10ha of BMV land, and/or loss of <5% of farmed land and/or no severance would be seen by the owners and/or occupiers as having more than a very low impact?</p>
Ag.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>The following areas have not been surveyed due to lack of access:</p> <p>(i) 14.5ha of the SLR (ii) 3.15ha of the TVB (iii) 14.4ha of the MDS</p> <p>Please explain why access was not possible.</p>
Ag.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>Please provide an update as to whether questionnaires have been completed with landowners at Theberton Hall Farm, Yew Tree Farm and Theberton House Estate [APP-470]. What assumptions were made to ensure that the lack of information did not affect the conclusions of the assessment?</p>
Ag.1.4	ESC, Natural England	<p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>The temporary compounds associated with the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line rail improvement works have not been included in the agriculture and soils assessment [APP-563]. Please confirm if you are satisfied with this approach?</p>
Ag.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Impact Assessment</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Paragraph 10.6.7 of [APP-563] states that the effect on two of the four land holdings would be significant. Paragraph 10.7.5 later states that three farm business would experience a significant effect. Please clarify the number of land holdings which would experience a significant effect.
Ag.1.6	Mollett's Partnership [RR-0812] Finn Dowley [RR-0382] LJ and EJ Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] Justin Dowley [RR-0638] Myles Dowley [RR-0866] Miss Frances Paul on behalf of Mrs J F Flick [RR-0806] NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] Ward Farming Business [RR-1259]	Effect on Business Operations Please provide more detail in respect of your concern on the impact that the Proposed Development may have on your business.
Ag.1.7	CLA County Land [RR-0029]	Effect on Business Operations Please explain in greater detail your concern that the Proposed Development would result in the fragmentation of farms and other rural businesses due to new infrastructure and the overall impact.
Ag.1.8	The Applicant	Effect on Business Operations What consideration has been given to the effect on the health and wellbeing of animals housed or grazing close to the Proposed Development including through noise and dust? What measures could be put in place to mitigate any impacts and how could this be secured through the DCO?
Ag.1.9	The Applicant	Mitigation Paragraphs 17.7.5 of [APP-277], 10.7.5 of [APP-531], 10.7.3 of [APP-371] and [APP-402, 10.7.5 of [APP-563] and 10.4.59 of [APP-502] state that the impact on the landholding(s)

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>would not be significant. However, further consultation with the landowner(s) is proposed to reduce impact on the farm business.</p> <p>Please expand on what the consultation will consist of, when this will occur and what specific measures are to be implemented to reduce impact? How will such measures reduce the level of impact?</p>
Ag.1.10	ESC, Natural England	<p>Outline Soil Management Plan</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the approach and content of the outline Soil Management Plan [APP-278]? Please provide specific comment regarding whether soils would be suitable for the required end use and the proposed soil restoration methods?</p>
Ag.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Outline Soil Management Plan [APP-278]</p> <p>(i) Please provide confirmation as to which stakeholders would be consulted with regarding possible cessation of works due to wet weather working.</p> <p>(ii) Please confirm how the Soil Management Plan and the review/approval role by relevant consultation bodies would be secured through the DCO?</p> <p>(iii) How will soils that are to be re-used for landscape restoration to be kept free of foreign matter or other materials which would render the soils unsuitable for re-use? A list of general principles relating to stockpile location and stability are detailed in paragraph 6.6.3:</p> <p>(iv) What measures would be employed to manage topsoil and subsoil stockpiles throughout their lifetime to maintain stability and integrity?</p>
Ag.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Soil Management</p> <p>In [RR-0304] ESC comment that the modelling of emissions from stockpiled materials, as set out in the Environmental Statement, is subject to significant uncertainty and should not be considered as providing definitive results. Please provide a response to this concern.</p>
Ag.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Soil Management</p> <p>ESC note that dust nuisance is likely to be minimal with the proposed mitigation in place [RR-0304]. ESC has however requested that stockpiles and earth bunds are turfed and fenced/screened in locations which are within 350m of sensitive human health and ecological receptors to minimise wind whipping of loose bund or stockpile material. Please</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		provide a response to this request including confirmation of how any such commitments would be secured.
Ag.1.14	The Applicant	Soil Management Paragraph 1.2.3 of Appendix 12A [APP-213] states that surface strip material from Zone A is anticipated to have low organic content and therefore would not be separated into top/sub soil. Paragraph 6.3.2 of Appendix 17C [APP-278] states that separate stockpiles will be created for different types of topsoil and subsoil. Please confirm if soils are to be separated?
Ag.1.15	The Applicant	Dust Management Please provide a response to the issues raised regarding dust management for spoil heaps and stockpiles [RR-0960, RR-0181, RR-1230, RR-0636, RR-577, RR-1162, RR-319].
Ag.1.16	The Applicant	Drainage How has the size and locations for the drainage treatment areas/other drainage infrastructure been considered to minimise the effect on operational agricultural land?
Ag.1.17	The Applicant	Drainage How will any affected field drainage on agricultural land be reinstated post construction phase? How will this be secured as part of the DCO?
Ag.1.18	The Applicant	Drainage Paragraph 10.4.8 of [APP-531] states that as the site is quite low lying, adequate fall for field drainage may be problematic. Please confirm how this issue has been addressed.
Ag.1.19	The Applicant	Consultation Paragraph 17.3.30 [APP-277] refers to landowner interviews. Please confirm how many landowners were not interviewed (Paragraph 17.3.30 [APP-277])? Please confirm why it wasn't possible to interview all landowners?
Ag.1.20	The Applicant	Consultation In response to [RR-0878], please confirm how NE advice and consultation responses, relating to soils and agriculture, has been considered in the drafting of the dDCO?
Ag.1.21	ESC, Natural England	Code of Construction Practice

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The below issues may increase effects on soils and agricultural land required for reinstatement of land, landscape planting areas, land outside the site boundary and soils required for reinstatement of land required temporarily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) ground contamination, soil erosion and silt-laden runoff; (ii) hydrological or hydrogeological changes; and (iii) noise and dust <p>Are you satisfied with the measures detailed within the CoCP [AS-273] to manage/reduce the risk of the above occurring?</p>
Ag.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>In [RR-0304] ESC requested that the CoCP should specify that dust deposition monitoring is required when soil stripping is undertaken within proximity of sensitive receptors. Please provide a response.</p>
Ag.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>[RR-1099], [RR-1101], [RR-1100], [RR-1098] request that a record of condition and soil statement is included within the CoCP. Additional requests have also been made for more detail regarding the measures to be put in place to bring soil back to its original condition and quality, the need for a pre-construction soil statement and an aftercare plan. Please provide a response.</p>
Ag.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Water Supply</p> <p>[RR-0215], [RR-0366], [RR-0424], [RR-0437],[RR-0891], [RR-0937], [RR-1122], [RR-1098], [RR-1099], [RR-1100], [RR-1122] commented on the provision of water supplies for agricultural businesses. Please provide a response to the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) What measures would be put in place to ensure that private water supplies for agricultural businesses are not adversely affected by the Proposed Development (ii) What measures would be put in place to monitor any effects during the construction phase? (iii) What measures would be put in place to monitor any effects post construction? (iv) How would any remedial action (such an alternative supply) be provided if private supplies are adversely affected, including through supply levels and contamination?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ag.1.25	Catherine Bacon [RR-0184] NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] NFU [RR-0885] Clarke & Simpson on behalf of Family Mellen [RR-0241] Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] Mollett's Partnership [RR-0812] Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of David and Belinda Grant [RR-1098] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Nat & India Bacon [RR-1100] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Trustees of AW Bacon Will Trust Myles Dowley [RR-0866] Justin Dowley [RR-0638] Emma Dowley [RR-0367] Finn Dowley [RR-0382] LJ & EJ Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] Dowley Family Business [RR-0319] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Justin & Emma Dowley [RR-1099]	<p>Water Supply</p> <p>Please provide information, including annotated maps, confirming whether your agricultural business(es) rely on private boreholes for water supply. Please also indicate whether you rely partly or solely on such supplies.</p>
Ag.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Water Supply</p> <p>Has Parkgate Farm constructed the large irrigation pond detailed in paragraph 10.4.31 of [APP-435]? If so, have alternative crops been grown other than those considered in the assessment and has the land remained in arable production? If changes have been made, do they have an impact on the findings of the assessment?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ag.1.27	Catherine Bacon [RR-0184] NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] NFU [RR-0885] Clarke & Simpson on behalf of Family Mellen [RR-0241] Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] Mollett's Partnership [RR-0812] Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of David and Belinda Grant [RR-1098] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Nat & India Bacon [RR-1100] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Trustees of AW Bacon Will Trust [RR-0003] Myles Dowley [RR-0866] Justin Dowley [RR-0638] Emma Dowley [RR-0367] Finn Dowley [RR-0382] LJ & EJ Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] Dowley Family Business [RR-0319] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Justin & Emma Dowley [RR-1099]	<p>Land Ownership and Severance</p> <p>Please provide information, including annotated maps if possible, to illustrate where agricultural land may be severed by the Proposed Development.</p>
Ag.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Best and Most Versatile land</p> <p>NPS EN1 (paragraph 5.1.080) states that "<i>Applicants should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defines as land in grades 1,2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5)...".</i></p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please explain how the test in paragraph 5.10.8 of the NPS is satisfied in the respect of the location of the Northern Park and Ride, the SLR and the TVB.
Ag.1.29	The Applicant, ESC, Natural England	Best and Most Versatile land Paragraph 17.6.6 of [APP-277] confirms that an area of 14.4ha has not been surveyed. Please can the Applicant detail why the area was unable to be surveyed. Do ESC and NE agree with the assumption that the un-surveyed area is unlikely to be Best and Most Versatile land?
Ag.1.30	The Applicant	Agricultural Liaison Officer Please provide a response regarding the need for the appointment of an Agricultural Liaison Officer [RR-1099].
Ag.1.31	The Applicant	Grazing land In relation to the proposed sites for fen meadow habitat Table 1.1 of Appendix 17B [APP-278] states that following completion of the works, it is anticipated that grazing would continue, albeit with a possible reduction in density. Please confirm whether grazing would continue and specify if grazing density would be lost? If a loss is to occur, please confirm by how much.
Ag.1.32	The Applicant	Grazing land Please comment regarding the concern over potential damage to Minsmere Sluice and subsequent damage to grazing land [RR-0319].
Ag.1.33	The Applicant	Access Table 10.9 of [APP-470] confirms that Fordley Hall Farm, Old Abbey Farm, Trust Farm, Hawthorn Farm, Dove House Farm and Theberton Hall Farm will be required to use the public highway. Please provide specific information relating to the location and anticipated level of use of the public highway.
Ag.1.34	The Applicant	Access In respect of Farnham Hall [APP-435], how much longer would journey times to the fields within the landholding east of the new road be?
Ag.1.35	The Applicant	Access

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Table 10.9 of [APP-470] confirms that Kelsale Manor will experience severance in the area to the north of the Sizewell Link Road. Please detail what restricted access would be experienced by the landowner?
Ag.1.36	ESC, Natural England	Materials Management Strategy Are you satisfied with the approach and content of the Material Management Strategy regarding soils and agriculture [AS-202]?
Ag.1.37	The Applicant	Committed Developments Please confirm what are the two committed developments within 700m of the Freight Management Facility, as detailed in paragraph 10.4.26 of [APP-531]. Please confirm why they do not have the potential to materially alter baseline conditions.
Ag.1.38	The Applicant	Land to East of Abbey Lane Mr John Poll has confirmed [AS-307] that he rents approximately 20 acres of land to the east of Abbey Lane which would be lost to the proposed rail line. Mr Poll contends that this area has not been identified as agricultural land which he farms. Please confirm whether this land has been included within the assessment?
AQ.1 Air Quality		
AQ.1.0	The Applicant	Methodology/Construction Traffic and Air Quality Please confirm that the emissions from traffic operating within the site during construction has been included in the assessment of air quality affects arising from the main development site and the associated sites. Please set out where this information can be found within each chapter.
AQ.1.1	ESC, EA, Natural England	Air quality receptors Are you satisfied that all potential sensitive receptors have been taken into account in the Air Quality Assessment (AQA), and with the Applicant's identification of worst-case locations for air quality?
AQ.1.2	ESC, EA	PM 2.5

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Are you satisfied that potential impacts of PM _{2.5} concentrations have been fully taken into account in the ES and appropriately assessed as a fraction of PM ₁₀ particulate concentrations? (ii) Do you consider using PM ₁₀ as a surrogate for PM _{2.5} an acceptable methodology?
AQ.1.3	ESC	Dust emissions Do you agree with the findings of the ES that the only potential source of significant air pollution would arise from construction dust?
AQ.1.4	The Applicant	Dust Emissions It is recognised within the Air Quality chapters that the development activities could give rise to dust emissions: (i) Please explain where in the Air Quality chapter or elsewhere there is an assessment of the potential impacts upon agriculture as implied by the Agriculture Chapter. (ii) Please explain where the potential effects in terms of crops and animals have been considered and where any necessary mitigation has been set out. (iii) Please explain where any mitigation, should it be necessary, is delivered through the DCO.
AQ.1.5	The Applicant	Dust Emissions In light of the concern raised by the NFU [RR-805] please respond setting out how the effects on agriculture, and crops has been assessed and mitigated to acceptable levels
AQ.1.6	The Applicant	Dust emissions (Baseline) (i) Please advise how you selected the sites for measuring the current dust levels. (ii) Please explain the reasoning behind there being no monitoring being undertaken at Land East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate, Valley Road or Bucklewood Road.
AQ.1.7	ESC	Dust emissions Are you confident the baseline monitoring locations chosen for assessing the significance of dust emissions arising from the main development site would satisfactorily provide sufficient information such that appropriate standards can be monitored managed and mitigated to safeguard health and amenity for local receptors?
AQ.1.8	The Applicant	Dust emissions

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In section 12.5.3 [APP-212] in seeking to minimise construction dust effects on sensitive receptors, iii suggests access points into sites are located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. Explain how this correlates with the junction/access into Land East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate and the proximity to LE7 Common Farm Cottages.
AQ.1.9	The Applicant	Dust emissions Please provide a plan identifying the location and extent of the bunds referred to in 12.5.4 [APP-212] or advise where this can be found.
AQ.1.10	The Applicant	Dust Monitoring Please explain the approach to determining the location of dust monitoring stations, and in particular how during the different construction phases how ongoing monitoring would ensure dust emissions remain below the predicted thresholds and sensitive receptors are protected.
AQ.1.11	The Applicant, ESC	Dust Monitoring (i) A High Risk of dust spoiling and medium risk to human health is identified from activities undertaken on Site E yet no dust monitoring stations are identified in close proximity – please explain why this is the case? (ii) How will sensitive receptors be safeguarded; and (iii) the work monitored; and (iv) standards enforced?
AQ.1.12	The Applicant, ESC	Dust Monitoring (i) As no monitoring has been carried out to understand base levels of dust particles in the vicinity of construction site C – what confidence do you have that the effects of the construction activities on this site would remain at acceptable levels? (ii) How can this be demonstrated when the base line is an important part of the initial consideration?
AQ.1.13	The Applicant, ESC, PHE	Temporary Accommodation (i) In light of the close proximity of the accommodation campus to both the active working site but also the stockpiles of materials, what safeguards are in place to ensure appropriate levels are monitored and maintained for the future occupiers of the campus.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Are the Council/PHE satisfied the relationship between the accommodation campus and the stockpiles/working areas can achieve an appropriate living environment to protect human health?
AQ.1.14	The Applicant, ESC, EA, PHE	Air Quality Assessment Please respond to each of the concerns expressed by Laurence Moss [RR 673] and in light of them whether there are any outstanding concerns in this regard.
AQ.1.15	The Applicant	Air Quality Assessment Please respond in light of the concerns raised by ESC [RR 342] regarding the potential release of carbon monoxide and formaldehyde from the diesel generators. If these are to be scoped out of the assessment, please provide a full justification for this approach.
AQ.1.16	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Air Quality [RR 804 and RR 820] both express concern that the increased emissions from increased traffic along the A12 could have a disproportionate effect on the health of students at Farlingaye High School. Please respond to this concern.
AQ.1.17	ESC, EA	Air Quality Do you agree that paragraph 5.2.9 of EN-1 does not apply as the Applicant suggests in the Planning Statement as "there would be no substantial changes in air quality levels"?
AQ.1.18	ESC, EA, PHE	Air Quality Receptors Are you satisfied that all potential sensitive receptors have been taken into account in the Air Quality Assessment and with the Applicant's identification of worst case locations for Air Quality?
AQ.1.19	ESC	Approach (i) Is the Council satisfied with the overall approach of the Applicant to dealing with Air Quality? (ii) Do the Council have any specific criticisms it would like to make?
AQ.1.20	PHE	Approach

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Are you satisfied that the Air Quality Assessment has responded fully and addressed all matters raised by PHE at the scoping stage?
AQ.1.21	ESC, The Applicant	<p>Additional Information</p> <p>Additional information was requested by ESC as referred to in ESC RR at paras 1.84 and 1.87:</p> <p>(i) Has this information been provided to the Examination?</p> <p>(ii) If so where can it be found?</p>
AQ.1.22	ESC, SCC	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>Can the relevant public health authorities confirm that they consider the effects on air quality from the additional traffic along the A12 have been adequately assessed and confirm that they would not result in significant adverse effects along this transport corridor as suggested by RRs 804, 820 amongst others.</p>
AQ.1.23	ESC	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>(i) Are you concerned that the scheme may result in the failure to comply to any statutory air quality limit?</p> <p>(ii) If this is the case please provide details of the concerns, the limits that apply and the area(s) this would cover.</p> <p>(iii) If answering the above in the affirmative do you consider additional mitigation could be offered that might resolve these issues, what would this entail and how could it be delivered?</p>
AQ.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant (Accommodation Campus)</p> <p>The ES does not fully explain what type of plant has been assessed within the ES. It refers in various paragraphs to different elements. Paragraph 12.3.14 indicates it to be a gas fuelled plant, with Table 12.11 indicating location, flue height and emissions. Paragraph 12.5.3 ii refers to an optimised stack height while Table 12.3.14 appears to set the height?</p> <p>(i) Please clarify the situation.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide the details of the type of plant assessed within the ES and how this would be delivered through the DCO to ensure it fell within those parameters.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant/back up energy centre</p> <p>In the event this plant was to be retained as a backup power supply for emergencies during operation of the power station as referred to in the ES.</p> <p>(i) Would all or some of the diesel generators still be required?</p> <p>(ii) Has the ES assessed the effects of the diesel generators running as well as the CHP and or energy centre/back up such that the potential cumulative effects have been fully set out? Please advise where the alternative assessments can be found.</p>
AQ.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>Paragraph 12.5.8 refers to the campus energy centre:</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that this is the combined heat and power plant, if not please provide details of where this has been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>(ii) What effect does 'designed, maintained and operated within the Medium Combustion Plant Directive' requirements have, please clarify whether this would be covered by the other licence requirements set out in Table 1.1 of the Other Licences and Consents Document?</p> <p>(iii) Has this operation regime been assumed within the ES assessment? How would this be delivered through the DCO?</p>
AQ.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>Following receipt of the explanation of the assessment of the CHP/back-up generator in correspondence dated 12.01.21 in response to PD 05 there remains some uncertainty as to what has been assessed.</p> <p>It is understood that the CHP may not be utilised, however an appropriate assessment of the CHP and the alternative still needs to be clearly described so assessment of likely effects is contained within the ES if it is to be delivered through the DCO.</p> <p>In response [APP 184] Description of Construction and [APP-180] Description of Permanent Development were referred to.</p> <p>In Table 2.7 of Vol 2 Chapter 2 [APP-180] Description of Permanent Development it states the parameter for the back-up power generation plant in Zone 1M as a maximum height of 36m (plus 3.5m tall stack). This would appear to exceed the construction parameter plans as listed in Schedule 6 of the dDCO (drwg no. 10092) which specifies a maximum height of 35m, it also exceeds the height of the stack as set out in Table 12.11.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The height of the back-up generator and stack appear to exceed the construction parameter plans [APP-022] which indicate a maximum height of 35m.</p> <p>The operation parameter plans for this area appear to be higher as defined in Table 2.7 linked to the dDCO. Please clarify how something could be operationally higher than the limit for construction?</p>
AQ.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Back Up Generator</p> <p>In the event the CHP is not utilised and a back up generator is subsequently provided for the operational period:</p> <p>(i) What form of generator would it be and where are the details for this set out within the ES chapters for noise, air quality, and landscape?</p> <p>(ii) Explain why it would be appropriate and necessary to site a permanent building potentially up to 35m in height (plus 3.5m stack) within the AONB, when you advise a stack height of just over 12m results in adequate emissions.</p> <p>(iii) How would this sit with the aims and purposes of the AONB?</p>
AQ.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>Appendix 12F provides an assessment of the CHP emissions. It does not however specify what form of plant was utilised to generate the data.</p> <p>(i) What type of plant does this assess, running what fuel and with what assumed flue height/location?</p> <p>(ii) How would this be delivered through the DCO?</p>
AQ.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>It is understood that alternative forms of power plant are still being considered to support the accommodation campus as reference is also made to air source heat pumps.</p> <p>(i) As alternatives are being sought what process would prevent more than one alternative being provided?</p> <p>(ii) Has a cumulative assessment been carried out in the event that more than one power source were to be provided?</p>
AQ.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>The position is further complicated by the information set out in the Noise Chapter of the ES which states "<i>The final designs for the proposed CHP, electrical sub-station and back-</i></p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>up generator (including component parts and sound power data) are not available at this time.</i>" [APP156] para 11.6.165. This suggests the CHP and back-up generator may be different things and it makes it more difficult to understand what has actually been assessed.</p> <p>If the CHP is not utilised what back up energy system has been assessed and where can the details of this be found?</p>
AQ.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>It is important to understand how the concerns highlighted in Q 1.17-1.24 knock on, if at all, to the assessment within the other chapters of the ES in particular, Noise and Vibration, Heritage, Landscape, Ecology, Agriculture.</p> <p>In answering the above questions please address any knock on effects which may be relevant to these aspects of the scheme.</p>
AQ.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation campus</p> <p>As can be seen from the previous questions there is a great deal of uncertainty over what has been assessed in respect of the power source for the accommodation campus during construction and what would be in place post construction to support operation:</p> <p>(i) Please provide a clear explanation of the alternatives considered and set out clearly where they have been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain how the alternatives would be delivered, monitored and controlled through the DCO such that they remain within the assessment parameters covered by the ES.</p>
AQ.1.34	ESC, SCC, PHE, EA	<p>Dust Soiling</p> <p>(i) Are you satisfied with the suggested mitigation to control the levels of dust arising from the development?</p> <p>(ii) If not what additional mitigation would you wish to see supplementing the Dust Management Plan, Outline Dust Management Plan or Code of Construction Practice?</p>
AQ.1.35	ESC, SCC, PHE, EA, Natural England	<p>Dust Soiling</p> <p>(i) Are you satisfied with the suggested monitoring of dust emissions from the development?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) If not what additional mitigation would you wish to see and how do you consider this should be secured?
AQ.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Dust Soiling</p> <p>In light of the comments from ESC in [RR-0342] can you confirm that the CoCP will address the need for dust monitoring during soil stripping to protect sensitive receptors? If you don't agree with this approach, please explain why.</p>
AQ.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Dust Soiling</p> <p>Please explain how the monitoring referred to in paragraph 12.6.8 [APP 212] would be secured.</p>
AQ.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Dust Emissions</p> <p>Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group [RR-803] consider that fugitive dust from the borrowpits and spoil heaps would have the great potential to adversely affect both ground water and surface water run-off. Please respond to these specific concerns.</p>
AQ.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Dust Emissions</p> <p>Estimates of quantities of material extracted from the main development site during construction are provided within the Air Quality Chapter:</p> <p>(i) Please explain how these quantities have been determined with cross reference to relevant sections of the ES or other application documents as appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) Does the dDCO not need to specify a maximum depth of excavation to ensure that these quantities are a fair reflection of the activities proposed for which consent is sought? And to safely link back to the assessment of effects assessed by the ES.</p>
AQ.1.40	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>(i) The Applicant suggests in paragraph 14.7.79 [APP-224] that if exceeded of dust levels occurs additional mitigation would be adopted – please explain what this might entail – particularly in light of the commitment within the CoCP to best practice?</p> <p>(ii) How would this additional mitigation be secured?</p> <p>(iii) In the event the threshold of 0.5g/m²/day had been exceeded – what would the consequence be? E.g. would work need to cease until the threshold level had fallen below the agreed level? Please explain the practicalities of what would occur on the ground and how this would be monitored, and the agreed level reached.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.41	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Dust Emissions (Rail)</p> <p>(i) ESC in the [RR-0342] at paragraph 2.207 – please clarify if you are seeking screens/fences in relation to general earthworks across the main development site and associated development sites.</p> <p>(ii) Have further discussions progressed identifying the areas of concern? Please advise the ExA where these are and whether an agreed approach to protecting these receptors has now been reached?</p>
AQ.1.42	The Applicant, ESC, PHE	<p>Human Health (particulate matter)</p> <p>Paragraph 12.6.11 of [APP-212] suggests that there could be a risk to human health if long term dust generating activities increase the baseline level within a receptor area. Do you consider the mitigation identified would be sufficient to avoid adverse effects to human health?</p>
AQ.1.43	The Applicant, Natural England, ESC	<p>Ammonia Deposition</p> <p>It has been suggested that the ES fails to deal with ammonia deposition [RR-908] as would appear to be advocated by the Institute of Air Quality Management's 2020 Guidance and would also need to be carried out to comply with Natural England Guidance. Please respond to these specific concerns.</p>
AQ.1.44	The Applicant	<p>Darsham Parish Council</p> <p>The Parish Council have indicated concern about the effects of the closure of the level crossings and the diversion of traffic this causes, with the resultant increase in air pollution particularly from HGVs.</p> <p>Please advise where the consideration for effects on NO_x, CO₂, and PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ levels from diversions is set out.</p>
AQ.1.45	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Stratford St Andrew AQMA</p> <p>Please advise on the latest position in respect of the assessment of air quality in the Stratford St Andrew AQMA and whether the assessment is now considered robust indicating whether there remain concerns on the assessment undertaken or whether the additional sensitivity testing has now resolved any concerns in this area.</p>
AQ.1.46	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Stratford St Andrew AQMA</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In paragraph 2.153 of the Council RR concern was expressed in respect of the speed of traffic continuing to exceed the speed limit and accelerating such that there remained concerns about the level of NOx. Does this concern remain?
AQ.1.47	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Stratford St Andrew and Woodbridge AQMA</p> <p>(i) In light of the proposed development do you agree that both AQMAs would remain within legal limits assuming the worst-case scenarios for traffic movements?</p> <p>(ii) Is there an agreed management and monitoring approach through the lifetime of the project?</p> <p>(iii) How will traffic from other projects be taken into account to ensure that air quality standards will be maintained?</p> <p>(iv) In the event there is congestion on the A12 what would be in place to monitor this, and ensure air quality remained within acceptable levels within Woodbridge and Stratford St Andrew AQMAs but also would not adversely affect other areas?</p> <p>(iv) What would be in place to secure appropriate mitigation?</p>
AQ.1.48	The Applicant	<p>Air Quality Monitoring</p> <p>(i) Please confirm the commitment to undertake air quality monitoring and the timing of when this would commence for the main development site and all the associated development sites both prior to, and during construction and subsequent operation.</p> <p>(ii) In light of the concerns raised by ESC over NO₂ levels in Stratford St Andrew AQMA, please advise how you would propose to monitor the air quality levels in this area and elsewhere to ensure standards were maintained and no breaches of standards occurred.</p>
AQ.1.49	The Applicant	<p>Non Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM)</p> <p>ESC have requested the adoption of low emitting plant and an assessment both alone and in combination of impacts on both human health and ecology from NRMM and other sources.</p> <p>(i) Please advise whether there is a commitment to low emitting plant and if so how this would be delivered.</p> <p>(ii) Has an assessment now been undertaken of the potential effects of NRMM and other sources as requested by the Council?</p>
AQ.1.50	EA	Concrete Batching Plants

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Are the EA satisfied with the level of information on concrete batching plants and are you satisfied sufficient dust controls are/would be in place to meet appropriate safety standards to protect both human and ecological receptors?
AQ.1.51	ESC, EA, Natural England	<p>Haul Routes</p> <p>(i) The applicant has indicated that haul routes would be hard surfaced 'where practicable' – do you consider this approach to be adequate to safeguard sensitive receptors?</p> <p>(ii) Are there specific locations you consider that a more robust approach should be required, or should a more robust approach be provided across the main development site and associated development sites?</p>
AQ.1.52	The Applicant	<p>NO₂ Emissions</p> <p>A resident of Leiston [RR-204] expresses concern that the development would lead to adverse NO₂ emissions from HDVs, please respond to this specific concern.</p>
AQ.1.53	The Applicant	<p>Traffic emissions at Yoxford</p> <p>Dr David Perry [RR-0323] expresses concern that idling traffic particularly HGVs at the Yoxford Roundabout would result in adverse effects in the locality and result in adverse effects at the local hotel. Please respond to this specific concern.</p>
AQ.1.54	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>Please explain how the various elements of mitigation relate to each other, and how they are secured by the dDCO.</p> <p>In particular how the Outline Dust Management Plan (oDMP), Dust Management Plan (DMP) relates to the Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) and the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p> <p>Please also set out which document would have precedence in the event of a conflict.</p>
AQ.1.55	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>Table 12.17 of [APP-212] Refers to LE25 – The Round House:</p> <p>(i) How would any specific mitigation be delivered to protect the amenity and living standards of this property such that appropriate air quality standards were maintained?</p> <p>(ii) How would this be enforced?</p>
AQ.1.56	The Applicant	<p>Early Years</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		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.
AQ.1.57	The Applicant	Southern Park and Ride Campsea Ashe Parish Council [RR-0170] express concern that the assessment of effects from the Southern Park and Ride have not been adequately addressed. Please respond to these specific concerns
AQ.1.58	The Applicant	Rail Emissions (i) Please advise on any likely effects of trains that are waiting to move onto or off site, or waiting on the line and what impact if any this may have on sensitive receptors. (ii) How might this be controlled, should it be necessary?
AQ.1.59	The Applicant	Back Up Generators Whilst it is understood that these are an essential part of the safety systems which would be in place to support the overall safe operation of the site, please explain: (i) Whether a cleaner alternative to diesel generators has been considered, and if so why this has been discounted. (ii) What mechanisms would be in place to ensure that the generators would operate as cleanly as possible and therefore be as sustainable as possible in the long term.
AQ.1.60	Natural England, ESC, EA	Back Up Generators [APP 212] Paragraph 12.6.65 indicates that the NO _x level would be 428% of the critical level at Sizewell Marshes SSSI and that daily exceedances would also occur at other sensitive ecological receptors: (i) Do you agree that the short term exposure is less important? (ii) Is the level at 428%, albeit likely to be for a short period, tolerable such that any sensitive receptor exposed to these levels of NO _x would be expected to recover?
AQ.1.61	Natural England, ESC, EA	Back Up Generators [APP 212] Paragraph 12.8.3 indicates that there could be significant adverse effects from NO ₂ concentrations, and this could exceed air quality strategy objectives:

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Please comment on this assessment and whether you regard this as reasonable in light of the likelihood of these circumstances occurring as being 'once in the lifetime of a fleet of nuclear sites'. (ii) Even in accepting this is an unlikely scenario would it lead to an exceedance of any statutory limits?
AQ.1.62	The Applicant	Back Up Generators It is indicated that the back-up generators would operate a maximum of 720 hours in any one year (paragraph 14.7.245) [APP-244]. Whilst this might be regarded as a conservative estimate it is not something that could be limited. In these circumstances where you have already identified exceedances of NO _x is it justifiable to say the addition generated by this development is 'not significant'? Please also explain what guidance or precedents you rely upon to support this position.
AQ.1.63	The Applicant	Background Levels The data provided suggests that in future years there will be reductions in NO ₂ , NO ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} figures - because of overall falls in emissions more generally - is there an assessment that shows the relative effects of this scheme and what the levels might be without it taking place?
AQ.1.64	The Applicant	Two Village Bypass - Foxburrow Wood It is suggested by The Woodland Trust [RR 1213] that a buffer zone of at least 30m would be required to ensure that the woodland would be adequately protected in line with standing advice from Natural England: (i) Please advise whether the design and layout of the road accommodates such a buffer; and (ii) If it does how this would be secured; and (iii) If it does not, why it does not.
AQ.1.65	The Applicant	The Round House The Round House (Receptor LE25) is indicated to be subject to activity specific mitigation to protect air quality during construction, but it is also indicated to be subject to compulsory acquisition. The property is in close proximity to both construction works and large areas for storing spoil, please advise how you anticipate ensuring the property and it's occupiers could be

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		adequately protected from the onsite construction activities when in such close proximity to this residence or do you anticipate that it would not be occupied throughout the duration of the works? If so, how would that be secured?
AQ.1.66	The Applicant, ONR, Environment Agency, Natural England, PHE	Tritium Gas Please comment on the concerns raised in [RR-785] in respect of the potential release of tritium gas and any controls that would be in place to safeguard human health and ecology.
AQ.1.67	The Applicant, SCC	Mitigation In the Air Quality Chapter [APP-212] you refer to primary mitigation as 'minimising' freight movements on roads in light of the other delivery methods envisaged via rail and sea. (i) Is it really fair to say these movements would be minimised when to date neither the rail nor sea alternatives are confirmed, or to what degree they could operate?
AQ.1.68	The Applicant	Mitigation In terms of tertiary mitigation please advise what is meant by the following terms: (i) 'as far as practicable' (first bullet point para 12.5.4 [APP-212]) and how you would expect this to be secured? (ii) 'additional mitigation as necessary' (third bullet point of para 12.5.4 [APP-212]) and how you would expect this to be secured? It seems that to be enforceable and to ensure the mitigation to be appropriate a standard needs to be defined against which the construction activities can be assessed, please explain where this standard can be found and how it is secured and would subsequently be monitored.
AQ.1.69	ESC, SCC	Mitigation The Outline Dust Management Plan [APP-213] would be an essential part of the mitigation required to control construction activities on site. Do you consider it sufficiently precise that it would be enforceable?
AQ.1.70	The Applicant	Mitigation – Earth Bunds

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>A 5m high bund is proposed along the southern boundary of the temporary construction area:</p> <p>(i) Is this indicated on any of the plans to be approved? – if so please provide the number.</p> <p>(ii) The ES relies on this as tertiary mitigation and it is assumed it would be secured through the CoCP – is this correct?</p> <p>(iii) What mechanism ensures it is provided in a timely manner to achieve the mitigation it would offer?</p>
AQ.1.71	The Applicant	<p>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</p> <p>Is there a definition of 'plant with significant dust rising potential'? Should there be a threshold specified so this term is fully understood?</p>
AQ.1.72	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>The CoCP contains general phrases such as 'where possible' and 'will seek to ensure'. In such circumstances how would the local authorities be able to enforce compliance?</p>
AQ.1.73	The Applicant	<p>Northern Park and Ride – Air Quality/Noise</p> <p>Within the Equality Statement [APP-158] a high potential for adverse effects from the Northern Park and Ride is indicated. Please advise where these concerns are set out in the corresponding air quality and noise chapters and how they might be mitigated to ensure there would not be a significant effect.</p>
AQ.1.74	The Applicant	<p>Bus Fleet</p> <p>(i) Is the bus fleet proposed to operate to and from the main development site and associated sites intended to be electric, zero emission or ultra low emission?</p> <p>(ii) Please advise on the types of bus to be employed and the effect on emissions/air quality.</p> <p>(iii) How might any commitment to electric, zero emission or ultra low emission be secured?</p>
AQ.1.75	The Applicant	<p>Conveyor on BLF</p> <p>It is not clear from the information provided how the conveyor system on the BLF would be powered. Please explain where this is set out in the ES.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		If it is to run via a non mains generator please explain how this would be delivered through the DCO and the mechanism for ensuring any environmental effects were not significant.
AQ.1.76	The Applicant, ESC (part ii), SCC (part ii)	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>The revised Mitigation Route Map [AS 276] has added for the Main Development Site</p> <p><i>“ Use of contractor vehicles as far as practicable that meet the Euro VI emissions standards and Euro V standards (98/69/EC) as a minimum, unless otherwise agreed with the local authority.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Use of non-road mobile machines as far as practicable and available that meet the Stage IV engine standards of the NRMM Emission Standards Directive to minimise NOx and particulate emissions on site.”</i> <p>(i) This wording is not consistent across the main development site and other associated sites – is there a reason for this?</p> <p>(ii) Do the Councils consider that as reworded this is sufficiently robust?</p>
AQ.1.77	The Applicant	<p>CoCP</p> <p>Table 4.1 [AS 273] requires an adequate water supply to be made available to suppress dust/particulate matter.</p> <p>The latest information provided with the ES Addendum appears to prefer the provision of a water supply which does not form part of the dDCO.</p> <p>Please explain the rationale for this approach and how the ExA can be assured adequate water supplies would be available in a timely manner to ensure dust and particulate matter is limited to agreed levels.</p>
AQ.1.78	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>CoCP</p> <p>Table 4.2 refers to regular inspection and monitoring and this terminology is used in several places. Regular could ostensibly be once a year, While, it is assumed this is not the intention is there a more precise term that could be used to ensure maintenance and monitoring is undertaken expeditiously?</p>
<p>Al.1 Alternatives</p>		
Al.1.0	The Applicant	General assessment principles

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Having regard to NPS EN-1, Section 4.4:</p> <p>(i) Please identify all legal and policy requirements relating to the assessment of alternatives applicable to this project and summarise the Applicant's compliance with those requirements;</p> <p>(ii) Please identify any such legal or policy requirements where compliance has not yet been agreed with the relevant statutory regulator? For example, in relation to the Habitats Directive, the Water Framework Directive or flood risk.</p>
Al.1.1	The Applicant	<p>General assessment principles</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.35, explains that SZC Co. has not considered any alternatives for elements of the Sizewell C Project which have been determined through other processes, policies or legislation, including the proposed siting of Sizewell C. Please identify all elements including any associated development for which alternatives have not been considered, providing reasons for each element in that category.</p>
Al.1.2	The Applicant	<p>General assessment principles</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.33, states that EN-6 clarifies how alternatives should be considered in the context of applications for new nuclear power stations. EN-6, paragraph 2.4.5, explains that in addition to the consideration of alternative sites, an assessment was undertaken as part of the Nuclear Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) to consider whether the objectives of this NPS could be delivered using alternative options. It concludes that: <i>"It is the Government's view that none of the alternative options looked at can be relied upon to deliver the objectives of this NPS by the end of 2025"</i>:</p> <p>Given that it is accepted those objectives cannot be delivered by the current scheme within that timescale, what reliance can be placed upon the EN-6 approach to alternative options?</p>
Al.1.3	The Applicant	<p>General assessment principles</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.34, refers to EN-6, section 2.4, which outlines how alternatives were considered through the nomination process that led to confirmation in EN-6 of the eight sites for new nuclear power stations. It states that there is nothing in the consultation on the new NPS or the Government's July 2018 response which suggests that the Government's position on this has changed. The representations of Ian Marshall [RR-0490] and Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257], submit that this conclusion is out of</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		date. Please comment on the criticisms made in those representations and provide further justification to support the view that the proposed siting of Sizewell C should not have been reconsidered for this application?
Al.1.4	The Applicant	<p>General assessment principles</p> <p>The Government response: consultation on the siting criteria and process for a new national policy statement for nuclear power with single reactor capacity over 1 gigawatt beyond 2025 July 2018 Annex II, paragraph II.4 states that : <i>“Government’s approach therefore is to carry the list of potentially suitable sites in EN-6 through to the new NPS. This will be subject to confirmation from the current developers associated with each potentially suitable site that they wish it to remain listed in future and subject to those sites meeting the strategic criteria as well as demonstrating they are credible for deployment by 2035. The finalised strategic siting criteria at Annex I are based on the original Strategic Siting Assessment (updated to be consistent with current law and policy and to take account of the views received as part of this consultation)”</i>. Please explain further:</p> <p>(i) How the scheme would comply with the strategic siting criteria set out in Annex I, paragraph 1.14, in relation to the flooding, tsunami, storm surge and coastal processes aspects of nuclear safety and security; and</p> <p>(ii) the credibility of this particular scheme for deployment by 2035.</p>
Al.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Site specific assessment – change in circumstances</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.8.9, indicates that further details of the evolution of the main development site boundary and the alternatives considered by SCZ Co. are provided at Volume 2, Chapter 6 of the ES:</p> <p>(i) Please provide a separate summary of those changes and the justification for them.</p> <p>(ii) Explain further why the changes to the nominated site area and the siting of the temporary construction area in close proximity to the main construction area do not represent a change in circumstances?</p>
Al.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Reactor design</p> <p>The NPS EN-6 Vol I, Section 2.6, considers the Regulatory Justification process and the planning regime. It explains that in October 2010 the Secretary of State published his decisions that two nuclear reactor designs, Westinghouse’s AP1000 and Areva’s EPR, are</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		justified and that Justification is a separate regulatory process. However, given the period that has elapsed since the Regulatory Justification decision and the criticisms raised by IPs in relation to reactor design, should requirements be attached to draft DCO to the effect that the order is conditional on the existence of a valid Regulatory Justification decision?
Al.1.7	ONR	<p>Reactor design</p> <p>The Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) [RR-0911] explains that in June 2020, NNB Generation Company (SZC) Ltd applied for a nuclear site licence to allow it to install and operate two EPR™ reactors at the Sizewell C site. The design of the proposed twin reactor development at Sizewell C is closely based on that for the power station that is currently under construction at Hinkley Point C. ONR carried out an assessment of the generic EPR design in 2012 and concluded that it could be safely constructed and operated in the United Kingdom. Whilst the ExA appreciates that the ONR is currently assessing the nuclear site licence application, does it have any concerns at this stage in the light of experience and development of the EPR reactor since 2012 at Hinkley Point C?</p>
Al.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for accommodation infrastructure</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report sets out SZCs approach to site selection. Section 2.2 considers the strategic alternatives for accommodation infrastructure. This is further explained in the Accommodation Strategy. Please explain in detail:</p> <p>(i) Why it was considered that an off-site campus would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community or environmental impacts around the main development site; and</p> <p>(ii) Why the delivery of permanent housing was not considered as a reasonable alternative to the on-site campus?</p>
Al.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for accommodation infrastructure</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.36, indicates that appropriate strategic options have been considered by SZC Co. for the accommodation of workforce. In addition, the Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 3 sets out the site selection process for development on the main development site. Section 6 considers the temporary construction area including c) the on-site campus location. However, there is criticism raised by IPs of the site selection process that led to proposal for the Eastbridge Lane site to accommodate a worker campus including by the Theberton</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and Eastbridge Parish Council [RR-1214] which states that justifications for selecting the single Eastbridge Lane site are poorly evidenced. (i) Please provide further justification of the selection of the Eastbridge Lane site; (ii) Explain in further detail, how that decision has taken on board responses to the Stage 1 consultation process including the concerns raised by the nearby communities of Theberton and Eastbridge; (iii) What consideration and weight was given to those community concerns, as opposed to the logistical benefits of an 'on-site' campus?</p>
Al.1.10	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight The Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] states that the Council does not support the Applicant's proposed freight transport strategy as it stands, and considers that it is still reasonably achievable to increase the proportion of rail and potentially sea-borne deliveries. In the light of the Applicant's strategic assessment of alternatives, and the Applicant's subsequent Changes to the original application, please indicate: (i) Why it is considered that an increased proportion of rail transport and sea-borne transport can be achieved without causing undue delay to the construction programme? (ii) Whether the changes to the application have overcome the SCCs concerns in this respect?</p>
Al.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight The ES 6.2 Volume 1 Chapter 4 – Project Evolution and Alternatives, sets out the strategic alternatives that have been considered by SZC Co. and how these have guided the evolution of the proposed development. In relation to the movement of freight, this explains why the option of a wide jetty was rejected including the assessment of the potential delay to the construction programme. In the light of the changes to the application including in relation to sea-borne deliveries: Please explain why the amended proposal would be acceptable in environmental terms compared to options previously considered for sea-borne deliveries and how the potential delay to construction and any other disadvantages previously identified associated with sea-borne deliveries would be overcome.</p>
Al.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight The ES 6.3 Volume 2 Chapter 6 – Main Site Development, Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 6.2.98, sets out the principal reasons why SZC Co. has chosen not to proceed with the two jetty options which are informed by design development and</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		environmental work since Stage 2 and SZC Co.'s experiences from the construction of Hinkley Point C. Please provide an update in the light of the changes to the application and distinguish the current proposal from the jetty options previously rejected with particular regard to underwater noise, seasonal controls on construction activity, and the potential for delay to the construction programme and the commencement of operation of the power station.
Al.1.13	The Applicant	Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight The ES 6.2 Volume I, Chapter 4 – Project Evolution and Alternatives, paragraph 4.3.66, states that the BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted: Please explain how the findings and conclusions expressed in the ES submitted in support of the application are compatible with the ES Addendum information relating to Change 2, in that previously the BLF was the “only capacity promoted” and now it is two BLFs and jetty components including the previous concerns expressed as to potential delay to the overall time taken to construct the power station caused by the implementation of those measures?
Al.1.14	The Applicant	Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight The ES 6.2 Volume I, Chapter 4 – Project Evolution and Alternatives Paragraph 4.3.63 states that the level of uncertainty of the works needed to deliver the rail-led option would affect SZC Co.'s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed in time to meet the urgent need for new nuclear power generation. Paragraph 4.3.64 concludes that on the basis of these concerns, the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable. Instead, an integrated strategy was developed to seek to secure the best deliverable rail outcome, whilst addressing the concerns expressed in relation to the road-led strategy: (i) Please provide further details of the reasons for the uncertainty surrounding the deliverability of the works associated with the rail-led option and why it was considered that these could not be overcome within the required timescale? (ii) Please provide further details to explain the complex nature of those rail works, and how this is overcome by the changes to the application? (iii) Please explain how the findings and conclusions expressed in the ES submitted in support of the application are compatible with the ES Addendum information relating to

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Change 1? In particular, why is it now considered that the changes in relation to the use of rail are now regarded as being deliverable?
Al.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Freight Management Facility</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 8, sets out the site selection process for the Freight Management Facility (FMF). The representation of Highways England [RR-0468] points out that the facility would be located to the east of the A14 Orwell Bridge which is susceptible to periods of disruption and closures to traffic during inclement weather. It seeks clarity around the proposed FMF location including whether viable alternative locations west of the A14 Orwell Bridge have been identified, and the criteria used to select the proposed location. Please summarise the selection criteria and explain:</p> <p>(i) The consideration given to the likelihood of closures of the Orwell Bridge in the site selection process;</p> <p>(ii) the consideration of viable alternatives west of the Orwell Bridge.</p>
Al.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 6, sets out the site selection process for the Two Village Bypass. This is also noted in the Site Selection Report, paragraph 6.4.70, and the reasons for rejection of that proposal are set out in subsequent paragraphs. The representation of Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council [RR-0379] expresses concern as regards the route alignment for the bypass of Farnham and Stratford St Andrew villages. There are also objections from a number of local residents including Ashtons Legal on behalf of Farnham Environment Residents & Neighbours (FERN) and others [RR-0108 to RR-0117]:</p> <p>(i) Please respond in detail to the criticism made by the Parish Council and other IPs to the proposed alignment of the new road including any change to the Ancient Woodland designation, the impact upon the properties at Farnham Hall and the benefit of facilitating a future four village bypass.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide a larger scale plan of Plate 6.1: A12 Four village route options with the proposed Two Village Bypass route overlaid to aid comparison of those schemes.</p>
Al.1.17	The Applicant	Site selection for the Two Village Bypass

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.2.25, refers to analysis which suggested that congestion was only likely within Farnham due to the narrowing of the road at the Farnham bend. At Stage 2 of the consultation Stratford St Andrew was also added to the bypass options so as to remove Sizewell C traffic congestion from both villages. The Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) for the Sizewell Site (DECC, 2010) noted the Four Village Bypass as one of the key transport interactions for the proposed Sizewell C development. Please explain in detail the reasons for concluding that congestion was only likely to occur at the bend and that the impact of Sizewell C traffic would not be sufficient to justify a bypass of all four villages.</p>
Al.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.25, indicates that the alternative alignment put forward by the Parish Council was reviewed at the Stage 4 consultation stage, taking into account the impacts on woodland, environment and nearby receptors as well as operational matters, but it was not considered to be a better solution. Please explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The operational matters that weighed upon that decision. (ii) The additional average journey time that users of the alternative alignment would be likely to take compared to the proposed route and the existing routes. (iii) Justification for the conclusion that the proposed route would be likely to encourage road users to bypass the current A12 route through Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham compared to the alternative route.
Al.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.27 states that the alternative alignment would be closer to Walk Barn Farm than the SZC Co. proposal is to any neighbouring property. Nonetheless the proposed route would pass close to the Farnham Hall complex. Please provide in summary a comparison of the distance of the two routes from residential properties in the vicinity; the numbers of residences in the various locations; the anticipated noise impact upon those residents and any impact upon heritage assets.</p>
Al.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Consultation Report Appendix G records concern that the two village bypass would damage Grade II listed buildings and other heritage assets in the area. The response indicates that potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting would be addressed through mitigation measures including standard CoCP measures to minimise noise and air quality effects (construction phase).</p> <p>(i) Please explain in detail why such measures are not proposed for the operational phase and identify the mitigation that is proposed for that phase?</p> <p>(ii) Specifically in relation to ES Vol 5 Chapter 4 Noise and Vibration para 4.7.12, how would further consideration of measures that could be implemented to further reduce traffic noise at detailed design stage be secured, and what type of measures are anticipated?</p>
Al.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.28, refers to the potential impact of the alternative alignment upon Friday Street Farm. Please explain further by reference to a plan the various impacts that would result from the alternative alignment upon the separate areas of the business mentioned.</p>
Al.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.29, refers to the potential impact of the alternative alignment upon Foxburrow Wood ancient woodland and Palants Grove:</p> <p>(i) Please explain in detail the perceived difficulties in maintaining a 15m buffer to Foxburrow Wood and why this could not be overcome?</p> <p>(ii) Provide an update as to the status of Foxburrow Wood and Palant's Grove as ancient woodland.</p> <p>(iii) The extent of the County Wildlife Site that would be lost as a result of the alternative alignment.</p>
Al.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 5, sets out the site selection process for the Southern Park and Ride (SPR). The representation of the Hacheston Parish Council [RR-0447] suggests that the SPR should be situated further south on the A12 at Martlesham where an under-used Park and Ride exists. Please</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		indicate whether consideration has been given to the specific alternative site proposed by the Parish Council and, if so, the reasons for rejection.
Al.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, paragraph 5.4.7, indicates that for the Stage 1 consultation, Option 1 – Wickham Market was considered to be in the optimal position:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further why that was considered to be the case, in particular by way of comparison with a site located further south on the A12.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain further why Options 2 and 3 were considered to have the potential to cause greater issues in terms of congestion, access and highway safety compared to Option 1.</p>
Al.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The representation of Great Glemham Parish Council [RR-0438], submits that the SPR facility should be situated alongside the FMF at Sevenhills to reduce pressure on Wickham Market. What assessment has been made of existing pressures on Wickham Market and the impact that the proposed park and ride facility would have on those pressures in comparison to a location beside the FMF?</p>
Al.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The ES 6.5 Volume 4 – Southern Park and Ride, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.2.22 states that Option 2 (Woodbridge) and Option 3 (Potash Corner) were both considered to be potentially suitable sites in transport terms but would have been in less optimal locations. These would have had the potential to cause greater issues in terms of congestion, as well as access and highway safety when compared with Option 1 (Wickham Market). This is expanded upon in paragraph 3.2.26. Please explain further these potential transport issues identified with Options 2 and 3 and why Option 1 was considered to be preferable in highway safety terms?</p>
Al.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 7, sets out the site selection process for the Sizewell Link Road (SLR). The Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council [RR-0019] is critical of the location of the SLR junction and submits that it is too far north for traffic from the south and does not provide the necessary relief to the existing road network further south. The Site Selection Report Table 7.1 provides a</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>comparison between various route options including those further to the south of the chosen route. However, the impact on traffic relief to the existing road network is not considered in this analysis. The initial need for the road to alleviate traffic impacts is identified in paragraph 7.4.10 but consequently the route options presented do not consider any traffic network analysis of the various route options. Given the report suggests that traffic analysis has been undertaken on the various route options considered, this analysis should be submitted to support the option appraisal of alternatives. If this has not been undertaken the Applicant should explain how it can therefore conclude that the selected alignment offers the best route choice in terms of network management.</p>
Al.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, paragraph 7.4.14, Route W is described as <i>"requiring engineering works to traverse the landform which would have had a significant adverse effect on the existing landscape character and there was the potential for the significant (sic) of several heritage assets to be affected adversely as a result of the route's alignment."</i> Yet in Table 7.1 in comparison with Route Z, the preferred option, there is very little difference in the summary presented in that table between the two options in terms of Landscape and Heritage. Given the level of engineering operations required to traverse the landform in the design progressed the Applicant is asked to explain in more detail why the Route W options have been discounted for the reasons set out in Table 7.1?</p>
Al.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>It is a working assumption of the Transport Assessment that 85% of the HGV traffic travelling to the Main Development Site is coming from the south. Please additionally set out the proportion of the remaining other Sizewell C related traffic (i.e. construction and operational workers, LGVs, etc) that will be travelling to the selected route of the SLR from the south?</p>
Al.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, paragraph 7.4.27, recognises that Route W located to the south of Saxmundham was best placed to intercept the Sizewell C HGVs from the south. However, it is asserted that it would not have as effectively relieved B1122 communities</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		of traffic as more northerly routes. Please explain the basis of that assertion and why greater weight was not placed upon the relief from HGVs and other traffic travelling from the south?
Al.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The ES 6.7 Volume 6 Sizewell Link Road Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.2.46, states that the W route could have had an adverse effect on the setting of the existing heritage assets including Hurts Hall and Leiston Abbey as they are situated approximately 450m north and 300m north of Route W respectively. Please provide further details of those heritage impacts and the landscape impacts and explain why they could not have been satisfactorily mitigated?</p>
Al.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The ES 6.7 Volume 6 Sizewell Link Road Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.21, confirms that once operational, the SLR would be open to general traffic during and after the construction of Sizewell C. The Consultation Report, section 8.10 - Changes to the Sizewell C Project in response to the Stage 4 consultation, indicates that a decision was made at that stage to propose the SLR as a permanent facility, rather than temporary. However, the Consultation Report Appendix G Stage 4 Issues Table f Sizewell Link Road/Theberton Bypass – records general support for removal of the SLR following the construction phase and for the land to be restored. Please explain in further detail the assessment of the consultation responses on this topic which led to the decision to permanently retain the SLR and how that reflects the Stage 4 consultation responses.</p>
Al.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] submits that the SLR should not be permanent and instead be removed after Sizewell C construction is completed for the reasons set out in paragraphs 40 and 41 of its representation. It submits that the retention of the SLR would cause a greater permanent residual landscape and ecological impact than a temporary solution, as well as resulting in permanent loss of agricultural land. Since there is no strategic transport case for permanent retention of the SLR the Council requests the road to be removed after the construction period:</p> <p>(i) Please provide a detailed response to these concerns relating to the need to retain the SLR on a permanent basis at this location.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(ii) Whilst the proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project, is it necessary for it to remain to achieve a reduction in traffic during the operational phase? And</p> <p>(iii) Please identify and explain the advantages and disadvantages of retention of the road versus its removal?</p>
Al.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The representation of Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] is critical of the process whereby the SLR route was selected. Please respond specifically to the criticisms made by Ward Farming Ltd including of the Aecom report commissioned by EDF.</p>
Al.1.35	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Electrical connection to the National Grid substation</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council [RR-1174], submits that the provision of four additional tall pylons with overhead lines on the development site would have considerable additional detrimental impact on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. The review on behalf of the Council by Pöyry Energy Limited (AFRY) indicates that the use of Gas Insulated Lines (GIL) to connect to the National Grid (NGET) substation is a feasible alternative to overhead lines and pylons. This technical report has been supplied to the applicant for consideration:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further on whether GIL would provide a viable and less impactful alternative in this location?</p> <p>(ii) If not already submitted, please provide a copy of the AFRY technical report.</p>
Al.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Electrical connection to the National Grid substation</p> <p>The ES Appendix 8.4 A Site Selection Report indicates that the 4 and 5 pylon and undergrounding options were assessed at Stage 4. The four pylon option was the preferred option.</p> <p>(i) Notwithstanding the details provided in the Site Selection Report, please explain further the safety issues and significant safety and programme-related risks associated with the construction and operation of an underground cable option that specifically apply to this location?</p> <p>(ii) Why could any adverse impact on the SSSI not be satisfactorily overcome by mitigation?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AR.1	Amenity and recreation	
AR.1.0	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Alde Valley Academy Leiston</p> <p>The off-site sports facilities are regarded as an important mitigation in assisting the assimilation of the workforce into the area. As currently set out the facility would not appear to have a time frame for delivery, or in light of the ESC [RR-0342] resolved potential drainage concerns:</p> <p>(i) Please advise on the latest position in respect of the progress of the S106, surface water management issue identified, and what the timeframe for delivery of this facility would be.</p> <p>(ii) In order to achieve the necessary mitigation what timeframe for delivery would be required?</p>
AR.1.1	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Leiston and Sizewell PC.	<p>Alde Valley Academy Leiston</p> <p>(i) In the event that the sports pitches and supporting facilities are not in place in a timely manner would the effect on the local community be regarded as significant in your view?</p> <p>(ii) What time frame of delivery needs to be stipulated to avoid such effects?</p>
AR.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (Accommodation)</p> <p>The application anticipates accommodation for up to 600 workers being available:</p> <p>(i) Has a plan been provided showing the layout for the site? Please clarify where this can be found and how this would be delivered through the DCO?</p> <p>(ii) How confident can the ExA be that this provision would be forthcoming in a timely manner, and be retained, and optimally occupied throughout the construction period.</p> <p>(iii) Reference is made by ESC [RR-0342] to the possibility the site may be laid out with mobile homes. These require very different space requirements and no doubt would offer very different levels of accommodation. In light of this suggestion what confidence can the ExA have in the mitigation suggested within the ES being delivered?</p> <p>(iv) In light of reference to two alternatives please explain what has been assessed within the ES and what would be delivered through the DCO.</p>
AR.1.3	The Applicant	Mitigation

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In light of the comments from ESC in their [RR-0342] is it agreed a financial contribution to the Suffolk Coast RAMS is an appropriate way of mitigating for the recreational disturbance likely to arise from the accommodation campus as suggested by ESC?
AR.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate</p> <p>The temporary construction area may be raised by as much as 5.5m above existing ground levels; please explain:</p> <p>(i) What implications this has for the noise assessment and in particular in respect of the properties in close proximity on Valley Road.</p> <p>(ii) Paragraph 3.4.208 of [APP-184] indicates that the topsoil would be set back so as to not harm residents – how has the effect been assessed?</p>
AR.1.5	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Consultation Group</p> <p>[APP-267] paragraph 15.3.12 appears to indicate that the consultation group included a single commercial fisherman:</p> <p>(i) Is this correct?</p> <p>(ii) Were they representing the wider industry or a representative organisation?</p> <p>(iii) Are the Councils satisfied that the makeup of the group was representative of all interests?</p>
AR.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>[APP-267] paragraph 15.5.33 final bullet point refers to Appendix 2C should this be 2B?</p>
AR.1.7	SCC	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>(i) Are the Council satisfied with the Rights of Way and Access Strategy (Appendix 15I) of [APP-270] and the future intention to submit a Footpath Implementation Plan for approval?</p> <p>(ii) Does the Council consider all parties with protective characteristics have been fully considered in this strategy?</p> <p>(iii) And the approach justified?</p>
AR.1.8	The Applicant, AONB Partnership, ESC, SCC	<p>AONB</p> <p>The AONB Partnership set out detailed concern [RR-1170] with regard to the assessment of and significance of effects on the AONB and its statutory purposes:</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Can the Applicant please respond in full to these concerns in respect of recreation and amenity?</p> <p>(ii) Can the Applicant also set out the effects on the AONB and its value as a recreational and amenity area through each of the construction, operational and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>(iii) Do the Councils and AONB Partnership consider the ES has fully recognised the benefits of the AONB as a recreational and amenity area and provided for appropriate mitigation?</p>
AR.1.9	SCC, ESC	<p>AONB PROW</p> <p>Do the Councils agree with the views as expressed by the AONB Partnership [RR-1170] that the loss of the open access adversely affects the purpose of the AONB and that the limitation of the PROW in the area particularly the coastal path have not been sufficiently mitigated?</p>
AR.1.10	SCC, ESC	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>Are the Councils concerned in respect of the location of the proposed accommodation campus and the potential effect it could have on the tranquillity of the AONB or residents of Eastbridge?</p>
AR.1.11	SCC, ESC	<p>Coastal Path</p> <p>Do the Councils consider that the assessment of effect on the National Coastal Path and the mitigation during: Construction; Operation; and Decommissioning are adequate to safeguard the amenity and recreational value they provide? For assistance, paragraph 15.5.11 to 15.5.20 [APP-267] sets out the potential implications for the Suffolk Coast Path, Sandlings Walk and the future route of the England Coast Path. Diversions are explained and shown in The Access and Rights of Way Strategy, Appendix 15I [APP-270].</p>
AR.1.12	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, National Trust, RSPB	<p>Displacement of Tourists/Visitors</p> <p>The National Trust [RR-877] and RSPB [RR-1059] indicate that they do not consider the displacement of tourists and visitors from the current pattern of visiting has been undertaken in a way which could be regarded as precautionary, it could therefore underestimate the effects on both the National Trust land at Dunwich, and the RSPB Minsmere site but also elsewhere:</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Please respond to this concern. (ii) The National Trust and RSPB are seeking a commitment to mitigation, monitoring of activity and potential compensation – please advise on any progress that has been made in this regard.
AR.1.13	SCC	PROW Does the Council consider the strategy for the PROW network has sufficient detail and the impacts throughout the construction and subsequent operation of the proposed development are fully understood?
AR.1.14	The Applicant, SCC	PROW The Ramblers Association [RR-1005] have expressed concern regarding the impacts on the local PROW network. Please respond to the concerns identified.
AR.1.15	The Applicant, SCC	PROW [RR-809] Miss Maria Toone and [RR-765] Martin Freeman have both expressed concern in respect of the potential safety risks for horse riders by diverting Bridleway 19. Please respond to these concerns and explain how the diversion would address the safety concerns for horse riders, cyclists, and other highway users.
AR.1.16	The Applicant, ESC	Aldhurst Farm (i) Please explain how the Aldhurst Farm compensatory land is intended to be managed going forward so that the ecological benefits it is intended to bring can be safeguarded. (ii) In the event that public access is to be provided to the area beyond just the PROW whether this leads to a conflict with conservation of any species on the site and how this would be monitored and managed.
AR.1.17	The Applicant	Aldhurst Farm The proposed parking would appear to be at the behest of a third party – please advise what is in place to secure delivery of the parking indicated.
AR.1.18	ESC, SCC, English Heritage	Leiston Abbey The Applicant concludes that the effects of construction and operation on Leiston Abbey in amenity and recreation terms would [APP-267 para 15.6.98] be significant. (i) Is this conclusion agreed?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Is the assessment on potential visitor numbers during construction and subsequent operation conservative and therefore fairly predicts the significance of effect in this respect?
AR.1.19	ESC, SCC	<p>Community Impact Report (CIR)</p> <p>The CIR indicates that there would be a significant adverse effect on the amenity of pedestrians and cyclists using the B1122 during the early years of construction (Table 2.2 of [APP-156]).</p> <p>Could this be mitigated to reduce this effect, if so how could this mitigation be secured?</p>
AR.1.20	ESC, SCC	<p>Recreational Receptors</p> <p>Do the Councils agree that the only recreational receptors significantly affected by the works on the main development site during construction would be as set out in para 15.3.55 of [APP-267] or are there other areas of concern that should be identified?</p>
AR.1.21	The Applicant, Relevant local authorities (iv only)	<p>Methodology</p> <p>(i) In light of the complexity of the assessment and the time period over which the construction would last would it be reasonable to assume that the significance of effect could be greater than that which has been concluded?</p> <p>(ii) What degree of confidence is there in the assessment?</p> <p>(iii) As there is not an agreed methodology for assessing such affects and it is reliant upon professional judgement – has an independent review been undertaken of the findings?</p> <p>(iv) Do the Councils agree with the methodology and the significance of effect found by the Applicant with regard to impacts upon recreation and amenity?</p>
AR.1.22	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>As part of the proposal to improve access to the Southern Park and Ride it is suggested [RR-762] that this may require traffic regulation orders to remove on street parking along the B1078.</p> <p>(i) Is this correct?</p> <p>(ii) If so, how many parking spaces would be removed?</p> <p>(iii) Where is it anticipated the residents using these spaces would park in the event that this is undertaken?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iv) What assessment has been undertaken to ensure no one with protected characteristics would be adversely affected by such a proposal?
AR.1.23	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>A number of RRs including [RR-521, RR-588, RR-762 and RR-898] indicate that the location of the P&R would adversely affect Wickham Market during construction and subsequent operation as a consequence of the additional traffic.</p> <p>(i) Please advise how the effects on the character and amenity of the town and its residents have been considered in selecting the location for the P&R and</p> <p>(ii) what mitigation if any would be secured to ensure that the effects are kept below a significant level?</p>
AR.1.24	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>A number of residents including [RR-749] have expressed concern that the closure of Pretty Road would result in significant problems of severance, causing significant difficulties for accessing services in Saxmundham. Please respond to this concern.</p>
AR.1.25	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Two Village Bypass</p> <p>Residents of Marlesford and Glemham including [RR-1018, RR-758] express concern regarding the adverse effect increased traffic would have from the proposed development, in combination with the positioning of the Southern Park and Ride. This combined with the lack of a bypass to the villages, could result in unacceptable impacts in terms of access to the A12 and severance from the facilities on the southern side of the A12.</p> <p>Please respond to these concerns setting out how you consider the effects are mitigated.</p>
AR.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Northern Park and Ride</p> <p>The Equality Statement [APP-158] paragraph 1.6.16 identifies that the Sai Grace Ashram has the high potential to be adversely affected by the Northern P&R.</p> <p>(i) Please explain where in the Noise and Air Quality Chapters this concern has been explained.</p> <p>(ii) What mitigation could be offered and secured to protect the environment of the property and its residents.</p>
AR.1.27	ESC, SCC	Public Sector Equality Duty

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>A number of RRs including [RR-681, 0790, 993] have been received identifying people with protected characteristics who indicate they would be disadvantaged by the proposed development.</p> <p>(i) Do the Councils consider adequate regard has been made to people with protected characteristics in identifying impacts and subsequently setting out appropriate mitigation?</p> <p>(ii) If in answering the above in the negative, what additional work should be undertaken to improve the assessment?</p> <p>(iii) What additional mitigation might be available?</p>
AR.1.28	ESC, SCC	<p>Parking Provision</p> <p>Do the Councils consider that the parking details set out in paras 3.4.143, 155, 178, 204 [APP-184] proposed is sufficiently clear and robust to avoid potential problems of fly parking such that this would avoid the need for additional provision/ mitigation/monitoring of parking and be regarded as appropriate?</p>
AR.1.29	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Leiston</p> <p>Leiston cum Sizewell Town Council [RR-679] express a variety of concerns about the broader impacts upon the town of the proposed development beyond those considered in the ES assessment. Please respond to these concerns and advise what progress has been made in any joint working in particular on the broader cultural issues identified, town centre improvements sought, and enhanced cycle provision.</p>
AR.1.30	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Leiston</p> <p>The Town Council [RR-679] indicate they intend to stop vehicular traffic along Valley Road. Please respond to this proposal and what implication if any it might have for the development in the area.</p>
AR.1.31	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Leiston</p> <p>Please respond to the Town Council concerns [RR-679] about improvements required for cyclists safety at the Kenton Hills /Lovers Lane junction, and the need to provide appropriate surfacing for walkers along the beach during construction activities.</p>
AR.1.32	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Lorry Park/Freight Management Facility</p> <p>[RR-226] raises concern over the potential adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of cyclists as a result of the proposed lorry park. Please respond to the concerns.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AR.1.33	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Leiston</p> <p>The Town Council express concern [RR-679] that the mitigation for impacts from a large influx of predominantly male workers has not been fully addressed, with the only specific mitigation proposed the sports facilities at the Academy.</p> <p>The concerns in respect of the potential community impacts are much broader than just the effects on sports provision.</p> <p>Please respond to these concerns and explain how the ES has considered the broader community effects of a large influx of workers and what mitigation would be secured to address these community effects.</p>
AR.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Translation Services</p> <p>It is indicated that Tier 1 Contractors [Table 9.49 APP-195] would be required to have translation services.</p> <p>(i) How is this to be secured?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain the rationale for this service only being provided by Tier 1 contractors.</p> <p>(iii) What proportion of the workforce would be provided by Tier 1 contractors?</p>
AR.1.35	English Heritage	<p>Leiston Abbey</p> <p>[APP-577] sets out a summary of project wide effects at the Abbey, do you agree with the overall conclusions?</p> <p>What effect do you consider this would have on visitors to Leiston Abbey and would you regard the effect as significant?</p>
AR.1.36	ESC, SCC, The Applicant (part (iii) only)	<p>Beach Landing Facility (BLF) Coastal Path</p> <p>(i) The BLF would affect the use of the coastal path, [APP-267, APP-270, AS-181] do you consider the mitigation proposed adequate during construction and operation of the proposed development?</p> <p>(ii) Would the route under the BLF or which is proposed to cross the BLF access road require to be surfaced in any way to ensure access for all?</p> <p>(iii) What surface would each of the two alternatives along the beach be?</p>
AR.1.37	National Trust, The Applicant (part (ii) only)	<p>Displacement of Visitors</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Please explain where the figure of 88,000 additional visitors as specified by the National Trust [RR- 877] originates (ii) Does the Applicant agree this would represent a reasonable figure for additional visitor numbers?
AR.1.38	The Applicant	Parking To assist in understanding the breakdown for a typical day of construction, for each phase please provide a breakdown of the number of workers on each site and where you anticipate they would have parked in advance of arriving at either the main development site or associated sites.
AR.1.39	The Applicant	CoCP Table 7.1 Code of Construction Practice Part B [APP-615] advises that advance notification would be given of the diversion of PROW in accordance with section 4 of Part A please provide a clear description/explanation of what this refers to.